The original documents are located in Box 15, folder "Intelligence - Interception of Non-Verbal Communications by FBI and NSA: Hearings Transcripts (1)" of the Loen and Leppert Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

THE WHITE HOUSE

3-12-76 Mete. And the attacked to goel March on My buch plip FyI. I'll argu a chitial the buch plus hepre its chas Buchen also

Digitized from Box 15 of the Loen & Leppert Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library

Inrevised and Unedited Not for Quotation or Suplication

Stenographic Transcript Of

HEARINGS

Before The

Government Information and Individual Rights COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HEARING ON THE INTERCEPTION OF NON-VERBAL COMMUNICATIONS BY THE FBI AND THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

February 25, 1976

Washington, D. C.

COURT REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 1911 Jefferson Davis Hwy, Suite 300-A Arlington, Virginia 22202 (703) 920-6155

			•
1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	· ·	
· 2	House of Representatives		•
3	Subcommittee on Government Information and Individual Rights of the Committee	•	
4	on Government Operations		
5	Washington, D. C.	February	25, 1976
6		• •	•
7	STATEMENT OF:		Page
8	Joe R. Craig Former FBI Special Agent		12
9	Walter C. Zink		
10	FBI Special Agent, New York		20
11	David G. Jenkins FBI Special Agent, New York		25
- 12	John P. Loomis	•	• • •
- 13	FBI Special Agent, Washington, D. C.	•	33
14	Joseph J. Tomba National Security Agency Employee		44
15			•
16			
17			•
18		·	
19			• • . •
20			
21 22		-	
22			
23			and the second
24 25			
23		•	

-

1

-

.

1	HEARING ON THE INTERCEPTION OF NON-VERBAL COMMUNICATIONS BY THE FBI AND THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY	
2		
3	WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1976	
4		
5	House of Representatives	
6	Subcommittee on Government	
7	Information and Individual Rights of the Committee on	
8	Government Operations	
9	Washington, D. C.	
10	The Subcommittee met at 9:40 a.m., pursuant to notice, in	
. 11	Room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Honorable Bella S.	
12	Abzug (Chairwoman of the Subcommittee) presiding.	
13	Present: Representatives Abzug, Moss, Maguire, Moffett,	
14	Harrington, and McCloskey; and Brooks (ex-officio).	
15	Also present: Eric L. Hirschhorn, Counsel; Timothy H.	
- 16	Ingram, Staff Director; Robert S. Fink, Professional Staff	-
17	Member; Thomas Sullivan, Minority Counsel; and Anita Wiesman,	
18	Clerk.	
19		
20	Mrs. Abzug. The hearing will come to order.	
21	During the summer of 1975, articles in the New York	
22	Daily News alleged that the FBI and the National Security	
23	Agency had for years been intercepting international tele-	
24	grams - cables - being transmitted to or from the United States	5
25	through various communications companies.	
		•

'C . '

bl.

Shortly thereafter, the Subcommittee commenced an investigation of these allegations.

2

Following interviews of cable company personnel and former FBI Agent, Joe R. Craig, by subcommittee investigator, Robert Fink, a hearing on the interception of such communications was scheduled for October 23, 1975.

On October 22, I was approached first by Deputy Attorney General Harold Tyler and later by a group consisting of Jonathan March, Counsellor to the President, General Lew Allen, head of the National Security Agency, and Dr. Albert Hall, Assistant Secretary of Defense - Intelligence.

All of these people asked that the hearing not be held for national security reasons, though none would specify what these national security considerations were.

Mr. Tyler also said that the testimony of certain witnesses might immunize them for subsequent prosecution, but he too did not specify just how this might happen.

The next morning, just before the hearing was scheduled to begin, Attorney General Levi approached me. He too asked that we not go forward with the hearing on the ground of national security but declined to specify what were the exact considerations underlying his request.

Not desiring to compromise the national defense in any way, we took in open session only the testimony of telephone company representatives. In essence, they stated that it was

1

2

3

their policy to permit national security taps to be made through their equipment if they were given a letter from the head of the FBI stating that a certain tap was necessary in the interest of national security, and that they never went behind such a request to ascertain whether there were in fact any national security considerations present.

3

We did not call any representatives of the cable companies on October 23. RCA Global and ITT Worldcom - the two largest cable companies - requested at the last moment that they be subpoended, though they had earlier indicated that they would appear voluntarily.

As for the others, we felt it incumbent upon us to afford General Allen a chance to appear before the Subcommittee to explain the considerations that he believed required an executive session or outright cancellation of the hearing.

Such an invitation was extended to General Allen, and one of a like nature was also extended to Attorney General Levi not once but several times.

Thus far, neither has been willing to appear to discuss this issue.

As a partial result of this Subcommittee's October 23rd hearing, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence released the Shamrock Report on November 6, 1975. That report stated that Shamrock was a cover name for a message-collection program that had been in operation since 1947, wherein the three

1

2

3

major international telegraph companies had turned over copies of most of their international telegrams that were going from or coming to or through the United States, to the National Security Agency or its predecessor agencies, which "in recent years selected about 150,000 messages a month" for its analysts to review.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The analysis of some 1.8 million communications a year by a Federal intelligence agency has to include the interception of hundreds of thousands of messages that have nothing whatever to do with foreign intelligence. Moreover, many of these 1.8 million messages are subsequently distributed to other agencies of government. Each and every aspect of Shamrock represents a scale of interception vastly greater than any known FBI or CIA mail intercept program. The privacy of virtually every person who has sent or received a cable in the last twenty-eight years - tens of millions of Americans has been invaded.

Given the refusal of Messrs. Levi and Allen to explain their positions, we decided to go forward with our inquiry and obtained appropriate subpoenas from the full committee on January 22, 1976.

Subpoenas duces tecum to three cable companies - ITT World Communications, RCA Global Communications, and Western Union International - one NSA employee - Joseph Tomba - three FBI agents - Walter Zink, John Loomis, and David Jenkins - and one former FBI agent - Joe Craig - were duly issued, returnable on February 18, 1976.

Two of the cable companies - RCA Global and ITT Worldcom have replied to the subpoena, essentially saying they have no documents, while supplying some recent correspondence. Western Union Intérnational has responded by saying that it has been ordered by the President not to comply, and enclosing a letter addressed to their counsel from the Attorney General, in which he requests that the company not comply.

So far as I know, this is the first instance in which an effort asserting a Constitutional privilege for a private corporation has ever been asserted.

The four witnesses currently employed by the Executive Branch and the one formerly employed by the Executive Branch have refused to comply, citing a memorandum from President Ford instructing the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General "to decline to comply with the subpoenas."

Today, we are scheduled to hear the testimony, under subpoena, of three present FBI agents: Messrs. Zink, Jenkins, and Loomis, one former FBI agent, Mr. Craig, and one employee of the National Security Agency.

I don't know what's happening today, but yesterday I was informed by letters from Mr. Levi, Mr. Clements, and Mr. Craig s attorney that none of these five witnesses would appear.

I ask at this time to include in the record the following documents:

1

2

3

4

5

1) the subpoenas duces tecum and the subpoenas ad testificandum issued with regard to this investigation;

2) the President's memorandum of February 17, 1976, addressed to Secretary Rumsfeld and Attorney General Levi, which instructs them to decline to comply with the subpoenas; and

3) the correspondence among Attorney General Levi, Deputy Defense Secretary Clements, Chairman Brooks of the full Government Operations Committee, Mr. Craig's attorney, and the witnesses themselves relative to the refusals to respond to the subpoenas duces tecum and the tentative refusals of todays' witnesses to respond to the testimonial subpoenas and all other relevant documents.

(Material to be supplied follows:)

1

2

3

4

5

6

-7

I note that although the President's memorandum of February 17 refers to "national security" and "the public interest," it makes no mention of the so-called doctrine of "executive privilege." The memorandum directs Messrs. Levi and Rumsfeld not to comply with the subpoenas requesting documents.

Our investigation is concerned with the interception of two distinct but related types of communications - cables and telex messages. Cables are wire messages between the United States and a foreign country sent through one of the cable companies; that is, the message is carried or telephoned to the cable company's office, from which it is sent to the cable company's office in the recipient location. A "cable" is a foreign version of what we call a "telegram" when it is sent domestically.

A telex message, on the other hand, is similar to a telephone call, though in writing. The customer, who may be a private business or even a private individual, has a telex machine in his office.

By dialing the telex number of another telex machine in another customer's office, the customer may transmit a written message directly to the other machine, without the necessity of having any employee of the cable company handle or retransmit the message.

Far more foreign messages are sent and received via telex

1

2

3

4

5

6

than by cable, especially when the senders are regularly engaged in the overseas business.

Though the Church Committee investigated this area, its Shamrock Report was addressed only to the interception of cables. The report made absolutely no mention of telex interceptions.

