House Republicans will launch a legislative attack on loan-sharking, narcotics peddling and organized gambling in the session of Congress beginning Jan. 15, House GOP Leader Gerald R. Ford of Grand Rapids said today.

Ford said the GOP will offer a package of three anti-crime bills as part of an overall assault on the Nation's crime problem. He noted that loan-sharking, narcotics trafficking and organized gambling are the three major money-makers of Mafia-type syndicates and produce an annual "take" of about $10 billion.

Pointing up his personal support of the House GOP anti-crime drive, Ford has introduced a bill directed at loan-sharking—the practice of lending money at highly exorbitant rates of interest to individuals unable to borrow from legal sources. This is the first of the three bills in the GOP war-on-crime program. Ford said.

Ford's anti-loan-sharking bill would make it a federal crime for anyone to lend money at illegal rates of interest. Federal penalties would apply whenever such a loan interfered with or affected interstate commerce, or whenever any part of the loan transaction or efforts at collecting the loan or interest on it crossed state lines. The interest rates involved would be deemed illegal under the Ford bill whenever they exceeded the rate permitted in a particular state.

"If my bill is enacted into law," Ford said, "it will go a long way toward drying up a principal source of revenue for organized crime." "Loan-sharking is clearly a part of organized crime on a national level, yet there is no federal law which deals directly or effectively with it."

Ford noted that the President's Crime Commission found loan-sharking to be second only to gambling as a source of revenue for organized crime. The commission also found, Ford pointed out, that loan-sharking is directly related to gambling and narcotics trafficking—because gamblers borrow to pay their losses and addicts borrow to purchase narcotics.

Ford also emphasized that small businessmen whose operations are marginal sometimes fall victim to loan sharks. He said congressional committee reports are filled with accounts of how small businesses have been taken over by the syndicate, after the syndicate got its foothold through a loan shark.

Sixteen other House Republicans have joined with Ford in introducing the loan-sharking bill. Fourteen of them are members of the House GOP Task Force on Crime. The others are the senior Republican on the House Judiciary Committee and the senior Republican on the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. Mr. Speaker, a page one story in the New York Times this morning reveals that organized crime has moved into Wall Street through the device of loan-sharking. I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times story be printed in the Congressional Record immediately following my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the testimony now being given before a committee of the New York Legislature on loan-sharking and organized crime points up the need for swift action by the Congress to swing federal investigators into action against loan-sharking—one of the principal sources of revenue for the crime syndicates.

We have a vehicle for that purpose in a bill due to come to the House floor shortly—the Truth-In-Lending Bill which yesterday was granted a three-hour open rule by the House Rules Committee.

The Truth-In-Lending Bill is urgently needed, and there will be Republican support for it in the House as in the Senate. As reported out of committee, however, the legislation would not touch upon the tremendous problem of loan-sharking.

I wish to announce that Republicans will offer an amendment to the Truth-In-Lending Bill to give additional protection to the man who has to borrow money. Our amendment will zero in on the lending of money at illegally high rates of interest. It will unleash federal agents in a drive to rid the country of the scourge of loan-sharking and to weaken the financial underpinnings of organized crime.

It seems safe to predict that the House will overwhelmingly approve this amendment. There now is no federal loan-sharking statute on the books.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican loan-sharking amendment has been carefully prepared by Rep. William B. Widnall, senior Republican on the Banking and Currency Committee, and Rep. Richard H. Poff, member of the Judiciary Committee and chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Crime.
The loan-sharking proposal first was offered in a bill introduced last December by all members of the Task Force, the senior Republican on the Judiciary Committee, Rep. William M. McCulloch, and me.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican amendment to the Truth-In-Lending Bill would make it a violation of federal law for anyone to lend money at illegal rates of interest. The interest rate involved would be deemed illegal whenever it exceeded the rate permitted in a particular state. Federal penalties of a $10,000 fine or 10 years in jail would apply whenever such a loan interfered with or affected interstate commerce, or whenever any part of the loan transaction or efforts at collecting the loan or interest on it crossed state lines.

Mr. Speaker, evidence of the infiltration of Wall Street by loan sharks and mobsters underscores the urgency of immediate action to bring the full force of federal investigative power into play against loan-sharking and all it entails.

Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Task Force on Crime has spent months in preparing this loan-sharking legislation. The legislation resulting from this group's efforts deserves the careful consideration of the House. The loan-sharking amendment merits ringing endorsement.

# # #
Mr. Speaker: Yesterday the President sent his message on crime to the Congress. He told the Congress that -- and I quote:

"Thousands of Americans are killed or injured each year by criminal acts. Many thousands more are unable to use the streets of their cities without fear, or to feel secure in their homes or shops.

"Property valued at almost $4 billion is lost through crime every year. Millions of dollars are taken from the productive economy by organized racketeers -- money that should be in the pockets of the poor, or in the bank accounts of honest businessmen.

"For decades our system of criminal justice has been neglected.

"For decades the conditions that nourish crime have been gathering force."

Republicans ask the President why he has waited until now to take action? We ask why he has ignored the findings and recommendations of his own Crime Commission until now?

I think that every Member of Congress knows that crime is our number one domestic problem. The fact and fear of crime stalks our nation. Since 1960 the reported rate of crime has increased over 88 percent. This alarming increase cannot be attributed to population growth, which has increased only 10 percent since 1960.

Republicans believe that the Administration must account to the nation for these figures. All levels of government -- local, state and national -- share responsibility for the safety of our nation.
Control and prevention of crime is not solely a responsibility of government. In the first and last analysis it is the responsibility of every American. Crime cannot and will not be controlled without the support and assistance of all responsible citizens. Americans need effective and sustained leadership to mobilize and properly channel their concern into constructive effort. The greatest failure of the Johnson Administration is its failure to provide Americans with this much needed leadership. No program can fill a leadership gap.

Republicans welcome the President's pledge to fight crime. But we express both disappointment and concern over inadequacies of the President's proposed program. The President has failed to fully recognize the problems of crime in America and effectively respond to the challenge. His proposed program is much like a prize fighter with dazzling foot work, but no punch.

I am concerned that an analysis will show that the President has given the nation a political document and not a much needed plan for national action.

Crime must be brought under control -- substantially reduced. The Republican Party is committed to solving this problem which each year grows as a deepening crisis. While the Johnson Administration slept, Republicans have developed and introduced specific legislative proposals designed to control and prevent crime and lawlessness. I believe these Republican proposals offer great promise for alleviating the problems of crime.
Indeed, the fact that the President has recommended the enactment of two proposals which were developed, drafted, introduced, and overwhelmingly supported by House Republicans -- the Cramer anti-riot bill and the Railsback appeals bill -- is but a sampling of the commitment and ability within our Party to solve this problem of crime.

Others from our side of the aisle will discuss other instances where Republican leadership has substantially improved Administration anti-crime legislation in this and previous Congresses.
Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon, the distinguished ranking minority member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch), made some excellent observations concerning the President’s crime message and the recommendations contained therein. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch) has been informed of the special order taken by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Poff) and he does know the sentiments that will be expressed in general by Members of the committee and Members of the Republican task force. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch), who has had great experience in this field, is coauthor of a number of the Republican bills which will be discussed. His leadership has contributed greatly to the overall Republican effort in this field.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President sent his message on crime to the Congress. He told the Congress that—

Thousands of Americans are killed or injured each year by criminal acts. Many hundreds more are unable to use the streets of their cities without fear, or to feel secure in their homes. Property valued at almost $4 billion is lost to crime every year. Millions of dollars are taken from the productive economy by organized racketeering—money that should be in the pockets of the poor, or in the bank accounts of honest businessmen. Thousands of Americans are killed or injured each year by criminal acts. Many thousands more are unable to use the streets of their cities without fear, or to feel secure in their homes. Property valued at almost $4 billion is lost to crime every year. Millions of dollars are taken from the productive economy by organized racketeering—money that should be in the pockets of the poor, or in the bank accounts of honest businessmen.

For decades the conditions that nourish crime have been neglected. For decades the conditions that nourish crime have been neglected. Republicans ask the President why he has waited until now to take action? We ask why he has ignored the findings and recommendations of his Commission until now?

I think that every Member of Congress knows that crime is our No. 1 domestic problem. The fear and fear of crime stalks our Nation. Since 1960 the reported rate of crime has increased over 88 percent. This alarming increase cannot be attributed to population growth, which has increased only 10 percent since 1960.

Republicans believe that the administration must account to the Nation for these failures. All levels of government—local, State, and National—share responsibility for the safety of our Nation.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. Poff. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I recognize the hour, Mr. Speaker. I shall be as brief as the subject will permit. I believe it is fair to say that the President’s crime message delivered to the Congress yesterday is an indication that he not only is concerned about but also that he finally means to do something about the problem of crime in this country. All Republicans will welcome the message. Until now I think it is further fair to say that the administration has been content to rely principally upon reaction and outrage. The legislative measures that have been proposed have been until now too few, too narrow, and too slow in coming. It is apparent that there has been some change in the climate now and with it hopefully a recognition that what has been offered so far has been inappropriate and inadequate to meet the challenge. I suggest that it is too early to attempt to make a definitive analysis of the President’s proposal. We do not attempt to assume either a negative posture or positive posture with respect to the specific proposals included by the President. What we do mean to make plain now is that the sense of urgency conveyed by the entire message cannot help but produce the priority treatment of crime measures which is so urgently needed in the Congress this year. This is all to the good. Whatever the motives behind the President’s new posture, the end result will benefit all Americans. By encouraging some Republican ideas he has at the very least laid a predicate for a meaningful and constructive dialogue on an issue that troubles every thoughtful American regardless of party.

Those who heard the President’s message and who had an opportunity to read it since recognize, I think, its distinct Republican flavor. It contains much of Republican origin and Republican orientation. Of the 72 proposals specifically explained by the President, four have such a Republican orientation. The immunity legislation which the President called upon the Congress to enact as legislation previously endorsed by the
Republican task force on crime. I might add it was unanimously proposed by the President's own Crime Commission several months ago.

Second, it has been indicated already, the legislation which passed the last year making it possible for the Government to take an appeal on a motion to suppress evidence or confessions was legislation offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Railsback). Again I think it is important to remember that it was the distinguished minority leader who first in the January 1966 Republican State of the Union messages suggested that a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice would make a proper shop for the conduct of basic research in new techniques in law enforcement and in prisoner rehabilitation. The President to his messages adopted the essence of that suggestion and then went forward to suggest an expansion of the program currently conducted in this area by the FBI at Quantico.

Finally, and most importantly, the President has called now for the adoption of an antiriot bill. Those who have observed the Congress will recall the chronology of this legislation. It was first proposed as an amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1966 by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Chappell). That amendment was adopted in the face of a substitute by an overwhelming vote.

And, as all will recall the legislation, after it passed the House, went to the other body where it died that year. I think the date upon which the bill was debated was July 19, 1967. And, in order to demonstrate that the President's recommendation of the antiriot bill is something of a new making it possible for the Government to take an appeal on a motion to suppress evidence or confessions was legislation offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Railsback). Again I think it is important to remember that it was the distinguished minority leader who first in the January 1966 Republican State of the Union messages suggested that a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice would make a proper shop for the conduct of basic research in new techniques in law enforcement and in prisoner rehabilitation. The President to his messages adopted the essence of that suggestion and then went forward to suggest an expansion of the program currently conducted in this area by the FBI at Quantico.

Finally, and most importantly, the President has called now for the adoption of an antiriot bill. Those who have observed the Congress will recall the chronology of this legislation. It was first proposed as an amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1966 by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Chappell). That amendment was adopted in the face of a substitute by an overwhelming vote.

And, as all will recall the legislation, after it passed the House, went to the other body where it died that year. I think the date upon which the bill was debated was July 19, 1967. And, in order to demonstrate that the President's recommendation of the antiriot bill is something of a new making it possible for the Government to take an appeal on a motion to suppress evidence or confessions was legislation offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Railsback). Again I think it is important to remember that it was the distinguished minority leader who first in the January 1966 Republican State of the Union messages suggested that a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice would make a proper shop for the conduct of basic research in new techniques in law enforcement and in prisoner rehabilitation. The President to his messages adopted the essence of that suggestion and then went forward to suggest an expansion of the program currently conducted in this area by the FBI at Quantico.

Finally, and most importantly, the President has called now for the adoption of an antiriot bill. Those who have observed the Congress will recall the chronology of this legislation. It was first proposed as an amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1966 by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Chappell). That amendment was adopted in the face of a substitute by an overwhelming vote.

And, as all will recall the legislation, after it passed the House, went to the other body where it died that year. I think the date upon which the bill was debated was July 19, 1967. And, in order to demonstrate that the President's recommendation of the antiriot bill is something of a new making it possible for the Government to take an appeal on a motion to suppress evidence or confessions was legislation offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Railsback). Again I think it is important to remember that it was the distinguished minority leader who first in the January 1966 Republican State of the Union messages suggested that a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice would make a proper shop for the conduct of basic research in new techniques in law enforcement and in prisoner rehabilitation. The President to his messages adopted the essence of that suggestion and then went forward to suggest an expansion of the program currently conducted in this area by the FBI at Quantico.
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Another measure that the President did not mention is the amendment to bring to the attention of the House that it was through the gentleman in the well that the amendment to make loan sharking a Federal crime was added to the truth-in-lending bill.

I am grateful to the President for the support he gave the amendment. It was through the gentleman in the well that the amendment to make loan sharking a Federal crime was added to the truth-in-lending bill.

I am interested to note that the President mentioned in his message that the gentleman in his message said:

"It involves a network, a countrywide network, and one which is interstate commerce of the most nefarious sort."

We look forward to some new approaches, to some new vigor in the fight against organized crime. If the President's message means what we all hope it does, because in the final analysis, this battle cannot be fought with words. It has to be fought with leadership of the highest order, it has to be fought with determination, and it has to be fought by all sides of our political system, by all parts of our Government.

I know the Republican task force on crime will indicate its efforts and its thought to continue the battle we have already been fighting for a year. In cooperation with the President if possible, but regardless of partisan or regardless of the possibilities of cooperation, at the fullest extent of our capabilities.

I, again I commend the speaker at a meeting of clergy and community leaders in his city and in the state of Minnesota. He is one of a number of Minnesota clergymen who have made a commitment to do more in the contest against the growing incidents of juvenile delinquency in both in his city and in the State of Minnesota.

He commended me on my appearance week ago Friday at Macalester College in St. Paul as the final banquet speaker at a meeting of clergy and leaders concerned about juvenile delinquency.

I gave him a copy of the President's crime message of yesterday. He sat in my office while I was on a long distance telephone call, and read from the message, and later quoted to me the following words of the President of the United States:

"I propose the passage of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act."

This clergyman said to me: "Congressman, do you think it will pass?" I told him already has passed the House of Representatives, in September of last year.

To be sure the House in its wisdom reversed the bill recommended by the administration. It tailored the bill to the Republican philosophy of the proper role for the Federal Government in the fight against juvenile delinquency, and it passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority. "The clergyman looked at me and said: "I find no reference to that fact in the President's message. Would you tell me why?"

"Sir, you have not addressed your question to the right party. I cannot look into my heart, but I know in the mind of another man..."

I am grateful to the gentleman for the full text of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. It is precisely the kind of legislation which will make a meaningful contribution to the fight against juvenile delinquency, which will do so in a proper and effective way, and I will ask you to adopt this amendment to the bill your Committee has already prepared for your consideration.

I propose the passage of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act.

I hope that the House will come to a decision, at least as it appears to the present time. I know that with the weight of the President behind a resolution of this issue, we are going to make some progress, that progress that is desperately needed.
Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman. Before I conclude I should like to say that the thing in the President's message which disappointed me most was his insistence once again upon the wiretap which he first proposed. As the Members of this body will recall, the President would permit wiretaps for the gathering of evidence only in national security cases, and he would decide or allow the appropriate authorities of the Executive establishment to decide when the national security was involved and what constituted national security cases.

The legislation which the task force has endorsed, which has been introduced in this body and in the other body, would permit wiretapping only in those cases where the law-enforcement officer was able to convince an appropriate judge that the evidence could not be acquired by other techniques. To convince the judge that a crime had been committed or was being committed, to convince the judge that a court order was necessary to acquire evidence of a crime specifically named in the legislation.

Legislation of this kind has received almost universal endorsement. The concept enjoys the approval of the three previous Attorney Generals, of the majority of the House and Senate, of the present Attorney General, of the present Attorneys General, of the Judicial Conference of the United States, of the majority of the House, and of every national law-enforcement association in the United States which has pronounced upon the subject.

The Attorney General of the United States today stands almost alone in his opposition to this legislation.

The urgency of that legislation is greater today than it was before Monday of this week. The Supreme Court on Monday of this week for the first time explicitly recognized the utility of the gambling statutes under question by so many of the organized criminals of this country have been brought to the point where law-enforcement officers are stripped of the means of assembling evidence it is essential to all the more important that this carefully devised procedure is promulgated and favorably by both Houses of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged to hope that this legislation will have the opportunity during this session of Congress to receive on its merits the consideration the item introduced by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch) and the gentleman from California (Mr. Cramer). The Smith and the gentleman from New York (Mr. Smith). A number of other Members of this body are also aware of the desire to have this legislation in a part of the bill the President is about to present to the Senate. I believe he will now find it to his interest to see this legislation passed. I cannot believe that the President could be brought to the present position of states to veto such legislation. With that thought in mind, I trust that our committees in both the House and the Senate will go promptly.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I thank the gentleman for his yielding. I must agree with the gentleman that I could not see the President bring himself to veto that kind of legislation when he reaffirmed again the statement he made last year, in his message about crime this year, in which he said:

Public order is the first business of Government.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman and my colleagues for their patience.

Mr. WRIGHT of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, we welcome President Johnson's support of public order, but we deplore his lack of support of public order. As the President said, the need for such an effort has been carefully documented. Each day brings new statistics that show a skyrocketing rise in crime. Each day brings fresh evidence that something must be done to reverse the alarming trend toward lawlessness.

One of the primary duties of Government is to establish and maintain law and order. Our very survival as a free and effective society depends upon how successfully we are able to implement this basic concept.

In the first session of the 90th Congress, Republicans sponsored and supported legislation that must be enacted in order to stop the battle against crime. A bill that would establish a Federal system to provide assistance to local law-enforcement agencies was passed by the House with the overwhelming support of the Republican Members. Similarly, a Republican-sponsored bill that would impose criminal penalties upon persons traveling in, or using the facilities of interstate commerce with the intent to inflict a harm, was also passed by the House.

Unfortunately, this essential legislation was not adopted by the Senate during the first session. We are hopeful that, with the new-found interest and support of the President, this legislation can be enacted into law without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the record the following statement made by Mr. R. B. Ford, and a number of other Members of Congress:

I include in the record the following statement made by Mr. R. B. Ford, and a number of other Members of Congress:

I include in the record the following statement made by Mr. R. B. Ford, and a number of other Members of Congress:

I thank the gentleman and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I believe he will see fit to sign this bill. I cannot believe that the President could bring himself to the present position of states to veto such legislation. With that thought in mind, I trust that our committees in both the House and the Senate will go promptly.
that must be dealt with by state and local governments. Even the Attorney General has stated, "We would hope to have all the States really working for a fully comprehensive plan for the States." Any provision or measure that would create new financial and administrative problems must be avoided. The recent decision of the Supreme Court that the State and its designated agencies must have the primary responsibility for controlling the law enforcement effort within a state. Certainly, experience under the "poverty" program has demonstrated that failure to coordinate federal activities with state efforts may result in an inappropriate distribution of resources to meet the needs of local law enforcement activities, the Attorney General should make all efforts to coordinate federal law enforcement activities with state activities in a manner that will be most appropriate for participation in the high priority considerations relevant to the solution of crime in the community.

We believe that the Attorney General should have the maximum discretion in recruiting and training law enforcement personnel. We reject the Attorney General's assertions that the Attorney General can effectively coordinate federal law enforcement personnel with state law enforcement personnel. We think the Attorney General's assertion that the Attorney General can effectively coordinate federal law enforcement personnel with state law enforcement personnel is based on a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of federalism.

We believe that an appropriate allocation of funds for crime control legislation-legislation which my Republican colleague from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska] and many other Republican colleagues, as well as the President, wants to see passed by this House last August, The President asks for a "major assistance program" for the purposes of educating and training the Nation's law enforcement personnel, as well as for improving the quality of state law enforcement personnel, as well as for improving the quality of state law enforcement personnel problem. The Attorney General should have the maximum discretion in recruiting and training law enforcement personnel. We believe that the Attorney General should have the maximum discretion in recruiting and training law enforcement personnel. We reject the Attorney General's assertions that the Attorney General can effectively coordinate federal law enforcement personnel with state law enforcement personnel. We think the Attorney General's assertion that the Attorney General can effectively coordinate federal law enforcement personnel with state law enforcement personnel is based on a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of federalism.
Insofar as the President’s crime message is an indication that he not only is concerned about crime but that he finally means to do something about it, we welcome it. Up until now his Administration has relied principally upon oration and outrage: the legislative measures they have proposed have been altogether too few, too narrow and too slow in coming. It is apparent that there has now been a change in climate and with it a new recognition that what has been offered so far has been inappropriate and inadequate to meet the challenge.

At this time, we do not undertake to endorse or oppose the President’s specific proposals. Some are good, no doubt, but others may be otherwise. Few are new. There is time enough later for critical analysis and, where necessary, constructive alternatives. What we do mean to say now is that the sense of urgency conveyed by the entire message cannot help but produce priority treatment of crime matters in the Congress. This is all to the good. Whatever the motive behind the new Presidential posture, the end result will benefit all Americans. By embracing some Republican ideas, he has at the very least set the stage for meaningful dialogue on an issue that troubles us all, regardless of party.

That the President has embraced Republican ideas is nowhere more clearly shown than in the anti-riot proposal. The House has already passed a bill in this field, despite Administration non-support. It was authored by Rep. William Cramer (R.-Fla.) and was endorsed by the Republican Task Force on Crime. Since the President has now come around to our way of thinking on this matter, we pause only to wonder what took so long. If his bill is an improvement, the time to have offered it was when the Cramer bill was first being studied in the House last year.

Perhaps the most encouraging feature of the crime message lies in the President’s new concern with organized crime. Again, we cannot endorse all he has proposed. Nor can we refrain from pointing out that at least two of his proposals are distinctly Republican in origin. The point to be made is simply that, whereas less than a year ago his Attorney General described organized crime as a “tiny” problem, the time has now come when the President, at least, recognizes that it is not tiny at all.
Trafficking in narcotics and dangerous drugs are, of course, organized crime activities. It can hardly be questioned that additional investigators and prosecutors are needed to push the fight against this trade. The most disappointing aspect of the President's message then, is found in his still persisting unwillingness to face up to the realities of law enforcement, not only in the narcotics field but in the field of organized crime at large. Prosecutors can't prosecute without evidence, and investigators can't investigate without the means to get the evidence. Whatever the merits of his narcotics proposals then, they will still be far from adequate to meet the needs unless and until law enforcement officers are given better and sharper tools to gather evidence to be used in Court. Republicans have made their proposal in this regard; we invite the President to submit a reasonable alternative if he will not support ours.
Washington--Rep. Richard H. Poff (Va.) Thursday said "new evidence" shows that Organized Crime is infiltrating Wall Street, and "this gives added weight to my loan-shark amendment", added to the Truth-in-Lending Bill by the House, he declared.

The Chairman of the House GOP Task Force on Crime described the "modern Wall Street Loan Shark" as shooting for high stakes by exploiting the services of borrowers who cannot meet repayment timetables. "The Loan Shark forces the borrower, typically a lower echelon clerk in a brokerage house who needs 'fast' money to invest in a 'hot' stock tip, to 'fence' stolen securities, in order to earn more time to repay the loan," Poff explained.