In our inquiry, we intend to go into the following issues 1) <u>Telex Communications</u>. Everything stated in the Shamrock Report concerning the interception of international cable traffic applies equally to telex, the Subcommittee has been told. Statistics supplied by the FCC indicate telex is a far more important means of international communication than cable.

2) The legality of cable companies' delivering communications to Federal agencies. The companies will argue that they have done nothing inconsistent with section 605 of the Communication Act, as they have responded to demands from a "lawful authority." If such is the case, corrective legislation may be called for.

3) <u>Shamrock's Replacement</u>. Operation Shamrock, according to the Senate Select Committee report, was terminated on May 15, 1975 - which, perhaps coincidentally, coincides with the Senate Select Committee's initial approach to the NSA. Circumstantial evidence suggests that Shamrock, under another name, continues through the use of other technology which is wholly within NSA's capability and which probably does not

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

1 require going through the facilities of the cable companies. 2 4) The FCC's responsibility in monitoring the communica-3 tions carriers activities vis-a-vis their supply communications 4 to Federal intelligence agencies. 5 5) Executive Order 11905. The effect and intent of Presi-6 dent Ford's Executive Order 11905, issued February 18, which 7 appears to expressly authorize the National Security Agency to 8 collect information on the domestic activities of Americans 9 through its international communications intercepts. The 10 relevant portion of the Executive Order states: 11 "Section 5(b) Restrictions on Collection. Foreign 12 intelligence agencies shall not engage in any of 13 the following activities: 14 (2) Electronic surveillance to intercept a communication which is made from, or is in-15 tended by the sender to be received in, the United States, or directed against United 16 States persons abroad, except lawful electronic surveillance under procedures approved 17 by the Attorney General; provided, that the Central Intelligence Agency shall not per-18 form electronic surveillance within the United States, except for the purpose of 19 testing equipment under procedures approved by the Attorney General consistent with law." 20 6) To what extent have the companies been acting illegally? 21 7) By what criterian are messages selected for analysis? 22 8) Who determines the "watch lists" used to select 23 messages for analysis? 24 9) Who selects the "trigger words" that select messages 25

•		
	for analysis?	
2	10) To what extent, if any, are wholly domestic communica	-
3	tions intercepted?	yan makada anaton
4	Is Mr. Joe Craig, former special agent for the FBI,	a a second
5	present here today?	· ·
6	Mr. Fogt. He is, Madame Chairwoman.	•
7	Mrs. Abzug. May I ask who those people are at the table?	
8	Mr. Goldbloom. I am Irwin Goldbloom, Deputy Assistant	
9	Attorney General.	•
10	I am here representing the United States and all of the	
11	witnesses who have been subpoenaed before the Subcommittee	
12	this morning.	
13	Mr. Moss. Madame Chairwoman, at this point the gentleman	
14	is not here representing anyone but himself until we have	• .
15	called him or called someone he desires to step forward to	
16	speak for.	
17	So I would suggest that they clear the witness table	
18	until the Subcommittee, at its pleasure, requests their	•
19	appearance.	
20	We called Mr. Craig.	
21	Mr. Goldbloom. I am here also representing Mr. Craig.	
22	Mr. Moss. He has not so informed the Subcommittee.	
23	Mr. Fogt. Mr. Craig will authorize Mr. Goldbloom	•
24	Mr. Moss. Is Mr. Craig a former employee of the Govern-	
25	ment of the United States?	
		•

11 1 Mrs. Abzug. That is our understanding. 2 Mr. Fogt. Yes. 3 Mr. Moss. Since when does the Department of Justice take 4 the role of representing a former employee of the Government 5 of the United States? 6 Mr. Goldbloom. We do represent Mr. Craig. 7 Mr. Moss. I said "since when." And under what authority? 8 Mr. Goldbloom. Under the authority of the Deputy Attorney 9 General. 10 Mr. Moss. Under the authority of what statute? 11 I don't give a damn about the Deputy Attorney General. 12 He has only the authority conferred by law. 13 Give us the statutory citation. 14 Mr. Goldbloom. 28 USC, Sections 516 and others. 15 Mr. Moss. Has counsel checked the relevant citation? 16 Mrs. Abzug. Will you repeat your citation? 17 Mr. Goldbloom. 28 USC, Section 516, 517, 518. 18 Mr. Moss. Madame Chairwoman, may I also point out that 19 the rules of the House of Representatives specifically pro-20 vide that the witness is entitled to counsel only for the 21 purpose of advising them on their Constitutional rights - and 22 for no other purpose. 23 I make a point of order, therefore, that the appearance of counsel for any other reason is counter to the rules of 24

25

the House of Representatives.

Mrs. Abzug. Would you be good enough, Mr. Goldbloom,
to let us swear in our witness?
Who are the other gentlemen with you at the table?
Mr. Goldbloom. On my right is Mr. Thomas Martin who is
a Special Assistant to the Assistant Attorney General. On
my left is John Mintz who is General Counsel for the Federal
Bureau of Investigation.
Mr. Moss. Madame Chairmwoman, I have made a point of
order.
The point of order is that at this moment we have called
Mr. Craig.
Mrs. Abzug. That is correct.
I have so ruled, Mr. Moss.
Mr. Moss. I ask that the witness table be cleared and
that Mr. Craig take the witness stand.
Mrs. Abzug. Would you please clear the table?
(Whereupon, the witness, Joe Craig, was duly sworn by
(Whereupon, the witness, Joe Craig, was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.)
the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.)
the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.) Would you please identify yourself for the record?
the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.) Would you please identify yourself for the record? Mr. Craig. I beg your pardon.
the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.) Would you please identify yourself for the record? Mr. Craig. I beg your pardon. Mrs. Abzug. Would you please identify yourself?
<pre>the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.) Would you please identify yourself for the record? Mr. Craig. I beg your pardon. Mrs. Abzug. Would you please identify yourself? Mr. Craig. Joe - J, O, E - middle initial, R, Craig -</pre>

the record.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Mr. Fogt. My name is Howard W. Fogt, Jr.

I am a member of the firm Foley, Lardner, Hollabaugh, and Jacobs; 815 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Abzug. I note that you have been provided with a copy of the rules of the Subcommittee and of clause two of House Rule XI.

You have previously been served with a subpoena duces tecum requiring you to produce certain documents necessary to our investigation on or before February 18, 1976.

Have you any documents with you?

Mr. Craig. I do not.

Mrs. Abzug. Do you intend to supply any documents to the Subcommittee? That is, as requested in the subpoena duces tecum.

Mr. Fogt. Madame Chairwoman, I believe the counsel for the Subcommittee has already been advised that the witness does not have documents responsive to the subpoena.

Mrs. Abzug. Well, then you have failed to comply with that subpoena and, in the opinion of the Subcommittee, have advanced no proper reason for your failure.

Mr. McCloskey. I respectfully dissent from the fact that the Subcommittee has rendered its judgment on that point.

I think that it is appropriate for the Chair to comment on the position of the Chair but not on that of the Subcommittee

25

at this point.

2

3

4

5

Mrs. Abzug. Well, there is a simple subpoena duces tecum, Mr. McCloskey, and the witness has failed to produce in response to the subpoena.

14

Do you have any documents that you will produce to this Subcommittee?

Mr. Fogt. Madame Chairwoman, at this time I would like to exercise our rights under Rule 3 to request that all lights and cameras be turned off for the benefit of the witness. Mr. Moss. That, I think, is a right that they may

invoke.

Mr. Fogt. Madame Chairwoman, did I understand your question to be: "Do we have a copy of the subpoena duces tecum?"

Mrs. Abzug. And do you have any documents.

I did not understand the answer to your question. I was questioning whether or not you did have documents or whether you refuse to supply them.

Mr. Fogt. Madame Chairwoman, counsel for the Subcommittee has already been advised that the witness does not have any documents responsive to the subpoena duces tecum.

Mrs. Abzug. Very well.

Do you have an opening statement?

Mr. Fogt. Mr. Craig has a short statement that he would like to read at this time.

Mrs. Abzug. Excuse me - let me say for the record that at this point in our proceedings there is a quorum present. Mr. Craig. I appear here today in response to a subpoena served on February 6, 1976.
By letter dated February 23, 1976 the Attorney General

Mrs. Abzug. Will you excuse me for just one moment, please?

of the United States has instructed me not to testify --

Will you turn the lights off, please?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

At the request of the witness, he does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, still photography coverage; and all lenses shall be covered and microphones used for coverage shall be turned off.

Would you please be good enough to do that during the testimony of this witness?

(Whereupon, lights and cameras were turned off.) Would you continue? I am sorry,

Mr. Craig. Do you want me to start from the beginning? Mrs. Abzug. Yes, if you don't mind.

Mr. Craig. I appear here today in response to a subpoena served on February 6, 1976.

By letter dated February 23, 1976 the Attorney General of the United States has instructed me not to testify in response to the subpoena.

Accordingly, I must respectfully decline to testify

before your Subcommittee at this time.

Mrs. Abzug. Mr. Moss?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

. 15

16

17

18

19

20

25

Mr. Moss. I ask that the witness be directed by the Chair at this point to give the testimony required by this Subcommittee.