"The money from the 'fenced' securities and the loan all end up in Organized Crime's giant coffers," Rep. Poff told his House colleagues.

"The Wall Street Loan Shark is only one of the targets of the GOP authored amendment to the Truth-in-Lending Bill. Other techniques are employed by other loan sharks in the Organized Crime complex. Nearly all are involved in or have an impact upon interstate commerce.

"State and local governments need the investigative tools of the Federal Government," Poff noted. "The loan-shark amendment would give them those tools."
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Four Statements From the Republicans

Task Force on Crime

HON. GERALD R. FORD
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tues., April 2, 1968

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, our Republican task force on crime has recently issued four statements. Under leave to extend my remarks I include its assessment of the President's crime message released on February 8, 1968; a statement of February 15 entitled "New Evidence Supports GOP-Authorized Loan-Shark Amendment;" a statement of March 25 about "Sky-Jacking;" and a statement of April 1 on "Reorganization Plan No. 1" relative to the transfer of the Bureau of Narcotics and the Drug Enforcement Administration to the Justice Department.

GOP Crime Force Assesses President's Crime Message

Insofar as the President's crime message is an indication that he not only is concerned about crime but that he finally means to do something about it, we welcome it. The message also suggests that the President is willing to see his proposals不仅仅是出于党派原因提出的,而且是基于一个更为全面的思考。这个问题困扰我们所有人，不管他们属于哪个政党。

The GOP task force on crime has been endorsed by the Republican Party. Since the administration non-support. It was noted.

Evidence has now been found in the Justice Department.

Emphasis is placed upon oration instead of legislative measures they have proposed.エビデンスは、同氏が司法省内でも同件手口に対する対策を講ずることを求めるようにと注釈付けています。

The GOP Crime Group believed that a greater measure of protection is advisable for pilots and crew of commercial passenger-carrying aircraft.

The legislation proposed would require bullet-proof construction for the door separating the pilot and passenger compartments; visibility of the passenger compartment from the cockpit; an improved warning system; and would prohibit the carrying of firearms on board an aircraft unless they are first declared.

The legislation proposed would require bullet-proof construction for the door separating the pilot and passenger compartments; visibility of the passenger compartment from the cockpit; an improved warning system; and would prohibit the carrying of firearms on board an aircraft unless they are first declared.

New Evidence Supports GOP-Authorized Loan-Shark Amendment

WASHINGTON -- Rep. Richard H. Poff (R-Va.) said the "new evidence" shows that Organized Crime is influencing Wall Street, and "this gives added emphasis to the loan-shark amendment," added to the Truth-in-Lending Bill by the House, he declared.

The Chairman of the House GOP Task Force on Crime described the "modern Wall Street Loan Shark" as shooting for high stakes by exploiting the services of borrowers unable to meet repayment timetables.

"The Loan Shark forces the borrower to borrow, and the borrower, who needs fast money to invest in a 'hot' stock or in 'lock' millions of dollars in order to each more time to repay the loan," Poff explained.

The money from the "loans" and the loss add up in Organized Crime's "index of success," Poff told his House colleagues.

The bill is the "modern Wall Street Loan Shark," and is one of the targets of the GOP-authored amendment to the Truth-in-Lending Bill. Other techniques are employed by other loan sharks in the Organized Crime complex. Nearby are involved in or have an impact upon interstate commerce.

Many of Organized Crime's more dangerous tools are located, they have been devot.
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"We also believe that it is ill-advised to reorganize the Federal drug enforcement agencies while the National Commission on Revision of the Federal Criminal Laws is, under the direction of the President, proposing revisions of the narcotic and drug abuse laws. Without knowing what will be the eventual direction and scope of the enforcement laws, it is impossible to intelligently where an agency should be located.

"It is essential that Congress, as well as the Administration, initiate a study of the entire structure of Federal law enforcement, and that any reorganization plans come about only as a result of that study, they concluded.

**TASK FORCE STATEMENT—REORGANIZATION Plan No. 1**

The House Republican Task Force on Crime opposes Reorganization Plan No. 1, which transfers the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Control to the Justice Department.

Republicans have regularly called attention to fragmentation in Federal law enforcement and have repeatedly urged that the two narcotics and drug abuse enforcement agencies be integrated and reorganized so that effective law enforcement can be located in Justice. Many agencies besides the Justice Department have important law enforcement responsibilities. To pull an agency out of one department, as it presently proposed for BON, and transfer it to another could undermine effective intra-departmental coordination. As indicated above, Customs and INS and BON—all four in Treasury—were created to coordinate their activities in this area and have produced an excellent record in the fight against organized crime. What would happen to this coordination or to coordination between Treasury and other departments is unknown at present, but this lack of knowledge is sufficient reason to withhold action until a broadside study of Federal law enforcement is conducted. Fragmentation is not the only reason for opposing the House plan. As a Nevada representative pointed out, a highly contested reorganization which substitutes whatever effective coordination that exists is far worse. This may be particularly so if the reorganization would also have the effect of concentrating too much authority and discretion in the hands of a single Federally-appointed "Mr. Big" who could thereby forge an all-powerful national police force. There is no need to establish cumbersome regulatory commissions and procedures to recognize the Federal drug enforcement agencies. While the National Commission on Revision of the Federal Criminal Laws is under the direction of the President, it will propose revisions of the laws pertaining to narcotics and drug abuse. Without knowing what will be the eventual direction and scope of the enforcement authority, it is necessarily premature to consider any reorganizations.

These are only the major motivating reasons why the Task Force opposes Reorganization Plan No. 1. Much more detailed and wide-ranging study of the entire Federal criminal law enforcement structure and operations must be made before particular reorganizations can be attempted.
Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon, the distinguished ranking minority member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch], made some excellent observations concerning the President's crime message and the recommendations contained therein. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] has informed of the special order taken by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff] and he does know the sentiments that will be expressed in general by Members of the committee and Members of the Republican task force. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch], who has had great experience in the field, is coauthor of a constructive effort in this field.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President sent his message on crime to the Congress. He told the Congress that:

Thousands of Americans are killed or injured each year by criminal acts. Many thousands more are unable to use the streets of their cities without fear, or to feel secure in their homes or shops.

Property valued at almost $4 billion is lost through crime every year. Millions of dollars are taken from the productive economy by organized racketeers—money that should be in the pockets of the poor, or in the hands of those who save and invest to build a better future.

For decades our system of criminal justice has been neglected.

For decades the conditions that nourish crime have been gathering force.

Republicans ask the President why he has waited until now to take action? We ask why he has ignored the findings and recommendations of his own Crime Commission.

I think that every Member of Congress knows that crime is our No. 1 domestic problem. The fact and fear of crime have been gathering force. Republicans believe that the administration must account to the Nation for its performance in this and previous Congresses.

I believe it is fair to say that insofar as the President's crime message delivered to the Congress yesterday is an indication that he not only is concerned about but also that he finally means to do something about the problem of crime in this country, all Republicans will welcome the message.

Until now I think it is further fair to say that the administration has been content to rely principally upon oration and outrage. The legislative measures that have been proposed have been until now too few, too narrow, and too slow in coming. It is apparent that there has been some change in the climate now and with it hopefully a recognition that what has been offered so far has been inappropriate and inadequate to meet the challenge.

I suggest that it is too early to attempt to make a definitive analysis of the President's proposal. We do not attempt to assume either a negative posture or positive posture with respect to the specific proposals itemized by the President. What we do mean to make plain now is that the sense of urgency conveyed by the entire message cannot help but produce the priority treatment of crime measures which is so urgently needed in the Congress this year. This is all to the good. Whatever the motives behind the President's new posture, the end result will benefit all Americans. By embracing some Republican ideas he has at least laid a predicate for a meaningful dialogue on an issue that troubles every thoughtful American regardless of party.

Those who heard the President's message and who had an opportunity to read it since received. I think it is a Republican message. It contained much of Republican origin and Republican orientation. Of the 22 proposals specifically contained by the President, four have such a Republican orientation. The immediate and lasting impact of the President's message is that the House Committee on the Judiciary has been called upon the Congress to enact legislation previously endorsed by the
Republican task force on crime. I might add it was urgently proposed by the President's own Cabinet several months ago.

Second, as has been indicated already, the legislation which passed the House last month making it possible for the Government to take an appeal on a motion to suppress evidence or confessions was legislation offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Ryan). Again I think it is important to remember that it was the distinguished minority leader who first in the January 1966 Republican state of the Union message suggested that a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice would make a proper shop for the conduct of basic research in new techniques in law enforcement and in prison rehabilitation. The President in his message adopted the essence of that suggestion and then went forward to suggest an expansion of the program currently conducted in this area by the FBI at Quantico.

Finally, and most conspicuously, the President has called now for the adoption of an antiriot bill. Those who have observed the Congress will recall the President's own admission months ago that the enforcement officer of the United States in the time of the original hearings which were held on the antiriot proposal of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Cramer), I wonder if I am not correct in my recollection of the hearings that were held at that time and out of which this bill grew, relating to the interstate activities of the Ku Klux Klan and other organizations of that type, which were rejected over and over again by the various witnesses who appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. PANNELL. In very large measure that is true. And, the author of the amendment, during the course of the debate, was careful to call attention to the fact that it was aimed at such activities; that it had a broad application; it had a worthy application then as it has a worthy application now. And, the starting thing is that the President of the United States has only recently become aware of the merits of such a proposal.

Mr. Speaker, if I may continue for just a moment, we say it might be premature to make an analysis of certain proposals in the President's message, it would be appropriate to take note of some of the comments in the President's message.

Last year the Republican task force on crime proposed a series of bills and endorsed other bills in the general law enforcement area to most of which the President made no reference. I ask unanimous consent that the record be extended to the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in the course of that debate, made it plain at the time, the Attorney General of the United States, the chief law-enforcement officer of the United States, as a member of the President's Cabinet, was opposed to the bill that the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. Cramer) that might be made crystal clear.

On July 19, 1967, in his message to Congress, the President referred to the hearing on the antiriot bill which was made by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of this House (Mr. Cramer) as "a significant contribution to the program of civil liberties and civil rights legislation which will be of great help to the enforcement area to most of which the President made no reference."

Mr. Speaker, this is a precedent. This is a significant contribution to the civil rights legislation which will be of great help to the enforcement area to most of which the President made no reference. I ask unanimous consent that it be extended to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in the course of that debate, made it plain at the time, the Attorney General of the United States, the chief law-enforcement officer of the United States, as a member of the President's Cabinet, was opposed to the bill that the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. Cramer) had made.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday would have been July 18, 1848, 4 days after the first outbreak of the Newark riot, and now, some several months later, for the first time, Oklahoma and New York have followed, the adopting of antiriot legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAPPT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. TAPPT. Mr. Speaker, while I was appearing in the Congress of the United States at the time of the original hearings which were held on the antiriot proposal of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Cramer), I wonder if I am not correct in my recollection of the hearings that were held at that time and out of which this bill grew, relating to the interstate activities of the Ku Klux Klan and other organizations of that type, which were rejected over and over again by the various witnesses who appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. PANNELL. In very large measure that is true. And, the author of the amendment, during the course of the debate, was careful to call attention to the fact that it was aimed at such activities; that it had a broad application; it had a worthy application then as it has a worthy application now. And, the starting thing is that the President of the United States has only recently become aware of the merits of such a proposal.
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Last year the Republican task force on crime proposed a series of bills and endorsed other bills in the general law enforcement area to most of which the President made no reference. I ask unanimous consent that the record be extended to the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in the course of that debate, made it plain at the time, the Attorney General of the United States, the chief law-enforcement officer of the United States, as a member of the President's Cabinet, was opposed to the bill that the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. Cramer) had made.
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Mr. PANNELL. In very large measure that is true. And, the author of the amendment, during the course of the debate, was careful to call attention to the fact that it was aimed at such activities; that it had a broad application; it had a worthy application then as it has a worthy application now. And, the starting thing is that the President of the United States has only recently become aware of the merits of such a proposal.
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For the legislation passed the House this year.

IV. THE COURTS

1. Bail reform—a proposal to re-examine and amend the Bail Reform Act of 1966 to allow the Courts more discretion in granting bail, particularly in cases involving the prevention of crime, methods of and the entire community which deals with the problem of criminal justice in America. The subjects they address include the prevention of crime, methods of apprehension, arrest, interrogation and prosecution of the suspect, and rehabilitation of the convicted criminal.

We suggest that the proposal to in the field agree, and that it be devoted to more serious matters. H.R. 946, proposed by Senator Tydings (O-Md.) and Scott (R-Pa.) is such a bill.

2. The District Anti-Crime bill—also an omnibus anti-crime bill dealing with special law enforcement proposals for the District of Columbia, Mr. Scott passed the House on June 6, 1967.

3. Appropriations and personnel—proposals to increase the authorized strength of the District of Columbia Police Department, to increase the staff of the District Bail Agency and to provide for personnel to supervise the activities of probationers released on personal recognizance prior to trial.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, these bills, we think, enjoyed a large measure of support from every section of Government and the entire community which deals with the problems of criminal justice in America. The subjects they address include the prevention of crime, methods of apprehension, arrest, interrogation and prosecution of the suspect, and rehabilitation of the convicted criminal.

We suggest that the proposal to in the field agree, and that it be devoted to more serious matters. H.R. 946, proposed by Senator Tydings (O-Md.) and Scott (R-Pa.) is such a bill.

Further omissions in the President's message are, I believe, should be underscored. First of all was disappo—of all was disappo—of all was disappo—and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CAVANAUGH], specifically to Republican endorsement of the congressional legislation. Mr. Scott passed the House last year on June 6, 1967. That legislation originally was known as the safe streets bill; it was under the act of the District of Columbia Police Department, to increase the staff of the District Bail Agency and to provide for personnel to supervise the activities of probationers released on personal recognizance prior to trial.
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We suggest that the proposal to in the field agree, and that it be devoted to more serious matters. H.R. 946, proposed by Senator Tydings (O-Md.) and Scott (R-Pa.) is such a bill.

Further omissions in the President's message are, I believe, should be underscored. First of all was disappo—to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POFF], yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], specifically to Republican endorsement of the congressional legislation. Mr. Scott passed the House last year on June 6, 1967. That legislation originally was known as the safe streets bill; it was under the act of the District of Columbia Police Department, to increase the staff of the District Bail Agency and to provide for personnel to supervise the activities of probationers released on personal recognizance prior to trial.

The Republican amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], we believe, made a significant improvement in the bill. We believe that it is important that the president will see fit to land in the courts and the executive branch. We believe that the president will see fit to land in the courts and the executive branch.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, these bills, we think, enjoyed a large measure of support from every section of Government and the entire community which deals with the problems of criminal justice in America. The subjects they address include the prevention of crime, methods of apprehension, arrest, interrogation and prosecution of the suspect, and rehabilitation of the convicted criminal.

We suggest that the proposal to in the field agree, and that it be devoted to more serious matters. H.R. 946, proposed by Senator Tydings (O-Md.) and Scott (R-Pa.) is such a bill.
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that legislation.

Another measure that the President did not mention is the amendment adopted by an overwhelming vote by the House only last week while the House was debating the truth-in-lending bill.

That amendment, as you will recall, was almost as orgainz ed crime involvement in the nefarious practice of loan sharking.

I am hopeful that the President's fail-ure to mention it is an omission that will be corrected when the Senate debates the truth-in-lending bill.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I would like to bring to the attention of the House that it was through the efforts of the gentleman in the well that the amendment which makes loan sharking a Federal crime was added to the truth-in-lending bill. I think that this was an activity for the great benefit of the United States, that the gentleman in the well perfected this amendment to make loan sharking a Federal crime, and secured its attachment to the truth-in-lending bill.

I am interested to note that the Presi-dent in his message said:

Organized crime is big business in America. I think this is something that Republi-cans in this House and the Republican task force on crime have been saying loudly and clearly for some time. We want to see some new action against organized crime, if the Presi-dent's message means what we all hope it does, because in the final analysis, this cannot be fought with words. It has to be fought with leadership of the highest order, it has to be fought with determination, and it has to be fought by means of political system, by all parts of our Government.

I know the Republican task force on crime will indicate its efforts and its best to continue the battle we have now been fighting for a year, in cooperation with the President if possible, but, regardless of partisanship and regard-less of the possibilities of cooperation, at least to the fullest extent of our capa-bilities.

Mr. Speaker, again I commend the gentleman in the well for the remarkable contributions he has made, for his dif-ficulties, for his thoughtfulness, and for the leadership he has given to our task force on crime.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I know all on the task force agree with the gentleman when he says that the gentleman brings a great reservoir of talent to our efforts.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I saw some correspondence about the rising crime, and the rising rate of crime, and the rising cost of crime, and I am happy to see that the President is sounding the alarm and picking up the cry against crime.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the gentleman from New York is a member of the President's task force on crime. He has only one task force now.

Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the man's contributions to the fight against crime.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, today a clergyman from St. Paul, Minn., visited me in my office. He is one of a number of Minnesota clergymen who has made a continual effort to do the work against the growing incidence of juvenile delinquency both in his city and in the State of Minnesota.

He commented to me on my appearance to the House last Friday night at Macalester College in St. Paul while the Speaker at a meeting of clergy and laymen concerned about juvenile delinquency.

I gave him a copy of the President's message of yesterday. He sat in my office while we were debating the bill recommended by the administration, that would give the Federal Government the power to fight against juvenile delinquency.

I believe the President made a speech Saturday night at the Capitol in Minnesota, saying, "I am interested to note that the President's message means what we all hope it does, because in the final analysis, this cannot be fought with words. It has to be fought with leadership of the highest order, it has to be fought with determination, and it has to be fought by means of political system, by all parts of our Government.

I know the Republican task force on crime will indicate its efforts and its best to continue the battle we have now been fighting for a year, in cooperation with the President if possible, but, regardless of partisanship and regardless of the possibilities of cooperation, at least to the fullest extent of our capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, again I commend the gentleman in the well for the remarkable contributions he has made, for his difficulties, for his thoughtfulness, and for the leadership he has given to our task force on crime.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I know all on the task force agree with the gentleman when he says that the gentleman brings a great reservoir of talent to our efforts.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I saw some correspondence about the rising crime, and the rising rate of crime, and the rising cost of crime, and I am happy to see that the President is sounding the alarm and picking up the cry against crime.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the gentleman from New York is a member of the President's task force on crime. He has only one task force now.

Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the man's contributions to the fight against crime.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, today a clergyman from St. Paul, Minn., visited me in my office. He is one of a number of Minnesota clergymen who has made a continual effort to do the work against the growing incidence of juvenile delinquency both in his city and in the State of Minnesota.

He commented to me on my appearance to the House last Friday night at Macalester College in St. Paul while the Speaker at a meeting of clergy and laymen concerned about juvenile delinquency.

I gave him a copy of the President's message of yesterday. He sat in my office while we were debating the bill recommended by the administration, that would give the Federal Government the power to fight against juvenile delinquency.

I believe the President made a speech Saturday night at the Capitol in Minnesota, saying, "I am interested to note that the President's message means what we all hope it does, because in the final analysis, this cannot be fought with words. It has to be fought with leadership of the highest order, it has to be fought with determination, and it has to be fought by means of political system, by all parts of our Government.

I know the Republican task force on crime will indicate its efforts and its best to continue the battle we have now been fighting for a year, in cooperation with the President if possible, but, regardless of partisanship and regardless of the possibilities of cooperation, at least to the fullest extent of our capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, again I commend the gentleman in the well for the remarkable contributions he has made, for his difficulties, for his thoughtfulness, and for the leadership he has given to our task force on crime.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I know all on the task force agree with the gentleman when he says that the gentleman brings a great reservoir of talent to our efforts.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I saw some correspondence about the rising crime, and the rising rate of crime, and the rising cost of crime, and I am happy to see that the President is sounding the alarm and picking up the cry against crime.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the gentleman from New York is a member of the President's task force on crime. He has only one task force now.

Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the man's contributions to the fight against crime.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.
Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman. Before I conclude I should like to say that the Title in the President’s message which disappointed me most was his insinuation once again upon the wiretap bill which he first proposed. As the Members of this body will recall, the President would permit wiretaps for the gathering of evidence only in national security cases, and he would decide or allow the appropriate authorities of the Executive establishment to decide when the national security was involved and what constituted national security cases.

The wiretap bill which the task force has endorsed, which has been introduced by Mr. Rhodes of Arizona, Mr. Speaker, would decide the President’s Johnson’s support in what we hope will be an all-out effort to combat and control crime. The need for such an effort has been carefully documented. Each day brings new statistics that show a skyrocketing rise in crime. Each day brings fresh evidence that something must be done to reverse the alarming trend toward lawlessness.

One of the primary duties of Government is to establish and maintain law and order. Our very survival as a free and effective society depends upon how successfully we are able to implement this basic concept.

In the first session of the 90th Congress, Republicans sponsored and supported legislation that must be enacted if we are to win the battle against crime. A bill that would establish a Federal program to provide assistance to local law enforcement agencies was passed by the House with the overwhelming support of the Republican Members. Similarly, a Republican-sponsored bill that would impose criminal penalties upon persons traveling in, or using the facilities of, Interstate commerce with the intent to incite a riot, was also passed by the House.

Unfortunately, this essential legislation was not adopted by the Senate during the first session. We are hopeful that, with the new-found interest and support of the President, this legislation can be enacted into law without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record at this point the House Republican policy committee statement of July 12, 1967, and August 2, 1967, that deal with this important legislation. As chairman of the policy committee, I believe that these statements carefully set forth the need for this legislation and the reasons we should enact it.

The statement referred to follows:

HE HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON THE ANTI-ROBBERY ACT

Mr. SMITH. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I must agree with the gentleman in the President bringing himself to veto that kind of legislation when he reaffirmed again the statement he made last year, in his message about crime this year, in which he said:

"Public order is the first business of Government."

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman and my colleagues for their patience. Mr. RODGERS of Arizona, Mr. Speaker, we welcome President Johnson’s support in what we hope will be an all-out effort to combat and control crime. The need for such an effort has been carefully documented. Each day brings new statistics that show a skyrocketing rise in crime. Each day brings fresh evidence that something must be done to reverse the alarming trend toward lawlessness.

One of the primary duties of Government is to establish and maintain law and order. Our very survival as a free and effective society depends upon how successfully we are able to implement this basic concept.
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Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman and my colleagues for their patience. Mr. RODGERS of Arizona, Mr. Speaker, we welcome President Johnson’s support in what we hope will be an all-out effort to combat and control crime. The need for such an effort has been carefully documented. Each day brings new statistics that show a skyrocketing rise in crime. Each day brings fresh evidence that something must be done to reverse the alarming trend toward lawlessness.

One of the primary duties of Government is to establish and maintain law and order. Our very survival as a free and effective society depends upon how successfully we are able to implement this basic concept.
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Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman and my colleagues for their patience. Mr. RODGERS of Arizona, Mr. Speaker, we welcome President Johnson’s support in what we hope will be an all-out effort to combat and control crime. The need for such an effort has been carefully documented. Each day brings new statistics that show a skyrocketing rise in crime. Each day brings fresh evidence that something must be done to reverse the alarming trend toward lawlessness.

One of the primary duties of Government is to establish and maintain law and order. Our very survival as a free and effective society depends upon how successfully we are able to implement this basic concept.

In the first session of the 90th Congress, Republicans sponsored and supported legislation that must be enacted if we are to win the battle against crime. A bill that would establish a Federal program to provide assistance to local law enforcement agencies was passed by the House with the overwhelming support of the Republican Members. Similarly, a Republican-sponsored bill that would impose criminal penalties upon persons traveling in, or using the facilities of, Interstate commerce with the intent to incite a riot, was also passed by the House.

Unfortunately, this essential legislation was not adopted by the Senate during the first session. We are hopeful that, with the new-found interest and support of the President, this legislation can be enacted into law without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record at this point the House Republican policy committee statement of July 12, 1967, and August 2, 1967, that deal with this important legislation. As chairman of the policy committee, I believe that these statements carefully set forth the need for this legislation and the reasons we should enact it.