16

I ask the Chair to relate the reasons why that testimony is relevant to the inquiry of this Subcommittee and also to observe that the Attorney General of the United States is without any authority to issue the kind of order that the Subcommittee does not recognize; and that it is not in any sense a valid order.

It is at the most, the most outrageous assumption and most arrogant display by an Attorney General that I have seen. This, after all, is the people's house of the Congress of the United States.

Some damn two-bit appointee of the President is not the law-making body of this nation.

Again I ask that the witness be instructed - and told the consequences of his failure - to respond to this Subcommittee.

21 Mrs. Abzug. Mr. Craig, your objection is not well
22 founded.

23 You are directed to answer the questions that will be
24 put to you.

Mr. Craig, you came to our attention because you have

been identified by employees of RCA Global, ITT Worldcom, and Western Union as a contact man.

You also had discussions with an investigator of this staff in which you acknowledged that you were the FBI liaison man with the telephone company in the Washington area; and that one of your activities for the last nine or ten years has been to pick up national security messages.

Now, your continuing refusal to answer questions of the Subcommittee will place you in contempt of Congress and in violation of section 192 of title 2 of the United States Code; and will render you liable to fine and imprisonment.

I agree with Mr. Moss that there is no valid, legal objection asserted for which you can, at present, refuse to comply with the subpoena which has been issued to you.

I will therefore proceed to question you and give you the opportunity to answer questions of this Subcommittee. My first question is: What were the dates of your FBI employment?

Mr. Craig. I appear here today in response to a subpoena served on February 6, 1976.

By letter dated February 23, 1976 the Attorney General --Mr. Moss. Madame Chairwoman, the gentleman wanted to invoke, that is, if the gentleman wanted to invoke a Constitutional right, then I could understand this charade of repeating a statement which is meaningless.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

But he is not asserting any Constitutional right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And the letter from the Attorney General does not con-• stitute a basis.

I think that the witness should be fully aware of the fact.

The Attorney General may advise him. The decision is yours. The liability is yours.

It is not the Attorney's General liability - it is your personal liability. You are the one who is incurring the risk involved here, again, not the Attorney General.

I don't know how thoroughly you have been advised by counsel, but if that is the response to this subpoena, the counsel has done a highly incompetent job of advising you in order to protect you as an individual.

Mrs. Abzug. Will you answer the question, Mr. Craig, put to you by the Chair?

Mr. Craig. I appear here today in response to a subpoena -Mr. Moss. Yes or no.

Mrs. Abzug. Your objection is not well founded.

I must direct you to answer the question. I direct you to answer the question which has been propounded to you.

Mr. Fogt. Madame Chairwoman, in fairness to the witness I think - as I am sure you are aware --

Mrs. Abzug. Mr. Fogt, the Chair has just directed the witness to answer the question.

	19
- 1	Do you intend to answer that question, Mr. Craig - yes
2	pr no?
3	Mr. Craig. No.
4	Mrs. Abzug. You refuse to answer the question?
5	Mr. Craig. Yes.
6	Mrs. Abzug. I am advising the witness that he is in
. 7	contempt, and I want the witness to stand down for the pre-
8	sent but to remain available at the call of the Chair.
9	Mr. Craig. Thank you, Madame Chairwoman.
10	Mrs. Abzug. I call Walter Zink to the stand.
11	(Short pause while the cameras and lights are activated.)
12	
	Will you please stand and be sworn?
13	Will you please stand and be sworn?
13	(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the
13 14	(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.)
13 14 15	(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the
13 14 15 16	(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.)
13 14 15	(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.)
13 14 15 16	(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.)
13 14 15 16 17 18	(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.)
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.)
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.)
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.)
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.)
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.)
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.)
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.)
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.)

1	
1	20 STATEMENT OF WALTER C. ZINK, FBI AGENT
C/bbl. 2	I am Walter C. Zink.
.3	• Mrs. Abzug. Are you accompanied by counsel?
4	Mr. Zink. I am.
5	Mrs. Abzug. Will you please state your name and address
6	for the record?
7	Mr. Zink. Walter C. Zink, 201 East 69th Street, New
8	York, New York.
9	Mrs. Abzug. And who is the counsel accompanying you?
10	Mr. Goldbloom. I am Irwin Goldbloom, Deputy Assistant
11	Attorney General of the Civil Division of the Department of
12	Justice, Washington, D.C.
!3	Mrs. Abzug. There has been some question raised as to
14	your status here. I have looked at Section 516 and 517 of
15	the United States Code which you have mentioned. I am not
16	sure that you are an interested party, but we can determine
17	that question at another time if-that is alright with you,
18	Mr. Moss.
19	Mr. Moss. Yes.
20	Mrs. Abzug. You have been provided with a copy of the
21	Rules of the Subcommittee of House Rule 11.
22	You have previously been served with a subpoena duces
23	tecum to require you to produce certain documents necessary
24	to our investigation of this Subcommittee on or before
25	February 18, 1976.

Do you have those documents with you?

Mr. Zink. No.

Mrs. Abzug. Do you intend to comply with that subpoena and to provide us with those documents?

Mr. Zink. The Attorney General has advised me in writing that I am not to produce such documents, and I respectfully decline to do so.

Mrs. Abzug. You have failed to comply with that subpoena and, in the opinion of the chair, you have advanced no proper reason for your failure.

I, therefore, direct you to comply with this subpoena and to produce the documents sought therein now.

Mr. Zink. I have been directed in writing by the Attorney General not to produce any documents, and I respectfully decline to do so.

Mrs. Abzug. I wish to advise you that your refusal to comply will place you in contempt of Congress and in violation of Section 192 of Title 2 of the United States Code and will render you liable to fine and imprisonment.

Do you wish to make an opening statement? Mr. Zink. No. Mrs. Abzug. Are you presently employed? I will now proceed to question the witness. Are you presently employed?

Mr. Zink. By letter dated February 23, 1976, the

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

22 Attorney General has instructed me not to testify, and I respectfully decline to do so.

Mrs. Abzug. Your objection is not well-founded. You are directed to answer the question that is put to you. Are you presently employed?

Mr. Zink. By letter dated February 23, 1976, the Attorney General has instructed me not to testify, and I respectfully decline to do so.

Mrs. Abzug. Your continuing refusal will place you in comtempt of Congress and in violation of Section 192 of Title 2 of the United States Code and will render you liable to fine and imprisonment.

Would you answer the question as put to you by the chair? Are you presently employed?

Mr. Zink. By letter dated February 23, 1976, the Attorney General has instructed me not to testify, and I respectfully decline to do so.

Mrs. Abzug. I would just like to suggest---Mr. Moss. Madam Chairwoman.

• • •

Mrs. Abzug. Just a moment.

That is not a Constitutional assertion.

Mr. Moss. Will you permit a question.

Mrs. Abzug. Yes.

Mr. Moss. Mr. Zink, you are here in response to a Subpoena Duces Tecum. Is that correct?

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12.

Mr. Zink. Yes.

1 Mr. Moss. And you have asserted that you have received 2 . from the Attorney General a letter directing you not to 3 respond to questions of this Subcommittee. Is that correct? 4 Mr. Zink. By letter dated --5 Mr. Moss. Is that correct? 6 Mr. Zink. The Attorney General has instructed me not 7 to testify, and I respectfully decline to do so. 8 Mr. Moss. You've just answered the question, Mr. Zink. 9 You said that you have a letter. 10 What is the relationship? Is the Attorney General your 11 employer or is he your counsel? 12 Mr. Zink. By letter dated --13 Mr. Moss. I don't give a damn about the letter of --14 Mr. Zink. The Attorney General has instructed me not 15 to testify. 16 Mr. Moss. Madam Chairwoman, I want you to instruct 17 the witness to answer that question. 18 Mrs. Abzug. Once again, the witness is directed to 19 answer the question put to him. 20 Mr. Moss. And answer it yes or no. 21 Mr. Zink. By letter dated February 23, 1976, the 22 Attorney General has instructed me not to testify, and I 23 respectfully decline to do so. 24 Mr. Moss. Sir, let me tell you something. 25

24 1 I happen to Chair a committee of this House, and I have 2 jurisdiction over international commerce and communications. 3 I am going to give you a very careful, brief experience 4 before this year is much further on. 5 Make no mistake about it. You are going to answer my questions when I am in the 6 Chair and when I am directing them to you. 7 And so is the Attorney General. - 8 9 Mrs. Abzug. I would like to advise the witness that he is in contempt, and I will also advise the witness to stand 10 down for the present but he is to remain available at the 11 call of the Chair. 12 I also note the presence of a quorum here today. 13 (Members present: Abzug, Moss, Harrington, Maguire, Moffett, and I call to the witness stand David Jenkins. McCloskdy. 14 McCloskdy.) Mr. Jenkins will you please stand? 15 (The witness was duly sworn.) 16 Please be seated. 17 You are accompanied by counsel as is your right. Please 18 have him state his name and address for the record. 19 Mr. Goldbloom. I am Irwin Goldbloom, Deputy Assistant 20 Attorney General, Civil Division, Department of Justice, 21 Washington, D.C. 22 Mrs. Abzug. Will the witness identify himself for the 23 record? 24 25

STATEMENT OF DAVID G. JENKINS, FBI SPECIAL AGENT

25

Mr. Jenkins. David G. Jenkins, Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 201 East 69th Street, New York, New York.