The statement referred to follows:

HE HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON THE ANTI-ROBBERY ACT

Mr. SMITH. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I must agree with the gentleman in the President bringing himself to veto that kind of legislation when he reaffirmed again the statement he made last year, in his message about crime this year, in which he said:

"Public order is the first business of Government."

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman and my colleagues for their patience. Mr. RODGERS of Arizona, Mr. Speaker, we welcome President Johnson’s support in what we hope will be an all-out effort to combat and control crime. The need for such an effort has been carefully documented. Each day brings new statistics that show a skyrocketing rise in crime. Each day brings fresh evidence that something must be done to reverse the alarming trend toward lawlessness.

One of the primary duties of Government is to establish and maintain law and order. Our very survival as a free and effective society depends upon how successfully we are able to implement this basic concept.

In the first session of the 90th Congress, Republicans sponsored and supported legislation that must be enacted if we are to win the battle against crime. A bill that would establish a Federal program to provide assistance to local law enforcement agencies was passed by the House with the overwhelming support of the Republican Members. Similarly, a Republican-sponsored bill that would impose criminal penalties upon persons traveling in, or using the facilities of, Interstate commerce with the intent to incite a riot, was also passed by the House.

Unfortunately, this essential legislation was not adopted by the Senate during the first session. We are hopeful that, with the new-found interest and support of the President, this legislation can be enacted into law without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record at this point the House Republican policy committee statement of July 12, 1967, and August 2, 1967, that deal with this important legislation. As chairman of the policy committee, I believe that these statements carefully set forth the need for this legislation and the reasons we should enact it.
that must be dealt with by state and local governments. If the Attorney General has stated, "We would hope to have all the States really working for a fully comprehensive plan for the States," any provision or measure that would upset or reverse this historic effort must be avoided. The recent riots have reemphasized the basic fact that the States and their designated agencies must have the primary responsibilitiy for coordinating Federal activities that would upset or reverse this historic effort.

Certainly, the primary responsibility for coordinating Federal activities with state activities creates serious financial and administrative problems. In a letter dated June 8, 1967, the Governor's Conference noted that the State of Ohio, after four years of attempting to establish the coordinating machinery needed for intergovernmental assistance programs, "It was then suggested that the States be advised so that a State has a plan for an appropriately balanced distribution of aid to local law enforcement activities, the Attorney General should have the primary responsibility for pointing out to the State agency designated by the Governor to administer such plan. On July 19, 1967, Governor Hebert A. Rebozo also urged the adoption of an amendment that would "assure that the States can effectively coordinate their efforts with the national programs." Governor Rockefeller pointed out, "Interstate crime control conferences established by 82, 907, is to be effective. The President has said, "I see no reason why the primary role of the State, especially in developing a state-wide comprehensive plan."

We support an amendment of this type. We believe it will provide essential state-coordination and eliminate the Federal Government's power to dominate and control local law enforcement. We reject the Democratic Majority's contention that the Attorney General should have the maximum discretion in promulgating regulations and eliminating the Federal Government to appeal the prohibition on gambling as a Federal activity. If imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, the Republicans modestly accept the role of pawnsmakers for the President administration. But we are not "be- pulled" nor will the American public be deceived.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is "interesting that in this election year of 1968 the President has suddenly "wished to the nation a gift of crime. It is easy for him to share the blame for this "gracious gift."

By imposing that it is not made a "partisan issue in the forthcoming election."

His wish is understandable! But the existence of crime in this country is not, because anyone makes it an issue. But because the serious, growing, rise of crime in this land has struck fear and frustration into the hearts of the good men and women of this Nation.

It is an issue because the present administration has failed to comprehend and cope with it. It is an issue and a culpability the administration cannot escape or share.

The people of this county know who was making the racket when the shop of state ran against on this nifty hook.

The President's election year message was a serry excuse for the dangerous course he has been setting throughout his administra tion. Every statistic is an indication of the public's will to see it once the President did not make it an issue of his concern. But because the senseless, spiraling, rise of crime in this land has struck fear and frustration into the hearts of the good men and women of this Nation. But we are not eager to have the Federal Government to appeal the prohibition on gambling as a Federal activity. If imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, the Republicans modestly accept the role of pawnsmakers for the President administration. But we are not "be-pulled" nor will the American public be deceived.
Poff Calls Recent Court Decision Mandate for Congressional Action on Eavesdropping

Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. Speaker, our Republican task force on crime is deeply concerned with the problems involved in electronic surveillance. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a January 16 press statement of the task force, entitled "Poff Calls Recent Court Decision Mandate for Congressional Action on Eavesdropping":

Poff Calls Recent Court Decision Mandate for Congressional Action on Eavesdropping

Rep. Richard H. Poff (R-Va.), Chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Crime today told his colleagues that a Supreme Court decision handed down during the recess was a "mandate for Congressional action" in the area of electronic eavesdropping.

In a speech on the House floor, Poff called attention to the case of Katz v. United States decided on December 18. In that case the Court struck down the conviction of a west coast bookmaker because government agents who were investigating him did not obtain a search warrant before installing a listening device outside a telephone booth from which he was making gambling calls. At the time the investigation was being carried on, the Fourth Amendment had been thought not to prohibit the use of listening devices where no trespass or physical intrusion was involved in their installation.

Poff pointed out, first, that the Katz opinion, like that of the Warren Court, "lays to rest for all time Constitutional doubts concerning Court supervised electronic surveillance." He further observed that since "it is beyond dispute that a warrant system precisely as is created in the McCulloch-Ford bill, of which he and the entire Crime Task Force are sponsors, "will survive any test" along Constitutional lines.

"At the same time, however," he continued, "Poff calls for another direction." "Whether right or wrong," Poff explained, "the Court has extended the reach of the Fourth Amendment far beyond the pale of anything previously held." "As of this date, Katz represents yet another restriction on legitimate law enforcement."

Poff noted that he was "not displeased" with the Katz decision as long as "it is recognized for what it is." He welcomed it as a mandate for legislation but, he said, "If Congress does not respond to the mandate, then law enforcement will suffer, again," and more important, he continued, "it will suffer at our hands, not those of the Court."

"The ball has been thrown to us," he concluded, "we cannot drop it."
SUMMARY OF THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON CRIME

Mr. GERALD R. POFF, Majority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives, presented the following statement:

Dear Colleagues:

I believe my colleagues will be interested in some of the work which the House Republican task force on crime has done since it was established earlier this session under the able chairmanship of Rep. Virginia (R-Va.), Chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Crime, the sincere appreciation I feel for the fine work you and all Task Force members have done this year.

I have just had an opportunity to review the major Task Force reports on crime and the Administration in 1968. The following is an exchange of correspondence and two recent statements of the House Republican Task Force on Crime, summarizing legislative action taken in the 1st Session, 90th Congress.

The following letter was sent to Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Crime, U.S. House of Representatives:

Dear Mr. Poff:

I am truly yours,

[Signature]

The following letter was sent to Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives:

Dear Speaker:

[Signature]

The following exchange of correspondence follows an exchange of correspondence and two recent statements of the House Republican Task Force on Crime, summarizing legislative action taken in the 1st Session, 90th Congress.

I am, truly yours,

[Signature]
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Chairman, indicated that the first part of the program would deal with "loan-sharking" and that the legislation would be "introduced hopefully in a day or so."

Gambling, narcotics trafficking, and loan-sharking were described as activities that are "absolutely essential to the survival of the illegal dollar" in the American public that is being drained today into the pockets of racketeers.

The President's Crime Commission indicated that the national Anti-Racketeering Program aimed at illegal dollar abuse would be largely legislative in approach. Last week the OGP Crime Group announced plans for a legislative program directed at gambling, narcotics trafficking and loan-sharking. "The three major money-generating crimes," whose "take" they estimated as "not less than two billion dollars a year.

Calling "loan-sharking," the lending of money at illegal rates of interest, a "source of racketeers' second largest source of revenue after narcotics," the Crime Group was told by the President's Crime Commission that loan-sharking in the major metropolitan centers of the nation is still illegal. "The states of the nation are virtually lacking in any enforcement capability of loan-sharking laws."

In light of these realistic estimates, it seems fair to place the "take" of these three illegal activities at nothing less than two billion dollars a year or fifty dollars for every man, woman and child in America. This is approximately one half of the entire outlay of the war effort, a figure which suggests that the various states of the federal budget deficit of $6.5 billion for the same year, and half of the $6.5 billion the President originally said his 10% surcharge on income would bring in. In light of the estimates the Crime Commission's finding that "if organized crime paid income tax on every one of these vast earnings everybody's tax bill would go down..." We do not suggest that all the money that is thus being poured into the coffers of organized crime could be or even should be "recaptured at the point of production"—in the words of the Commission—"or captured at the point of distribution."

It is our purpose in citing these figures to dramatize the staggering sums that are being skimmed from the American public at the very time when it is being asked to make sacrifices in order to combat inflation, cut the budget deficit, and pay for the increased cost of living.

The organized criminals of today are generally not the rootless individuals of a decade ago, although certainly they principally feed upon the cash in the pockets of the legitimate American citizen. Their activities today are a part of the national economy. They are drawn from the ranks of the wealthy and affluent. These are the men who own or control the great enterprises of industry, of commerce and of public administration. They are the men who love for ourselves, the people who employ our labor, the men who are employed in the public eye by our nation's policies and our administration. They are the men who command the wealth of the nation.

This Task Force remains committed to the position that the development of legislation permitting semi-supervised electronic searching would constitute the single most significant legislative step that could be taken to stem the drain of the illegal dollar from the American public and to effectuate the very purpose of the Executive Branch in discharging its responsibility for enforcing these laws.

[In a joint release of the Republican Task Force on Crime, Dec. 11, 1963]...


"Having the benefits that will result from the new law is increased jurisdiction for law-enforcement officials, defeating the crime syndicate by controlling the money flow."

As has been pointed out, a number of states have laws against loan-sharking and have actually enforced them, but in most cases these laws are complicated and difficult to enforce. The anti-crime proposals introduced by Rep. Richard W. Pett of the Task Force Chairman, Rep. George W. Mahoney and Rep. George J. Eastham, Jr. before the House Judiciary Committee, and Rep. James H. Oberstar before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

"Having the benefits that will result from the new law is increased jurisdiction for law-enforcement officials, defeating the crime syndicate by controlling the money flow."

According to the President's Crime Commission report, "loan-sharking" is the lending of money at illegal rates of interest. The annual "take" of the crime syndicate from loan-sharking is estimated at 20 cents for every dollar loaned. Loan-sharking has been eliminated in many states where bank regulations and state usury laws have been enforced.
REPORTS OF THE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON CRIME

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Americans everywhere are becoming increasingly concerned with the growing crime problem. The Republican House crime task force has released new state after state with the same refrain: "We have within our own communities a crime situation that is the worst in the nation where the federal government has the loi;n to it and is doing nothing about it." This month which deserves the attention of all of us.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement on "Crime in the District of Columbia," issued with a press release of November 12, entitled "GOP Task Force Charges Administration Failure in D.C. Crime Fight." On November 11 the press release was entitled "Crime Rate "National Disgrace.""

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1967
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THE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON CRIME has released a statement on the crime situation in the District of Columbia, issuing the following statement on the situation:

"The GOP Task Force also called for reform of the Bail Reform Act, citing the "no-show" rule among criminal defendants which has jumped alarmingly since it has been implemented as have the numbers of those who have been released under it. They suggested altering the court's discretion in denying or setting conditions of release for those who are a danger to the community and in revoking or cancelling the release of those who continue to commit criminal acts while free."

"They further called the District Bail Reform Act "anemic" and recommended the establishment of "some machinery to supervise the activities of released defendants." "If some money and manpower are needed, it is up to the Executive Branch to advise the Congress where and how much." "So far we have heard nothing," they said.

Crime on the District of Columbia

There is a distinctly hollow ring to President Johnson's latest statements about fighting crime. Congress has failed in its own responsibility for insuring safe streets elsewhere. The only crime legislation passed this year to date has been patchwork legislation bearing no relationship to the present crime situation.

"The President might well be concerned over crime in Washington and the fact that the situation here is close to the worst in the nation. But his recent assertions come a little late in the game. We are concerned that they are nothing more than the President's way of doing an end run around this Administration's rejection of this partial solution to the crime situation."

"For one thing, it is now a year to the day since the President voiced the District of Columbia anti-crime bill which had been passed overwhelmingly by the 89th Congress and that he has vetoed "precious little" in it as of yet. In the meantime, crime in the District is up more than one and one-half years ago.

The Task Force also took note of the President's latest "get-tough" statements about crime in Washington and said they "come a little late in the game." "We are concerned that they are nothing more than the President's way of doing an end run around this Administration's rejection of this partial solution to the crime situation."

"For one thing, it is now a year to the day since the President vowed the District of Columbia anti-crime bill which had been passed overwhelmingly by the 89th Congress and that he has vetoed "precious little" in it as of yet. In the meantime, crime in the District is up more than one and one-half years ago.

The GOP Task Force charges Administration failure in D.C. Crime Fight. On November 11 the press release was entitled "Crime Rate 'National Disgrace.'" And the statement is on: 'The Federal Magistrates Act - § 566.'"
The record of the Administration is equally ignominious when it comes to filling existing vacancies in law enforcement personnel. The President spoke about doubling the size of the Police Department, yet it is an established fact that more than three hundred vacancies exist in positions already open. More alarming is the situation in the United States Marshal Service. There are other court vacancies that remain unfilled for months because almost 30 per cent of their positions are unfilled. This delay in service results in the denial of habeas corpus. The record of the District of Columbia, which is considered to be the model as far as the administration of justice is concerned, shows that the marshals have six days to serve the warrant. If the marshal fails to serve it within that period, the defendant will have to be held in jail, which is tantamount to forfeiting his liberty.

In summary, the House Republican Task Force believes that the record of the Administration in dealing with the nationwide problem of crime is pitiful. This failure to fill the vacancies is a product of the Administration's own doing. We see no evidence that the President will do anything about it. Nothing demonstrates this more clearly than the response of the Administration to the report of the House Republican Task Force. The legislation that we introduced is a step in the right direction. It must be passed with the understanding that the President will sign it.

The GOPE Crime Group noted that the nation's spiraling crime rate is a "disgrace," and blamed part of the problem on the failure "to dispense swift, sure justice." Any bill which tends to speed up the process of criminal justice takes on "special significance," the report stated. The House Republican Task Force also declared that the "ending of the delays in the Criminal Justice System could be the single greatest contribution which our country could make to the peace and security of our time."

The House Republican Task Force on Crime believes that the "ending of the delays in the Criminal Justice System could be the single greatest contribution which our country could make to the peace and security of our time." In this regard, it is significant to note that the Administration has failed to take any steps to address the problem of crime. The House Republican Task Force has introduced legislation to deal with the problem of crime, and it has been met with a lack of action by the Administration.

The GOPE Crime Group noted that the nation's spiraling crime rate is a "disgrace," and blamed part of the problem on the failure "to dispense swift, sure justice." Any bill which tends to speed up the process of criminal justice takes on "special significance," the report stated. The House Republican Task Force also declared that the "ending of the delays in the Criminal Justice System could be the single greatest contribution which our country could make to the peace and security of our time." In this regard, it is significant to note that the Administration has failed to take any steps to address the problem of crime. The House Republican Task Force has introduced legislation to deal with the problem of crime, and it has been met with a lack of action by the Administration.
Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing additional to add to the remarks I made on September 27, 1967, regarding their statement. The Task Force credited Notre Dame Law School's Blakey as Negative, and we predict that Republicans and Democrats alike, in both Houses of Congress, will unite to specify stringent legislation which is eminently and necessarily necessary.
Rep. Richard H. Poff (R-Va.) and Rep. Barber B. Conable (R-N.Y.) Tuesday called it "incredible" that the Attorney General continues to stymie the fight against organized crime.

Chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Crime, claimed the Judicial Conference's support for legislation authorizing courts-approved electronic surveillance in the investigation of organized crime by federal and state law enforcement officers "should dispel any uncertainty about the consequence and effect of the Supreme Court decision in the Berger case. He checked off "the overwhelming support--the Association of Federal Investigators, the National Association of Attorneys General, the National Association of District Attorneys Association, a majority of the President's own Commission on Crime, and the three previous Attorneys General of the United States," faced with overwhelming support from the chief law enforcement authorities in the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial branches of the Federal government, Poff stated. "It is difficult to understand how Attorney General Ramsey Clark can persist in the posture he has assumed."

"It is one thing to be firm and steadfast, it is another to be negative and obstinate," Poff charged.

Rep. Conable, Task Force member, exclaimed, "The federal government should have a major role in fighting organized crime, and the Attorney General should be the leader, marshalling our forces to do battle." Conable noted that "sophisticated and hardened criminals cannot be controlled without sophisticated weapons" and the legal use of court-approved electronic surveillance by federal and state law enforcement officers in the investigation of organized crime could be one of those weapons.
CRIME FIGHTERS JOIN PUSH FOR WIRETAP ACT

WASHINGTON, D.C.—An organization of over 1,000 Federal career employees, all active in law enforcement, today filed with the Johnson Administration the request of Mr. McEWEN was granted per­

Mr. R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement read to me in September 21, 1967. by the Republican task force on crime entitled "Washington Post on wiretapping," and a statement of September 19 which was part of a roll call entitled "Take Wraps Off Organized Crime Data."

WASHINGTON, D.C.—An organization of over 1,000 Federal career employees, all active in law enforcement, today filed with the Johnson Administration the request of Mr. McEWEN was granted per­

Mr. R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement read to a congressional record at the request of the Republican task force on crime entitled "Washington Post on wiretapping," and a statement of September 19 which was part of a roll call entitled "Take Wraps Off Organized Crime Data."

WASHINGTON, D.C.—An organization of over 1,000 Federal career employees, all active in law enforcement, today filed with the Johnson Administration the request of Mr. McEWEN was granted per­

Mr. R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement read to a congressional record at the request of the Republican task force on crime entitled "Washington Post on wiretapping," and a statement of September 19 which was part of a roll call entitled "Take Wraps Off Organized Crime Data."
Magazine, for example, has recently concluded a series of articles which spectacularly demonstrates the menace of organized crime; the material for these, in substantial part, could not have been obtained other than by electronic surveillance.

It is a matter of record where some of the electronic coverage was. It is a matter of record that the tape recordings, log entries and internal communications concerning that coverage still exist. It is a matter of record that the tape recordings, log entries and internal communications concerning that coverage still exist. In the past this Task Force has proposed the creation of a bipartisan Joint Congressional Committee on Organized Crime. We here reiterate the proposal and call upon the Congress to act with great dispatch in this regard. We suggest, moreover, that the first act of the Joint Committee be to call for Justice Department materials concerning their electronic surveillance of organized crime.

Quite incidentally, inspection of these materials will doubtless serve to end another controversy—that concerning the effectiveness of lawful electronic surveillance. This Task Force is on the side of those who believe that under appropriate court supervision and sanction, it can do both that and that. It is a matter of record that the materials exist; it is a matter of record that the tape recordings, log entries and internal communications concerning that coverage still exist. In the past this Task Force has re-
Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement by Representative ROBERT TAFT Jr., entitled "TAFT CHALLENGES JUSTICE DEPARTMENT ON STATISTICS," and a release of September 13, 1967, by the Republican task force on crime on the same subject.

I also include a release of September 12 entitled, "Articles Dramatic Need for Wireless Law Representative Porn," and one of August 28 on "Rules Ham Striking Agents, Says Crime Task Force," which is accompanied by a statement of the House Republican task force on crime.

The material follows:

TAFT CHALLENGES JUSTICE DEPARTMENT ON STATISTICS

"WASHINGTON, D.C.-Representative Robert Taft Jr. (R-Ohio) Wednesday challenged the Justice Department's statistics which it called "statistical justification" of the "War on Crime" in response to attacks on its handling of recent OGP crime statistics. Taft stated: "Since the Justice Department cited the numbers of their convictions as a measure of their success in fighting Organized Crime, I suggest that additional figures serve comment."

"The President's Crime Commission called 'Cosa Nostra' the core of Organized Crime and one of the authors of the recent attack on 23 Republican moderates on the Johnson Administration. Taft reminded the Justice Department that in the seven years since 1954--a period of official investigations--15,000,000 people have been convicted of organizing crime.

"In addition, the figures Taft specified for the year 1961 only about 120 identified 'Cosa Nostra' members have been convicted by the Federal government. That amounts to roughly 0.8% of 'Cosa Nostra' membership for the entire seven-year period--a conviction rate of 0.8% per year. That conviction rate was less than 0.5% the year before."

"The most dramatic and typical issue is the recent FBI report of convictions for racketeering. This report of convictions reflects the sum total of the efforts of 26 Federal investigative agencies dealing with both organized crime and other forms of crime. The FBI,. Bureau of Investigation, the Internal Revenue Service, the Treasury Department, the Treasury, the Air Force, the Coast Guard, the Customs Service, the Post Office, and, of course, the Organized Crime section of the Department of Justice itself."

"Taft labeled a number of questions asked by Mr. Christopher and the Justice Department as 'unanswerable.' He further said FBI-investigated organized crime convictions have fallen since the previous year. Taft pointed out that convic­tions rose 39% in 1960 and 40% in 1959 while convictions for organized crime have fallen slightly since then. Taft also pointed out that FBI and organized crime convictions are directly related to the membership of the organized crime group. Since organized crime groups have continued to exist, the conviction rate is more or less constant."

"The Justice Department's figures are among those contained in the annual Life Magazine detail the dominance over the underworld of those remaining free. And the 130 convictions represent the sum total of the efforts of 26 Federal investigative agencies, 94 United States Attorney's Offices and, of course, the Organized Crime Section of the Justice Department."

"Criticism of the Organized Crime Section of the Justice Department is not inclined. The section should not be divorced from the Justice Department. Any suggestion that it be, is basically one of uncovering evidence. It is extremely difficult to prosecute. The problem goes beyond the Federal government. To the credit of the Organized Crime Commission, it served as a direct retort. It evades questions, quotes meaningless statistics, poses partiality, and leaves credit where none is due."

"The President's Crime Commission cited the conviction rate of 0.6% as a valuable statistic. Taft said it is substantially lower than the conviction rate of organized crime groups. Taft stated: "The Justice Department's figures serve a direct retort. It evades questions, quotes meaningless statistics, poses partiality, and leaves credit where none is due."

"And the 130 convictions represent the sum total of the efforts of 26 Federal investigative agencies, 94 United States Attorney's Offices and, of course, the Organized Crime Section of the Justice Department."

"The criticism of the Organized Crime Section of the Justice Department is not inclined. The section should not be divorced from the Justice Department. Any suggestion that it be, is basically one of uncovering evidence. It is extremely difficult to prosecute. The problem goes beyond the Federal government."

"Taft pointed out that the conviction rate of 0.6% as a valuable statistic. Taft said it is substantially lower than the conviction rate of organized crime groups. Taft stated: "The Justice Department's figures serve a direct retort. It evades questions, quotes meaningless statistics, poses partiality, and leaves credit where none is due."

"And the 130 convictions represent the sum total of the efforts of 26 Federal investigative agencies, 94 United States Attorney's Offices and, of course, the Organized Crime Section of the Justice Department."

"The most dramatic and typical issue is the recent FBI report of convictions for racketeering. This report of convictions reflects the sum total of the efforts of 26 Federal investigative agencies dealing with both organized crime and other forms of crime. The FBI, Bureau of Investigation, the Internal Revenue Service, the Treasury Department, the Treasury, the Air Force, the Coast Guard, the Customs Service, the Post Office, and, of course, the Organized Crime section of the Department of Justice itself."