Mrs. Abzug. I note that you have been provided with a copy of the Rules of the Subcommittee and of Clause 2 of House Rule XI.

You have previously been served with a Subpoena Duces Tecum requiring you to produce certain documents necessary to our investigation of this Subcommittee on or before February 18, 1976.

Do you have documents with you?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Jenkins. By instruction of the Attorney General, I have no documents.

Mrs. Abzug. Is it your intention to supply this Subcommittee with documents and to comply with the Subpoena? Mr. Jenkins. No, pursuant to the instructions of the Attorney General.

Mrs. Abzug. What are the instructions of the Attorney General?

Mr. Goldbloom. Madam Chairwoman, I believe those instructions have been placed into the record.

Mrs. Abzug. I am asking this witness what those instructions are.

Mr. Jenkins. By letter from the Attorney General to me

not to comply with the instructions to commit documents.

26.

Mrs. Abzug. You have failed then to comply with that Subpoena, and in the opinion of the Chair, you have advanced no proper reason for your failure. I, therefore, direct you to comply with this Subpoena now and to produce the documents sought therein.

Your refusal to comply --

7.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

. 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Jenkins. I decline to comply upon instructions from the Attorney General in writing.

Mrs. Abzug. Your refusal to comply will place you in contempt of Congress and in violation of Section 192 of Title 2 of the United States Code and will render you liable to fine and imprisonment.

For what agencies of the United States have you worked and during what periods of time?

Mr. Jenkins. By letter dated February 23, 1976, the Attorney General of the United States has instructed me not to testify.

Mr. Moss. Madam Chairwoman, would you yield for a question.

Mrs. Abzug. Yes.

Mr. Moss. Have you been afforded the advice of private, independent counsel? That is, other than the Department of Justice?

The counsel at this point is in violation of the Rules

of the House. He is there only for the purpose of advising this witness as to his Constitutional rights.

27

You have read the Rules of this House, and I am stating them quite accurately. You are not there to coach him or to do anything but to advise him when he seeks your advice on a Constitutional question.

If you persist, then I will insist that you step down. Mr. McCloskey. Madam Chairwoman, a point of order. Mrs. Abzug. Yes.

Mr. McCloskey. With all due respect to my colleague from California, it seems to me that anytime the witness is asked a question of this House he has the right to consult counsel before answering.

Mr. Moss. With all due respect to my colleague from California, and I had the floor, there is no point of order because the Rules of the House on this point are not ambiguous; they are very clear.

I have enforced them a number of times.

Witnesses are confined - that is counsel is confined - to that role and that sole role.

Mr. McCloskey. Madam Chairwoman, may I be recognized. Mrs. Abzug. Yes.

Mr. McCloskey. The point I wanted to make on the point of order is that my distinguished colleague from California interrupted the witness as he was turning to his counsel,

8

1

2

and his counsel was discussing with the witness something of which this committee knows nothing. What was said between counsel and the witness is not something we should intrude on. It is not something that we should infer that counsel is coaching the witness.

28

I think the one thing that we offer in this House is the right to any witness before us to consult with counsel and not to draw inferences as to what is said, either by witness or counsel, in front of us.

Mr. Moss. Madam Chairwoman, I have chaired committees of this House for 22 years. I don't believe that I have been charged with being unfair or unmindful of the rights of witnesses, but I am also mindful of the rights of this House and the rights of the people represented by the collective membership of this House.

Those rights are being very seriously challenged today in the most arrogant fashion that I have witnessed in my 22 years.

Whether it be in the hearings where we had to go through the Sherman Adams-Bernard Goldfine era and where we had to have counsel stand down because he insisted on going beyond the Rules of the House - and whatever the gentleman from California might think, the Rules are clear.

The witness may seek advice only on a Constitutional question and for no other purpose.

9

1

2

3

Mr. McCloskey. I do not question that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Moss. You have questioned that, Mr. McCloskey, and that is why I am taking the time to address myself to it. Mr. McCloskey. May I be recognized Madam Chairwoman? Mrs. Abzug. Yes, Mr. McCloskey.

Mr. McCloskey. My only point, Madam Chairwoman, is that when the witness turns to counsel and they confer, it is not appropriate for this committee to draw inferences that the witness and counsel are not discussing a Constitutional question. We don't know what they are saying.

We don't know that their conversation is improper.

What I object to is the inference that their conversation is somehow improper. My distinguished colleague from California contended that.

I think we owe them the obligation to assume that what they're saying privately to one another is private.

Mrs. Abzug. The Chair will rule.

Mr. Moss. Let me go a little further because I did watch with great care, and the initiative was not with the witness. The initiative was with counsel.

Had I not observed that fact, I would not have raised the objection, but I did observe that fact. I might add that this counsel is here under a set of instructions that apply to every witness who has been subpoenaed by this Subcommittee. He is here for the purpose of interfering with

the work of Congress and of delaying endlessly, and it is not a unique instance of the Department of Justice acting in this fasion.

As I stated, I have studied with great care for 22 years the information problems of our country, but they have never become as aggravated as they are today under this first nonelected Administration in this nation's history.

There has never been the arrogance demonstrated by the Department of Justice as has been demonstrated under Gerald Ford - not even Richard Nixon carried it to the extreme of this Administration.

And I think if the gentleman from California who has objected has any sense of his obligation, assumed by the oath he has taken, then by God he will insist that this executive do what the Constitution says it shall do. That is, to take care that the laws of this nation be faithfully executed and not openly flaunted as is being urged by the Department of Justice at this moment.

Mrs. Abzug. Thank you, Mr. Moss.

Mr. McCloskey, I share the concern of the gentleman from California, Mr. Moss, about the unprecedented interference here with the normal processes of Congressional committee work.

My concern is - this is the concern of Congress - and we are concerned about the issues in this hearing, but I

11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

will rule that witnesses may consult with counsel.

I realize that the rules provide that the witness may consult with counsel on a Constitutional question. There is also a Constitutional protection for the right of a witness to consult counsel.

I will rule that the witness has the right to consult counsel, and I hope it will be done in the proper manner.

Mr. Moss. Madam Chairwoman, with utmost reluctance I want to have this record show that I strongly dissent from the ruling of the Chair because it does not comport with the rules of the House. The rules do provide that a witness is entitled to counsel but within very narrow limitations.

We are not in a court of law. We are not operating under the rules that govern a court of law. This is a committee of the Congress, and the Justice Department seems unmindful of it and I hope my colleagues are not unmindful of it.

Mrs. Abzug. I will repeat the question for the witness. For what agencies of the government have you worked and during what periods of time?

You are directed to answer this question.

Mr. Jenkins. By letter of February 23, 1976, the Attorney General has advised me not to testify, and I respectfully decline.

Mrs. Abzug. Your continuing refusal will place you in

12

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

contempt of Congress and in violation of Section 192 of Title 2 of the United States Code and will render you liable to fine and imprisonment.

Do you still refuse to answer the question?

Mr. Jenkins. Yes, pursuant to the instructions of the Attorney General of February 23, 1976.

Mrs. Abzug. Well, I must inform you that you're in contempt and that you are to stand down for the present and to remain available at the call of the Chair.

I wish to also note that there is a presence of a quorum.

The quorum consists of the Chair, Mr. Moss, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Maguire, Mr. Moffett, Mr. McCloskey.

I call Mr. John Loomis.

(Whereupon the witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee.)

Will you please state your name and address for the

record?
33 STATEMENT OF JOHN P. LOOMIS, FBI SPECIAL AGENT 1 Mr. Loomis. John Loomis, Special Agent for the FBI, 2 3 Washington Field Office, Washington, D.C. Mrs. Abzug. If you are accompanied by counsel, please 4 have him state his name and address for the record. 5 Mr. Goldbloom. Irwin Goldbloom, Deputy Assistant 6 Attorney General, Civil Division, Department of Justice, 7 Washington, D.C. 8 Mrs. Abzug. Are you accompanied by private counsel? 9 Are you accompanied by private counsel? 10 Mr. Loomis. He is my counsel. 11 Mrs. Abzug. Are you accompanied by private counsel, 12 answer yes or no. 13 Mr. Loomis. No. 14 Mrs. Abzug. Have you consulted private counsel? 15 Mr. Moss. Madam Chairwoman, may I make a point of 16 order? 17 The United States Attorney General's representative 18 continues to consistently violate the rules of this Sub-19 committee. He did not seek your advice then. 20 I think that these men ought to realize that they 21 should really have a private counsel who are interested in 22 their welfare and not in being thrown as sacrificial lambs 23 by the Department of Justice. 24 That is what you're doing. 25

I think they should have had the opportunity to seek out 1 and talk with private counsel, and I do not think that they 2 have had that opportunity. 3 Mr. Goldbloom. Mr. Congressman, I respectfully --4 Mr. Moss. I do not want your respect nor your inter-5 ruptions. 6 Mrs. Abzug. I think Mr. Moss is quite right in trying 7 to point out that the witness refuses to testify or to 8 comply with this Subpoena Duces Tecum. He is placing himself 9 in a position which may render him liable to fine and 10 imprisonment. 11 I now address myself to the witness. 12 We have concern this is clearly understood by the 13 witness who is before us. If the witness comes before this 14 Subcommittee, then he has a right to be accompanied by 15 counsel. 16 The questions that the Chair has put, and that Mr. 17 Moss, a member of this Subcommittee, has put, are in order 18 to make sure that the witness understands that he has a 19 right to counsel. 20 I'm sure the witness understands that he has the right 21 to counsel does he not? 22 I am addressing myself to the witness. 23 Mr. Loomis. I do. 24 Mrs. Abzug. Then you do understand that. You feel you 25

34

have provided yourself with counsel - is that correct?

Mr. Loomis. I do.

Mrs. Abzug. I note that you have been provided with a copy of the Rules of the Subcommittee and of Clause 2 of House Rule XI.

35

You have previously been served with a Subpoena Duces Tecum requiring you to produce certain documents necessary to our investigation of the Subcommittee on or before February 18, 1976. You have thus far failed to comply with that Subpoena.

Do you have the documents with you today?

Mr. Loomis. By instruction of the Attorney General, I have been told that I will not comply with that, and I respectfully decline to do so.

Mrs. Abzug. Do you have any documents today?

Mr. Loomis. No, I do not.

Mrs. Abzug. Do you intend to supply the committee with documents requested under Subpoena?

Mr. Loomis. No, pursuant to instructions of the Attorney General of the United States.

Mrs. Abzug. You have failed to comply with the Subpoena Duces Tecum and, in the opinion of the Chair, you have advanced no proper reason for your failure. I, therefore, direct you to comply with this Subpoena now and to produce the documents sought therein.

16

1

2

3

Mr. Loomis. I respectfully decline.

Mr. Moss. Madam Chairwoman, I would like to address a question to the witness.

36

Are you lying at this point upon any Constitutional provisions as the basis for denying the information sought by this committee?

Mr. Loomis. I am relying upon the instructions of the Attorney General.

Mr. Moss. I did not ask that question.

I am entitled to know whether you are relying upon any provision of the Constitution of the United States. Do you contend that it is a violation of your First Amendment rights or are you faced with any Fifth Amendment problems?

You must have some idea of the Constitutional issues here. You have had a long discussion with counsel, and if it were only to advise you on Constitutional matters, then obviously it has been discussed between you.

So would you tell us if you are relying upon any Constitutional protection and invoking it against this committee.

Mr. Loomis. I am relying upon my decision based upon the orders of the Attorney General.

Mr. Moss. Solely upon that - is that correct? Mr. Loomis. That is correct.

Mr. Moss. Fine. I'm glad to have that clarified.

17

1

- 37 Mrs. Abzug. Your refusal to comply with the Subpoena 1 Duces Tecum places you in contempt of Congress and in viola-2 .tion of Section 192 of Title 2 of the United States Code and 3 will render you liable to fine and imprisonment. 4 Do you want to make an opening statement? 5 Mr. Loomis. No, I do not. 6 Mrs. Abzug. For what agencies of the United States have 7 you worked and during what periods of time? 8 Mr. Loomis. By letter dated February 23, 1976, the 9 Attorney General of the United States instructed me not to 10 testify further in this matter and with all due respect to 11 the Subcommittee, I respectfully decline. 12 Mrs. Abzug. On what ground and for what reason does 13 the Attorney General direct you not to testify? 14 Mr. Loomis. Pursuant to his letter of February 23, 15 1976, I have been instructed not to testify. 16 Mrs. Abzug. Is that addressed to you? What does that 17 letter say? 18 Mr. Loomis. Would you like it in its entirety? 19 Mrs. Abzug. Yes. Read me the letter. 20 Mr. Loomis. It's addressed to Special Agent John Paul **2**ł Loomis, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, D.C. 22 Dear Mr. Loomis: I attach a copy of a letter that has been 23 sent to Chairwoman Abzug of the Government Information and 24 Individual Rights Subcommittee of the Committee on Govern-25

ment Operations.

In accordance with that letter you are hereby instructed not to appear and testify before the Subcommittee."

38

Mr. McCloskey. For the record, may we have the letter attached?

The letter that the witness refers to, refers to a second letter.

Do we have that?

Mrs. Abzug. I have already put those into the record, Mr. McCloskey, in the opening statement. I asked to have all those letters included in the record.

Mr. McCloskey. Thank you.

Mrs. Abzug. Mr. Loomis, your objection is not wellfounded.

You are directed to answer the question that was put to you.

Mr. Loomis. By letter dated February 23, 1976, I have been instructed by the Attorney General of the United States not to discuss this matter further, and I respectfully decline.

Mr. Moss. That also is not based on the Constitutional grounds, is that correct?

(No response.)

Mr. Moss. I have a question which I have directed to the witness.

Mr. McCloskey. I object to the propriety of the question.

13

14

15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

21

22

23

24

		•
0 1	39 Mr. Moss. Fine, go ahead and object but I still state	
2	the question.	
3	Mrs. Abzug. A question has been put to the witness.	
4	Mr. McCloskey. I respectfully	
5	Mr. Moss. Madam Chairwoman, I respectfully report to	,
6	my colleague that he has no authority to determine the nature	
7	of questions that I put to the witness. That is not his	
8	purpose.	
. 9	He may disagree with them, but he may not right them for	
10	me nor may he edit them for me.	
11	Mr. McCloskey. May I be recognized?	
12	Mr. Moss. Madam Chairwoman, I have a question before	
13	this witness, and I do not yield to the gentleman from	
14	California.	
15	Mr. McCloskey. Madam Chairwoman, if I may cite from	
16	Section 343	
17	Mr. Moss. I do not yield to the gentleman from	
18	California.	
19	Mr. McCloskey. Any member wishing	
20	Mrs. Abzug. Order please.	
	Mr. Moss. I do not yield to the gentleman from	
21 22	California.	
	Mrs. Abzug. If you will both cease and desist for a	
23	moment.	
24	Mr. Moss. I want my question answered, or I want a	
25		

21		10 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	1	refusal on this record.
-	2	Are you relying upon any Constitutional basis for your
	3	failure to respond to the question just put to you by the
-	4	Chairwoman?
	5	Mr. Loomis. I am relying upon instructions of the
	6	Attorney General.
	7	Mr. Moss. Solely, is that correct?
	8	Mr. Loomis. That is correct.
	9	Mr. Moss. Fine.
	10	Mr. McCloskey. I want to make a formal objection to
	11	the propriety of the question and cite to the Chair Section
	12	343 of Jefferson's Manual, stating: "But if the propriety
	13	of the question be objected to, the speaker directs the
	14	witness, counsel and parties to withdraw for no question
	15	can be moved or put or debated while they are there." Under
	16	that Section, I am objecting to the question put to the
	. 17	witness as to whether or not he is relying on Constitutional
	. 18	grounds.
	19	Mr. Moss. The poor distinguished lawyer from California
	20	ought to check that the question is used in context with the
	21	putting of the question for the purpose of a vote.
	22	Mrs. Abzug. That is correct, Mr. Moss.
	23	I will now repeat a question which is pending: For
	24	what agencies of the United States have you worked and during
	25	what periods of time?
	·	
<.	u	

•...

	41
1	Mr. Loomis. By letter dated February 23, 1976, the
2	Attorney General has instructed me not to testify further in
3	. this matter and with due respect to the committee, I respect-
. 4	fully decline.
5	Mrs. Abzug. I note that a quorum is present.
6	The quorum consists of the Chair, Mr. Moss, Mr. Harring-
7	ton, Mr. Maguire, Mr. Moffett, Mr. McCloskey.
. 8	I address the question again.
9	Mr. Loomis. I respectfully decline.
10	Mrs. Abzug. Your continuing refusal will place you in
11 -	contempt of Congress and in violation of Section 192 of Title
12	2 of United States Code and will render you liable for fine
13	and imprisonment.
14	Do you still refuse to answer this question?
15	Mr. Loomis. Pursuant to my instructions dated
16	February 23, 1976, yes.
17	Mrs. Abzug. Did you act in a liaison capacity for the
18	FBI with communications, common carriers, or in the capacity
19	of an FBI Special Agent to collect, read, analyze or
20	disseminate FBI private communications, Assembly communica-
21	tions, common carriers without a court order?
22	Mr. Loomis. By letter dated February 23, 1976, I have
23	been instructed by the Attorney General not to testify
24	further in this matter, and I respectfully decline to do so.
25	Mrs. Abzug. I direct you to answer this question.