"The Justice Department's figures are among those contained in the annual Life Magazine detail the dominance over the underworld of those remaining free. And the 130 convictions represent the sum total of the efforts of 26 Federal investigative agencies, 94 United States Attorney's Offices and, of course, the Organized Crime Section of the Justice Department."

With respect to the Administration's statistical justification of the war on Organized Crime, we must note that it is carefully confined to FBI-investigated convictions. It makes no mention of what the subjects of investigation are to be. The FBI-investigated convictions cited by the Justice Department were those that had been sponsored in this session of Congress, and any others that had been sponsored in this session of Congress, and any other session, and were among recommendations of the President Crime Commission.
The House Republican Task Force on Crime believes that it is a necessary and proper function of the Attorney General and the Department of Justice to operate within the framework of existing law in conducting its investigations into and prosecution of criminal matters, if it is organized crime or any other type of crime. By this general authorization, when such crimes are established by evidence and evidence traceable thereto, the Attorney General or the Department is authorized to proceed with trial and its actions are not subject to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In the face of legitimate security and anti-security threats, the Attorneys General of the United States have shown a willingness to expand their investigative powers beyond what is sometimes considered normal boundaries. In recent years, the Justice Department has undertaken sweeping initiatives to combat organized crime, including the use of electronic surveillance, wiretapping, and other investigative tools.

The House Republican Task Force on Crime believes that the Attorney General and the Department of Justice should be able to conduct investigations in a manner that is consistent with the law and the Constitution. The Task Force believes that the Attorney General and the Department of Justice should have the authority to conduct investigations in a manner that is consistent with the law and the Constitution, provided that such actions are justified by the facts and circumstances of the case.

The Task Force also believes that the Attorney General and the Department of Justice should be subject to review by the Congress and the courts to ensure that their actions are consistent with the law and the Constitution. The Task Force believes that the Attorney General and the Department of Justice should be subject to review by the Congress and the courts to ensure that their actions are consistent with the law and the Constitution.

The Task Force further believes that the Attorney General and the Department of Justice should be able to conduct investigations in a manner that is consistent with the law and the Constitution, provided that such actions are justified by the facts and circumstances of the case. The Task Force believes that the Attorney General and the Department of Justice should be subject to review by the Congress and the courts to ensure that their actions are consistent with the law and the Constitution.
The violence and lawlessness so prevalent in America today must be halted. All our civil rights and freedoms become meaningless without effective police protection backed by citizen cooperation, an atmosphere of safety and security on our streets, order in our cities and throughout the land.

With passage by the Congress of the "Law Enforcement Assistance and Criminal Justice Act of 1968" we finally are moving toward restoration of law and order in America.

This legislation points up how determined Congress is to deal with lawlessness in our Nation.

As proposed by the Administration last year, this legislation started out simply as a program of Federal grants to improve local law enforcement.

The House of Representatives last August adopted amendments emphasizing control of organized crime and riots and shifting responsibility for administration of the program from the U.S. Department of Justice to the states.

The Senate recently expanded and toughened the measure. House supporters of a strong anti-crime bill--I among them--were happy to accept the Senate bill.

So the final version of the Law Enforcement Assistance and Criminal Justice Act of 1968 which I voted for and which was sent to the President provided for an increase in grants to $100 million the first year and $300 million the second year to aid state and local law enforcement; modification of recent Supreme Court rulings which limited the use of identification procedures and confessions in tracking down and convicting criminal suspects; authority for Federal, State and local law enforcement agencies to use wiretapping and electronic surveillance devices to fight crime but only with the sanction and supervision of the courts; and a ban on mail order sale of hand guns and on the sale of such guns to minors and out-of-state residents.

If the ban on mail order sale of hand guns is inadequate, then Congress should immediately look affirmatively at proposals for additional gun controls.
But it should be remembered that California has a tough gun control law and that the gun used to assassinate Sen. Robert F. Kennedy was passed along to the alleged assassin after an original under-the-counter sale.

There now is a revulsion against violence in this country stemming from the assassination of Sen. Kennedy. It may be that this swelling of popular feeling against violence spells the beginning of the end of the kind of violence we have been experiencing in this country. It would be helpful and it may well follow that all law-abiding Americans now will condemn the use of violence to attain any political, economic or social objective. This would, in effect, "ostracize" the practitioners of violence and could prove highly effective in discouraging the use of violence.

It is also helpful that the U.S. Supreme Court has upheld the right of police to "frisk" suspicious persons for dangerous weapons. This is the first time the Court has held that police can detain and search such persons without the "probable cause" mentioned in the Constitution's Fourth Amendment. I heartily applaud the Court's decision. It is vitally important when you consider that 355 law enforcement officers were killed on duty from 1960 through 1966, and that there were 23,851 assaults on police officers in 1966 nationwide.

So we now have "a lot going for us" in our determination to reverse the crime rate that has climbed 88 per cent in the last seven years--the Omnibus Crime Control Act, a strong measure fitting the times; the Supreme Court ruling upholding the right of police to stop and "frisk" suspicious persons; and the strong upsurge of popular sentiment against violence of any kind.

I believe we now will see a crackdown on crime and, ultimately, the restoration of law and order in America.

#$#$
STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN:

In 1976, it will be 200 years that this good land became a new nation. It began with but three million people. Today it exceeds 200 million. The basic law under which it was launched as a Republic not only created a structure of government but also recited the purposes for which the Constitution was ordained. Among those purposes was the establishment of justice and the insurance of domestic tranquillity.

Save for the long civil strife more than a century ago, the refinement and expansion of justice has gone forward and domestic tranquillity has been preserved.

During most of those two centuries authority has been respected, the laws have been generally obeyed and enforced, human life has been protected and safeguarded, a feeling of security has prevailed, and the right of private property has been upheld. Ours has been a good history.

But, in our time, something has happened.

Authority is challenged. The burning of draft cards, the seizure of school administration offices, the riotous rupture of peace in the cities -- all are challenges to authority.

The law has been flouted. Riots in cities large and small, the ghastly increase in serious crime, all these attest to disobedience to law and the inadequacy of enforcement.

The sanctity of human life is so callously disdained. A young President is shot down. A young Senator is shot down. A non-violent Christian crusader is shot down. Each year there are thousands of murders and homicides.

Private property rights are ignored by the robber, the looter and the arsonist.

(con't)
Too much of the language of today is uncouth and un-American. "Burn baby, burn!" becomes a slogan. "Get guns!" becomes an arrogant war cry.

A brooding insecurity arouses the fears of the citizenry.

The flag is deliberately desecrated at home and abroad. There is doubt that we really are "One nation, under God, indivisible."

The nation has paid a terrible price in lives, in peace of mind, in haunting fear and insecurity, in property damage, in prestige and a tarnished image abroad.

Whatever the cause -- be it in the homes, the schools, the courts, in public stewardship or some other field -- both the problem and the remedy are reasonable clear.

What does it take?

The law must be obeyed and enforced. No disorderly society can long survive. "There is no grievance," said Abraham Lincoln, "that is a fit object of redress by mob law."

A sacred regard for human life must be restored. Fear seems to be the only universal passion. Even the hardened criminal fears swift, certain, speedy punishment. Mandatory sentences written in the law might help to stem the crime tide.

Respect for authority must be restored. Without it, we may find ourselves on the road to disaster.

The hateful language of destruction which comes so readily to the tongue should be discouraged at every turn.

The flag is the embodiment of the principles of this Republic. The very Republic suffers by its desecration.

Finally, the time has come to rethink our history. It should have emphasis in every school, church and forum in the land. The legacy which is ours came from those who were here before us. Into this land they built their skills and talents, their hopes and dreams, their tears and sacrifices. Today, we are the trustees of America. Upon us is a two-fold duty. The one is to those who came before us and gave us this land for our inheritance. The other is to those who shall come after us.

Perhaps three words can state the whole case: dedication, discipline, duty.
One full week ago, meeting in the shadow of violence and tragedy, the House passed and sent to the President the Law Enforcement Assistance and Criminal Justice Act of 1968.

The House vote was 368 to 17.
The Senate vote was 72 to 4.

These overwhelming majorities reflected the massive demand of an aroused America that crime must be stopped. People must feel safe to walk in their own neighborhoods, sleep in their own homes, work in their own stores. The law must be upheld and lawbreakers must be punished.

But a week has passed and President Johnson has not signed this comprehensive crime bill into law. What is he waiting for?

Immediately, the President clouded this life-and-death legislation by attacking its gun control provisions, incidentally authored by Senate Democrats, and utterly ignoring the nine other urgently-needed sections of the omnibus bill, many of which bear a Republican stamp.

The major gun control provisions Congress already has approved still await the President's signature, along with other long-overdue, anti-crime provisions.

What is the President waiting for?

Instead of taking prompt and constructive action, he appointed another study commission. Even if he intends to veto the crime bill, he should do so without delay so we can re-enact it over his veto.

A whole week has been lost. Projecting the FBI Crime Index statistics over an average week, more than 70,000 major crimes occur in this country; some 246 murders, 530 rapes, 3400 robberies and over 5000 aggravated assaults have ticked off the crime clock since Congress did its duty a week ago today.

What is the President waiting for?

Besides the gun control sections, the Crime Bill on the President's desk contains these important provisions:

1 -- Block grants of Federal funds to assist State governments in the war on crime -- sponsored by Sen. Dirksen in the Senate and Rep. Cahill in the House -- urged by virtually all State Governors of both parties over the opposition of the President and the Attorney General.

(con't)
2. -- Federal prohibition of all private electronic eavesdropping and wire-tapping, along with carefully defined permission for such surveillance by enforcement officers under court authorization and supervision. This was introduced in the House by Rep. McCulloch, Rep. Poff, and other minority members of the Judiciary Committee and the Republican Task Force on Crime. The President's own Crime Commission made these recommendations. He has opposed them. These are major weapons in the fight against organized crime, espionage and subversion.


All these matters are awaiting final approval at the White House.

What is the President waiting for?

The President's signing of the omnibus anti-crime bill is a victory for the American people and the Republican Party. This legislation represents the enactment into law of a multitude of anti-crime measures long sought and vigorously fought for by Republicans in Congress.

The National Law Enforcement Assistance and Criminal Justice Act is a vehicle for the restoration of law and order in America and for a reversal of the sharp upward spiral in lawlessness which has pushed the national crime rate up 88 per cent in the last seven years.

The omnibus crime bill is good legislation. Its wire-tapping provision is good legislation. Giving law enforcement officials the authority to use the wire-tapping tool against major criminal activity under court order provides our lawmen with a valuable weapon against organized crime, as well as espionage and subversion.

The President is badly mistaken in seeking repeal of the wire-tap provision and refusing to use it against the crime syndicates. He has completely distorted the wire-tap provision, and this is most unfortunate. He has sought to mislead the American people into believing that even the most scrupulously law-abiding citizen is not safe from electronic surveillance. The truth is that the anti-crime bill outlaw all wiretapping and electronic surveillance except as authorized by the federal courts in cases involving major crimes and the national security.

The American people can feel certain that a new Republican President and a Republican Attorney General will use these new anti-crime provisions to root out the evils of organized crime and those who seek to destroy our government by espionage.

The American people want an end to the widespread lawlessness that has plagued this country under the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. The Law Enforcement Assistance and Criminal Justice Act of 1968 will help to accomplish exactly that.

###
The House Republican Task Force on Crime charged yesterday that despite a substantial increase in Justice Department employees and expenditures since 1960 "there has been no corresponding increase in the Department's effectiveness in the nationwide crime fight." The GOP lawmakers declared that "something is drastically wrong with the policies, means and methods being used in the federal anti-crime fight."

The Task Force noted that the number of persons employed by the Justice Department rose to an all-time high of more than 34,000 in June 1967, and Department expenditures for the year, in excess of $422 million, were 55% greater than 1960. They then cited the nationwide 88% increase in crime since 1960 and disclosed that convictions in federal courts throughout the country, in cases prosecuted by the Justice Department, have decreased during this same period, by 3300 or 11%.

The record for the District of Columbia, where the Justice Department has exclusive jurisdiction over all crimes, they said "is even worse." Serious felonies in the District have climbed by 175% since 1960—felony convictions have decreased by 37%.