22

Mr. Loomis. I respectfully decline.

Mrs. Abzug. Your continuing refusal places you in contempt of Congress and in violation of Section 192 of Title 2 of the United States Code and will render you liable to fine and imprisonment.

Your objection is not well-founded. You are in contempt of Congress. You are directed to stand down for the present but to remain available at the call of the Chair.

Mr. McCloskey. Madam Chairwoman, may I be recognized? Mrs. Abzug. Yes, Mr. McCloskey.

Mr. McCloskey. I want to cite to the Chair, in view of the Chair's ruling about the propriety of questions, this. Section 13 of Jefferson's Manual, Section 341 and 342, and 343 refers to the examination of witnesses.

These are not motions put to the House for debate. My colleague from California urged this earlier.

Section 342 states that witnesses are not to be produced but where the House has previously instituted an inquiry. It states: "When any person is examined before a committee or at the bar of the House, any member wishing to ask the person a question must address the Speaker or Chairman who will repeat the question to the person or says to him - you heard the question, answer it. But if the propriety of the question be objected to, the Speaker directs the witness, counsel and parties to withdraw for no question can be moved

23

1

2

3

1	43 or put or debated while they are there."
2	Mrs. Abzug. Mr. McCloskey, all questions put to
3	witnesses before the committee pursuant to Rule 15 of our
4	committee rules shall be relevant to the subject matter before
5	the committee for consideration and the Chairman shall rule
6	on the relevance of any questions put to the witness.
7	I made my ruling pursuant to that which I believe is
8	relevant here.
9	I considered the question raised by Mr. McCloskey and
. 10	Mr. Moss.
- 11	I believe that this is where the ruling stands now.
12	I would like to call the next witness if I may.
133	I call Mr. Tomba.
14	(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairwoman.)
15	Mrs. Abzug. Please be seated and state your name and
16,	address for the record.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH J. TOMBA, NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY 1 Mr. Tomba. Joseph J. Tomba, 6118 Sebring Drive, 2 Columbia, Maryland. 3 Mrs. Abzug. Are you accompanied by counsel? 4 Mr. Tomba. Yes. 5 Mrs. Abzug. Would you have him state his name and 6 address for the record? 7 Mr. Goldbloom. Irwin Goldbloom, Deputy Assistant 8 Attorney General, Civil Division, Department of Justice, 9 Washington, D.C. 10 Mrs. Abzug. I note that you have been provided with 11 a copy of the Rules of this Subcommittee and of Clause 2 12 of House Rule XI. 13 You have previously been served with a Subpoena Duces 14 Tecum requiring you to produce certain documents necessary 15 to our investigation of this Subcommittee on or before 16 February 18, 1976. You have thus far failed to comply with 17 that Subpoena. Do you have the documents with you today? 18 Mr. Tomba. I have no documents. 19 Mrs. Abzug. Why have you not brought those documents 20 pursuant to the Subpoena. 21 Mr. Tomba. Because I have no documents. 22 Mrs. Abzug. You have no documents? 23 You have read the Subpoena Duces Tecum? 24 Mr. Tomba. Yes. 25

25

Mrs. Abzug. Is it your testimony that you have no documents of any kind which we request in that Subpoena? Mr. Tomba. That is true. Mrs. Abzug. You were asked by the Subpoena Duces Tecum to produce any and all records - and the term records includes, but is not limited to, writings, documents, contracts, agreements, memorandums, reports, correspondence, lists, tables, minutes of electronic records, or recordings in his possession, under his dominion or control, or within his means to produce, concerning or relating to the interception by, examination by, request by or from, or delivery to or for any employee or agent of any department, agency, bureau, or other entity of the United States since January, 1947, of: (1) Information as to the existence, contents, substance, effect, meaning, sender or recipient of any interstate or foreign communication by wire, cable, radio, carrier frequency, or other means; and (2) information as to the users or customers of Western Union International, including, but not limited to, information as to the identity of such users or customers and communications, lines, channel numbers, of such users or customers."

64

2

3

4

5

6

• 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, I left something out. It was not only users and customers of Western Union International, but it was RCA Global and ITT World Intercom.

Now, I ask you this question again. I read the Subpoena to you.

•	46	.
. 1	Is it your testimony that you have no documents of any	
2	kind?	
3	Mr. Tomba. I have no documents.	
4	Mrs. Abzug. Or no means to produce them?	
5	Mr. Tomba. No means to produce them.	
6	Mrs. Abzug. You have failed to comply with the Subpoena.	
7	You have absolutely no documents nor means to produce them?	
8	Mr. Tomba. I have no documents under my control and in	
9	my dominion which I can produce.	
10	Mrs. Abzug. And none within your means to produce?	
11	Mr. Tomba. I do not have any means to produce them, no.	
12	Mrs. Abzug. Do you wish to make an opening statement?	•
13	Mr. Tomba. Yes.	
14	Mrs. Abzug. Proceed.	
15	Mr. Tomba. I have been directed, and let me finish,	
16	Mr. Moss, if you don't mind.	
17	I have been directed not to appear and testify before	
18	this Subcommittee by the Deputy Secretary of Defense.	
19	Mr. Moss. I object to the comment by the witness and	
20	the gratuities by the witness.	
21	Mr. Tomba. I apologize.	
22	Mr. Moss. You should.	
23	Mr. Tomba. I did.	
24	Mrs. Abzug. Do you?	
25	Mr. Tomba. Yes, sincerely.	
1		1

Mrs. Abzug. Now, do you wish to make an opening statement?

Mr.	Tomba.	Yes

Mrs. Abzug. Will you please proceed.

Mr. Tomba. Although I have been directed not to appear and testify before the Subcommittee by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, I would like to point out a paragraph in the letter to your committee on February 23, 1976. It is the fourth paragraph, and I would like to read it.

It is signed by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Clements.

"We would be pleased, however, to discuss with you at your convenience whether there may be some letters which might appropriately be the subject of testimony under carefully controlled conditions under which such testimony might be given."

In addition to this, General Allen has asked me to convey to you his willingness to attempt to meet the requirements of your Subcommittee along with the necessary safeguards applicable to any classified information. To this end his staff is available to work with your people to define more precisely your exact information requirements.

Mrs Abzug. I certainly appreciate getting this message through you, Mr. Tomba.

The fact is that General Allen has been invited here to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

48 1 meet with this committee, as I said in my opening statement. 2 I said it not once, but several times. 3 This committee is always open to members of Government 4 for the purpose of discussing any problems. 5 As a matter of fact, we have tried and tried to find out what are the concerns specifically that General Allen and 6 others of the Government purport to have. 7 This has been to no avail. 8 This, however, welcome as your statement is on behalf 9 of General Allen - and I assume it's on his behalf - that is, 10 do you have a letter from him or did he authorize you to 11 make this statement? 12 Mr. Tomba. I do not have a letter from him. 13 We talked with him this morning. 14 Mrs. Abzug. I certainly appreciate your bringing that 15 message to us, particularly since it is quite obvious that 16 there is no telephone communication which can be made 17 apparently without interception. 18 So I certainly appreciate the fact that you have come 19 here personally to tell me this, even though General Allen 20 has not seen fit to pick up the telephone and suggest 21 directly that he would like to appear before this committee. 22 Now, however, this Subcommittee has issued some process 23 and it's a very serious matter. We have started these 24 hearings quite some time ago. 25

49 As I explained in my opening statement, we have sought 1 to conduct the business of this Subcommittee and the business 2 of the House without any real cooperation. 3 People, I believe, must cooperate with the committees 4 of Congress and especially one that's doing its 'work. And 5 so we have to get down to the business of what you are here 6 for today. 7 That is a response to a Subpoena and a response to a 8 Subpoena Duces Tecum which you have already responded to. 9 Now, you are here in response to a Subpoena as a witness 10 Do you wish to make any further opening statement? 11 Mr. Tomba. No. 12 Mr. Moffett. May I be recognized? 13 Mrs. Abzug. Yes. 14 Mr. Moffett. To my satisfaction, we have not establish-15 ed whether the witness does or does not possess - is that 16 established to the Chair's satisfaction? If it is, perhaps 17 the Chair could explain it to me - what the interpretation 18 is. 19 I thought it was a little confusing in regard to the 20 question of whether we had the means to produce. 21 Might we find out that? Might we find out what 22 obstacles there are that the witness has? 23 Mrs. Abzug. We have testimony on this, but if Mr. 24 Moffett would like to question the witness further on that, 25

30.

go ahead.

31

1

2

3

4

5

Mr. Moffett. Sir, when you responded that you did not have the means to produce, were you suggesting that you do not have the authority to produce them but otherwise you might be able to?

Mr. Tomba. Based on my instructions from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, dated 23 February, I respectfully decline to answer that question.

Mr. Moffett. That seems to me to be the answer, Madam Chairwoman.

It is confused as to what he does and does not have. I would urge the Chair and the Subcommittee to contact General Allen and determine if he is, in fact, willing to talk. I know that we have sought to speak to him before. I wonder if that might be done again because I sense an implication here that they might --

Mrs. Abzug. Yes.

The last question was definitely from your previous testimony, so I will ask you under those conditions whether you intend to produce documents necessary to our investigation as requested in the Subpoena Duces Tecum.

Mr. Tomba. As far as I'm concerned, I have no means of producing any documents for this committee. In fact, if I did, I have been directed by the Deputy Secretary of Defense Clements by letter of February 18, 1976, not to produce any

documents to this committee.

Mr. Moss. Madam Chairwoman, may I be recognized. Mrs. Abzug. Yes.

Mr. Moss. If I heard correctly, and I believe the reporter could go back and tell us, the response to the question of whether you were here with documents required by Subpoena and you stated that you had no documents.

Am I correct?

Mr. Tomba. Yes.

Mr. Moss. Either you have or you have not documents. Now you are inferring that you do have documents available under certain conditions.

Now, do you have documents?

That means within the custody or control, because you stated that you had none.

I think the record should not remain ambiguous.

Mr. Tomba. I have no records in my custody or under my control.

Mr. Moss. In other words, you are not in a position to produce the material requested, not because of an order of the Attorney General or any personal reluctance, but it is just that you don't have them. Is that a fact? Mr. Tomba. That is true.

Mr. Moss. I think that makes it quite clear, Madam Chairwoman, that the witness now states, without equivocation,

25

32

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

33

that he has no means because he has no documents.

Mrs. Abzug. What did you mean when you answered twice. Once you answered and said you had no documents and now you answered Mr. Moss and said that you asserted the Attorney General's letter.

You must have gathered by now this is not regarded by this committee as reason to refuse to comply with the Subpoena Duces Tecum?

You cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Tomba. All I can do is to state again my position that I have no documents under my custody or control. I don't know how else to tell you.

Mrs. Abzug. Do you have the physical means of producing them assuming you had the authority?

Mr. Tomba. I do not have the authority to produce any documents.

Mrs. Abzug. I recognize Mr. Harrington.

Mr. Harrington. I don't want to belabor this, but let me just understand.

You indicated to Mr. Moss that you had no capacity to produce documents but even if you had, the letter from your superior or from Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Clements, directed you not to comply with the request of the committee to produce documents.

If your first statement was true as to your capacity,

53 1 why would that letter have been needed? 2 Do you understand my question? 3 Mr. Tomba. Yes. 4 Having not discussed this matter with the Deputy 5 Secretary of Defense directly, I presume that he may have 6 assumed that I might have had some documents because I had 7 been subpoenaed and might have wanted to make sure of that. 8 In fact, to protect such documents, he sent to me a letter 9 instructing me not to produce them, not knowing whether I 10 had any or not. 10 That is the way I wiew it	
 Mr. Tomba. Yes. Having not discussed this matter with the Deputy Secretary of Defense directly, I presume that he may have assumed that I might have had some documents because I had been subpoenaed and might have wanted to make sure of that. In fact, to protect such documents, he sent to me a letter instructing me not to produce them, not knowing whether I had any or not. 	
Having not discussed this matter with the Deputy Secretary of Defense directly, I presume that he may have assumed that I might have had some documents because I had been subpoenaed and might have wanted to make sure of that. In fact, to protect such documents, he sent to me a letter instructing me not to produce them, not knowing whether I had any or not.	
Secretary of Defense directly, I presume that he may have assumed that I might have had some documents because I had been subpoenaed and might have wanted to make sure of that. In fact, to protect such documents, he sent to me a letter instructing me not to produce them, not knowing whether I had any or not.	
 assumed that I might have had some documents because I had been subpoenaed and might have wanted to make sure of that. In fact, to protect such documents, he sent to me a letter instructing me not to produce them, not knowing whether I had any or not. 	
 been subpoenaed and might have wanted to make sure of that. In fact, to protect such documents, he sent to me a letter instructing me not to produce them, not knowing whether I had any or not. 	
8 In fact, to protect such documents, he sent to me a letter 9 instructing me not to produce them, not knowing whether I 10 had any or not.	
9 instructing me not to produce them, not knowing whether I 10 had any or not. That is the year I wice it	
10 had any or not.	
That is the year T wiew it	
What is the year T wiew it	
11 That is the way I view it.	
12 Mrs. Abzug. Do you have an additional opening state-	· .
13 ment?	
Mr. Tomba. No.	
Mrs. Abzug. Would you answer the question of the	
16 Chair?	· . · .
For what agencies of the United States have you worked	
18 and during what periods of time?	
Mr. Tomba. I have been directed by the Deputy Secretar	y
of Defense by letter not to testify. I respectfully decline	•
Mrs. Abzug. Your objection is not well-founded.	
You are directed to answer the question.	
23 For what agencies of the United States have you worked	
and during what periods of times?	
Mr. Tomba. I must respectfully decline to answer that	44 44

question.

Mrs. Abzug. Your continuing refusal places you in contempt of Congress and in violation of Section 192 of Title 2 of the United States Code and will render you liable to fine and imprisonment.

I direct you to answer the question.

Mr. Tomba. I must respectfully decline to answer. Mrs. Abzug. I inform you that you are in contempt and that there is a quorum present here consisting of the Chair, Mr.Moss, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Maguire, Mr. Moffett, and Mr. McCloskey, and I direct you to stand down for the present but to remain available at the call of the Chair.

Mr. Moffett. Before the witness steps down, may we also ask that the question of Mr. Moss - that is, is he invoking any Constitutional issue here. May we have the answer to that? That is, a yes or no answer.

I would urge the witness to give us a yes or no answer and also urge that it's something I think you can answer without counsel's help: Are you or are you not invoking any Constitutional basis here?

Mr. Tomba. Would you like me to read the letter that was sent to me by Mr. Clements?

Mr. Moffett. I would like you to answer the question yes or no. It's a very simple question it seems to me. We know about the letter. We know about the letter from

24

25

35.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

.17

18

19

20

21

22

23

6		55
	1	55 Mr. Clement. But I think we have a right to know if you are
•	2	invoking any Constitutional basis.
	3	Mr. Tomba. I would like you to hear the letter that was
	. 4	sent to me. I'd like to read it into the record.
	5	I am here. I am answering the way I am because of the
	6	directions I have been given by the Deputy Secretary of
	7	Defense.
	8	Mr. Moffett. I understand that. I think it is sorrow-
	9	ful that this Administration, like the past one, uses people
	10	like you as fodder.
	11	We can read the letter. I'm not interested in it now.
•	12	Could you give us a yes or no answer about the Constitu-
	13	tional basis for your refusal?
	. 14	Is there one or is there not?
	15	Are you relying upon a Constitutional right - that is,
	16	your personal right? I am asking the question of the witness
	17	(Witness and counsel confer.)
	18	Mr. Tomba. I am relying on instructions in the letter
	19	and I would like to read it into the record.
•	20	Mr. Moss. Would the gentleman yield.
	21	Mr. Moffett. Yes.
	22	Mr. Moss. Are you relying solely upon the letter?
	23	Mr. Tomba. I am relying on the letter.
• •	24	Mr. Moss. Are you relying solely on the letter?
	25	Mr. Tomba. I am relying solely on the directions in

this letter, yes.

Mr. Moss. I think he has answered the question.

Mr. Moffett. I think he has too.

Mrs. Abzug. I think prior to the last question the witness was informed that he is contempt and I repeat it. He's in contempt, and I ask him to stand down for the present and to remain available at the order of the Chair.

This hearing is adjourned and the meeting of the Subcommittee is called.

I recognize Mr. Harrington.

Mr. Harrington. I move that we are convening the Subcommittee, and I recommend that the full committee of Government Operations, because of their failure to give testimony and to produce documents, the following individuals be cited in contempt of Congress: Joe R. Craig, Walter C. Zink, David G. Jenkins, John P. Loomis, and Joseph J. Tomba. Mrs. Abzug. Is there any discussion?

Mr. Moss. Madam Chairwoman, I believe that that requires that we act separately on each witness.

I think we would have to have a roll-call vote. Mrs. Abzug. Mr. Harrington, Would you move that each recommendation be separate?

Mr. Harrington. I so move that we take each of the individuals severally and that in each instance we do so by a record vote of the Subcommittee.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

38		
	1	Mrs. Abzug. The Motion is that the Subcommittee
	2	recommend to the full committee on Government Operations
	3	that the failure to give testimony and/or failure to produce
	4	documents - that Joe R. Craig be cited for contempt of
	5	Congress.
	6	Will the clerk call the roll?
	7	The Clerk. Congresswoman Abzug?
	8	Mrs. Abzug. Aye.
	9	The Clerk. Congressman Ryan?
	10	(No response.)
	n	The Clerk. Congressman Conyers?
	12	Mrs. Abzug. Aye by proxy.
	13	The Clerk. Congressman Moss?
	14	Mr. Moss. Aye.
	15	The Clerk. Congressman Harrington?
	16	Mr. Harrington. Aye.
	17	The Clerk. Congressman Maguire.
. •	18	Mr. Maguire. Aye.
•		The Clerk. Congressman Moffett.
	19	Mr. Moffett. Aye.
	20	The Clerk. Congressman Steiger.
	21	(No response.)
· ·	22	The Clerk. Congressman Brown.
	23	(No response.)
	24	The Clerk. Congressman McCloskey.
	25	

Mr. McCloskey. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mrs. Abzug. The Motion is adopted.

By a vote of 6 to 1 with 6 members present, it is recommended to the full committee on Government Operations that for his failure to give testimony and/or to produce documents, Joe R. Craig be cited for contempt of Congress.

Mr. Harrington now moves that the Subcommittee recommend to the full committee on Government Operations that for his failure to give testimony and/or to produce documents, that Walter C. Zink be cited for contempt of Congress. Do you so move?

Mr. Harrington. I so move.

Mrs. Abzug. Will the Clerk please call the roll?

The Clerk. Congresswoman Abzug?

Mrs. Abzug. Aye

The Clerk. Congressman Ryan?

(No response.)

The Clerk. Congressman Conyers?

Mrs. Abzug. Aye by proxy.

The Clerk. Congressman McDonald?

(No response.)

The Clerk. Congressman Moss?

Mr. Moss. Aye.

The Clerk. Congressman Harrington?

Mr. Harrington. Aye.

	59
1	The Clerk. Congressman Maguire?
2	Mr. Maguire. Aye.
3	• The Clerk. Congressman Moffett?
4	Mr. Moffett. Aye.
. 5	The Clerk. Congressman Steiger?
6	(No response.)
7	The Clerk. Congressman Brown?
8	(No response.)
9	The Clerk. Congressman McCloskey?
10	Mr. McCloskey. No.
11	The Clerk. There are 6 ayes.
12	Mrs. Abzug. By a vote of 6 ayes and 1 no, with 6
13	members of Congress present, the Subcommittee has recommended
14	to the full committee on Government Operations that for his
15	failure to give testimony and/or to produce documents, that
16	Walter Zink be cited for contempt of Congress.
17	Mr. Harrington. Madam Chairwoman, I move with respect
18	to David Jenkins, because of his failure to give testimony,
19	that he be cited for contempt of Congress.
20	Mrs. Abzug. Will the Clerk please call the roll?
20	The Clerk. Congresswoman Abzug?
22	Mrs. Abzug. Aye.
23	The Clerk. Congressman Ryan?
23	(No response.)
24 25	The Clerk. Congressman Conyers?
25	Mrs. Abzug. Aye by proxy.

40

l

. 1	
. 1	60 The Clerk. Congressman McDonald?
2	(No response.)
3	The Clerk. Congressman Moss?
4	Mr. Moss. Aye.
5	The Clerk. Congressman Harrington?
6	Mr. Harrington. Aye.
7	The Clerk. Congressman Maguire?
8	Mr. Maguire. Aye.
9	The Clerk. Congressman Moffett?
	Mr. Moffett. Aye.
10	The Clerk. Congressman Steiger?
11	(No response.)
12 .	The Clerk. Congressman Brown?
13	
14	(No response.)
15	The Clerk. Congressman McCloskey?
16	Mr. McCloskey. No.
17	The Clerk. 6 ayes and 1 no.
18	Mrs. Abzug. Let the record show that with six members
19	present, by a vote of 6 to 1, David Jenkins is recommended b
20	the Subcommittee to the full committee on Government Opera-
21	tions to be cited for contempt of Congress for his failure t
22	give testimony and/or to produce documents.
23	Mr. Harrington. Madam Chairwoman, with respect to
	John Loomis, I move that with his failure to answer our
24	questions, that he be cited for contempt of Congress.
25	
. 1	

by

to

.42 .	61	
1	Mrs. Abzug. Will the Clerk please call the roll?	
2	The Clerk. Congresswoman Abzug?	
3	Mrs. Abzug. Aye.	
4	The Clerk. Congressman Ryan?	
5	(No response.)	
6	The Clerk. Congressman Conyers?	
7	Mrs. Abzug. Aye by proxy.	
8	The Clerk. Congressman McDonald?	
9	(No response.)	
10	The Clerk. Congressman Moss?	
· 11	Mr. Moss. Aye.	
12	The Clerk. Congressman Harrington?	
13	Mr. Harrington. Aye.	
14	The Clerk. Congressman Maguire?	
15	Mr. Maguire. Aye.	
16	The Clerk. Congressman Moffett?	
17	Mr. Moffett. Aye.	
18	The Clerk. Congressman Steiger?	
19	(No response.)	
20	The Clerk. Congressman Brown?	
20	(No response.)	
	The Clerk. Congressman McCloskey?	
22	Mr. McCloskey. No.	
23	The Clerk. 6 ayes and 1 no.	
24	Mrs. Abzug. With six members present, and by a vote of	
25		
1		1

(

l

6 to 1, the Subcommittee recommends to the full committee on Government Operations that for his failure to give testimony and/or produce documents, John Loomis be cited for contempt of Congress.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

62

Mr. Harrington. Madam Chairwoman, I move because of the ambiguity involved in the question of whether or not he is able to produce documents, that Joseph Tomba be cited for contempt of Congress because of his failure to give testimony to this Subcommittee this morning.

Mrs. Abzug. Will the Clerk please call the roll? 10 The Clerk. Congresswoman Abzug? 11 Mrs. Abzug. Aye. 12 Congressman Ryan? The Clerk. 13 (No response.) 14 The Clerk. Congressman Conyers? 15 Mrs. Abzug. Aye by proxy. 16 The Clerk. Congressman McDonald? 17 (No response.) 18 The Clerk. Congressman Moss? 19 Mr. Moss. Aye. 20 The Clerk. Congressman Harrington? 21 Mr. Harrington. Aye. 22 The Clerk. Congressman Maguire? 23 Mr. Maguire. Aye. 24 The Clerk. Congressman Moffett? 25

Mr. Moffett. Aye.

The Clerk. Congressman Steiger?

(No response.)

The Clerk. Congressman Brown?

(No response.)

The Clerk. Congressman McCloskey?

Mr. McCloskey. No.

The Clerk. 6 ayes and 1 no.

Mrs. Abzug. The vote was 6 to 1, with six members present.

63

Mr. Harrington. Let me understand this last thing. The vote we have taken with respect to the failure to give testimony only.

There was the question of whether or not Mr. Tomba could or would supply documents - we are not citing him conjunctively this morning for that reason.

Mrs. Abzug. This is correct. This was a vote to recommend that the Subcommittee recommend to the full committee on Government Operations that for his failure to give testimony, Joseph Tomba would be cited for contempt of Congress, and this was done by a vote of 6 to 1, with 6 members of the Subcommittee being present.

Mr. Moss. May I make an observation? Mrs. Abzug. Yes.

Mr. Moss. While we have just voted to cite to the

44

2

3

full committee with the recommendation that the matter be carried to the House and these five persons be found in contempt of Congress, that the real contempt here has been committed by the Attorney General of the United States and by the President of the United States.

They have acted arrogantly and contemptuously of the peoples' elected representatives in a most outrageous and unprecedented fashion.

Mrs. Abzug. I must concur with Mr. Moss that the procedure here used by the Executive Branch of Government is highly questionable.

We will be continuing these hearings next week. As I stated in my opening statement, I have never, and I know of no instance, in which, Executive privilege or a Constitutional privilege has been asserted by private corporations.

This is also on our agenda for our hearing next week that the continuation of these hearings we have subpoenaed here Western Union International, who has asserted that they have received an Attorney General's letter in which the Attorney General advises them that they should not appear by reason of the fact that the President has claimed Executive privilege.

I know of no instance, though we may quarrel on the subject of Executive privilege, and I believe that that went

•

45

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

65 out with the American Revolution, but that was a privilege of monarchs and not presidents.

There is no Constitutional privilege of the President which has ever been claimed by a corporation.

I think this is a very serious question.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Those of us who have lived through the Watergate era with the Nixon impeachment, find this a most horrible extension and expansion - and in his wildest moments Richard Nixon never claimed that a Constitutional privilege of the President could be claimed by a corporation.

In addition to which, I wish to state and agree with what has been so ably stated by Mr. Moss at these hearings, that what the Government has done today has really been tantamount to interference with witnesses.

I must say that there is no valid claim that I can see which has been claimed for such an interference.

These hearings are now adjourned until next week when we shall continue to attempt to carry out the functions of this Subcommittee and the functions of this Congress which are our responsibilities under the law.

I hope that the Government will not continue to interfere at these very important functions of the separate and independent branch of Government.

The meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon at 11:25 a.m., the Subcommittee adjourned.)