They said they could understand a decrease in convictions "if it were accompanied by a corresponding decrease in crime. Otherwise, it is indefensible."

The Task Force pointed out that in 1967 for every 45 felonies committed in the District of Columbia, only one felony conviction resulted. "Those odds invite more crime," they said.

"Some criminologists would doubtless blame the courts for such a show of ineffectiveness," the Task Force continued. "However, Attorney General Ramsey Clark has consistently denied any adverse effect of court decisions on law enforcement. Certainly, if the courts are not to blame for this ineffectiveness, the Department of Justice is," the Crime Group concluded.
Crime throughout the United States, as measured by the FBI Crime Index, has increased 88% since 1960. In the District of Columbia serious felonies and misdemeanors have increased 135%, and felonies alone have increased 175% during the same period.

According to the Annual Report of the Attorney General for fiscal year 1967, the Department of Justice conducted an "unprecedented program" to achieve effective law enforcement and reduction of crime last year. The number of persons employed by the Department "rose to an all time high of 34,052 in June 1967" and Department expenditures for the year, in excess of $422 million, were 55% more than 1960.

Despite the substantial increase in personnel, expenditures and, we are given to understand, in effort by the Department of Justice, there has been no corresponding increase in the effectiveness of their anti-crime program. In fact, there has been a substantial decrease.

In fiscal 1960, 30,955 persons were found guilty of crimes in federal courts. In 1967, 27,643 were found guilty, a decrease of 3,312 or approximately 11%.

The record for the District of Columbia where the Justice Department has exclusive jurisdiction over all crime is even worse. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia has jurisdiction over all felony violations committed in the District. During the same period that felonies increased by 175%, felony convictions in the District Court decreased by 37%.

A decrease in convictions is understandable, even welcome, as long as it is accompanied by a decrease in crime. Otherwise it is indefensible.

In 1960 the ratio of known felony offenses to felony convictions in the District stood at approximately 10 to 1, at or about the national average. In 1967 the ratio was 45 to 1. Those odds invite more crime.

Some criminologists doubtless would blame the courts for such a show of ineffectiveness. However, Attorney General Ramsey Clark has consistently denied any adverse effect of court decisions on law enforcement. And the Democrat ex-United States Attorney for the District, David Acheson, has said that "changes in court decisions and prosecution procedures would have about the same effect upon the crime rate as an aspirin would have on a tumor of the brain." Certainly, if the courts are not to blame for this ineffectiveness, the Department of Justice is.

It is evident that something is drastically wrong with the policies, means and methods being employed in the federal anti-crime fight. They are not working. The federal government under the present Administration is not bearing its share of the load in bringing criminals to justice.
SENATOR DIRKSEN

The Republican Party, in its Platform of 1968, solemnly pledges to every American that "we shall think anew and act anew". And indeed we shall!

That platform, specifically, pledges us:

To dedicate our efforts toward restoration of peace both at home and abroad--

To bring about a national commitment to rebuild our urban and rural slum areas --

To enable family farm enterprise to participate fully in the nation's prosperity --

To bring about quality education for all --

To assure every individual an opportunity for satisfying and rewarding employment --

To attack the root causes of poverty and eradicate racism, hatred and violence --

To give all citizens the opportunity to influence and shape the events of our time --

To give increasing attention to the views of the young and recognize their key role in our present as well as the future --

To mobilize the resources, talents and energy of public and private sectors to reach these goals, utilizing the unique strength and initiative of state and local governments --

To re-establish fiscal responsibility and put an end to increases in the cost of living.

The Republican Leadership of the Congress reaffirms and endorses to the full each and all of these platform purposes and pledges.

We pledge our strong support of the Nixon-Agnew ticket as the new leadership this nation must have. With this new leadership we will face squarely and resolve successfully the grievous problems the American people face today.

Seldom has there been such a scathing indictment of American leadership. Rarely has there been so obvious a need for a change.

The F.B.I. reports that, during 1967 alone: violent crime was committed each minute; murder was committed every 43 minutes; forcible rape was committed every 19 minutes; aggravated assault was committed every 2 minutes; robbery was committed every 2 1/2 minutes; burglary was committed every 20 seconds; larceny was committed every 30 seconds; auto theft was committed every 48 seconds.

Never in our history has our national leadership been so vulnerable to criticism -- and replacement -- as it is today in the face of such stark statistics.

Frightening as these facts are, we have reason to be equally concerned about another: the apparent collapse of our people's confidence in the orderly and just society our forefathers strove so hard and so long to build. That loss of confidence can be attributed only to America's lack of leadership at the highest level.

The Law Enforcement Code of Ethics published in the F.B.I. Report, in its opening paragraph reads:

"As a Law Enforcement Officer, my fundamental duty is to serve mankind; to safeguard lives and property; to protect the innocent against deception, the weak against oppression or intimidation, and the peaceful against violence or disorder; and to respect the Constitutional rights of all men to liberty, equality and justice."

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has failed to apply this philosophy of law enforcement and now seeks to cover its glaring deficiencies in a torrent of words and statistics. The incredible fact is that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has ordered their Attorney General not to execute new laws enacted upon Republican initiative by the people's representatives in Congress, to wage effective war on the Mafia and other organized crime activities.

Clearly this nation needs new leadership, in the White House, in the House of Representatives, and certainly in the Department of Justice, to carry out the unequivocal pledge of the Republican Party Platform for protection of the public peace and safety and elimination of criminal activity and social injustice in every form.

Therefore, our Question-of-the-Week:

Mr. President, When Can We Expect Order With Justice Under Law?
I am very pleased that Mayor Walter Washington has joined hands with House Republicans who are seeking legislation to deny bond to dangerous criminals awaiting trial.

I and 21 other Republican House members introduced a bill on Jan. 8 aimed at denying bond to the dangerous offender who may well go out and commit another crime if released while his case is pending.

The sponsors of this amendment to the Bail Reform Act included Rep. William M. McCulloch, R-Ohio, senior Republican on the House Judiciary Committee, and Rep. Richard H. Poff, R-Va., chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Crime. Mr. Poff also had introduced a bail reform bill in somewhat different form on Jan. 3, opening day of this congressional session.

Republicans have been shaping this legislation since last year.

In the last session of Congress the House Republican Task Force on Crime gave priority attention to bail reform. The proposed amendment was not quite in final form when the session ended.

Mr. Poff informs me that he is encouraged by Mayor Walter Washington's attitude, by his "willingness to go out on a limb on bail reform."

I congratulate the mayor on backing the kind of bail reform legislation advocated by House Republicans. We welcome his support.

As the mayor has pointed out, this is only one of the steps that must be taken to cope with the fresh crime wave which is resulting in an average of 20 armed robberies a day in Washington and a rash of bank holdups and killings.

I urge that prompt action be taken to deal with the situation.

# # #

Mr. Speaker: I rise today to urge every member of this House to join with President Nixon in placing the leaders of La Cosa Nostra at the top of America's Most Wanted Criminals list.

Mr. Speaker, I also urge every member of this House to help arouse the law-abiding citizens of this land.

We have before us today, Mr. Speaker, a battle plan from the President of the United States -- an outline of the strategy and a list of the weapons needed to strike at the crime lords of this country, the greedy, vicious, rapacious criminal kings whose subjects are the gamblers, drug pushers, panderers and other criminal types who drain away America's moral strength and economic life blood like millions of leeches.

In the message we have received from the White House today, President Nixon has branded organized crime as Enemy Number One. He has told us what we are doing now to fight the enemy. He has urged us to do more -- far more -- in terms of men and money and new laws. We must accept that challenge.

The President has spelled out his plans to make life miserable for the Mafia. And on the basis of his plans, if Congress concurs, I would advise anyone with stock in the Mafia to sell it right now.

I agree completely with the President that the best-laid plans are useless without the manpower to carry them out -- the manpower to carry out the President's declared objective of convicting the heads of the Mafia, paralyzing crime syndicate administrators, frightening the street workers and ultimately squeezing to death the whole crime syndicate operation in our cities.

I therefore join the President in urging this House to vote the additional funds needed to double our present outlays for fighting organized crime and to vote the full $300 million authorization to help the states and local communities join with Federal authorities in a nationwide drive against racketeers and street criminals.

I applaud the proposed increase in the number of Federal Racketeering (more)
Field Offices and the establishment of a new Special Federal-State Racket Squad in the Southern District of New York.

I also urge congressional approval of President Nixon's requests for new authority aimed at stepping up the rate of Mafia prosecutions and convictions -- authority dealing with general witness immunity, bribery and corruption of police or local officials, illicit gambling operations in interstate commerce, and wagering tax law amendments.

These are anti-crime weapons Congress should make immediately available to our anti-racketeering forces.

As the President has so well put it: The Federal Government must prosecute both the corruptor and the corrupted.

Mr. Speaker, organized crime is like an octopus stretching its tentacles into every corner of our land. From time to time we have lopped off an arm or a leg but new members have grown in their place. It is long past time to strike at the head of the operation, to cut deep into the brains of this monstrosity which has the entire nation in its grip.

We must hunt down the chieftains of organized crime. We must bring every one of them to book if we are to halt the crime wave which has swept over America like a poisonous torrent.

President Nixon has asked for the weapons to do the job. Let us, the chosen representatives of the people, give him the tools he needs.

# # #

Mr. Speaker: Today I join with Mr. McCulloch and the Republican members of the House Committee on the Judiciary in introducing the Illegal Gambling Business Control Act of 1969 to permit the Federal Government to further assist the States in the control of illegal gambling.

This proposal is one of the keystones of the President’s Organized Crime message which he sent to Congress on April 23, 1969. It is vital to the internal well-being of this nation that the activities of organized criminals be curtailed; that the influence and control this small but potent segment of our society yields be reduced. The bill I introduce today, if enacted, will take us a long way toward accomplishing this task.

For many, gambling does not appear to be a very sinister aspect of organized criminal activity. Its existence is certainly not as shocking to society as murder, kidnapping, armed robbery, rape or any of the other spectacular varieties of criminal behavior which make daily newspaper headlines. It is exactly this attitude -- this lack of concern -- which makes illegal gambling such a force in our society. It takes from the pocketbooks of millions of citizens, usually those who can least afford the loss, anywhere from $20 billion to $50 billion annually.

Referring to the profits realized from illegal gambling in his recent message, the President said:

"Many decent Americans contribute regularly, voluntarily and unwittingly to the coffers of organized crime -- the suburban housewife and the city slum dweller who place a twenty-five cent numbers bet, the bricklayer and the college student who buy a football card; the businessman and the secretary who bet illegally on a horse."

To curb this drain from the economy, the bill I am introducing will give the Federal government two additional methods of assisting States in combatting illegal gambling.
Title I will make it a felony for gamblers involved in any operation which exists for 30 days or has a gross daily revenue in excess of $2000 to scheme with any public or law enforcement official to obstruct, hinder, or impede the enforcement of gambling laws by means of bribery of the government official.

Title II makes it a Federal offense to engage in a large-scale gambling enterprise.

Title III amends existing law to permit interception of wire or oral communications where such interception may lead to evidence of an offense punishable under this proposal.

This proposal is the heart of the Administration's war on organized crime. If the profit can be taken from illegal gambling, the flow of funds used to finance such deadly activities as narcotics traffic will be dried up.

Illegal gambling itself is a menace to our society; the criminal activity financed from its bounty is far worse. We need the additional Federal weapons of law enforcement this legislation will provide. With these the Attorney General can effectively work with State and local governments to eradicate this evil from our nation. I urge rapid consideration and favorable action on the Illegal Gambling Business Control Act of 1969.

# # #

Mr. Speaker: Congress has struggled long and unsuccessfully to cope with the problem created by the mailing of obscene material. Now the Nixon Administration has come up with three proposals which offer genuine hope of curbing this despicable activity of the smut profiteer.

The trend of most United States Supreme Court decisions in recent years has caused some members of Congress to throw up their hands and take the attitude that little or nothing can be done about obscene mail.

But President Nixon appears to have found the means of stopping the flood of obscene mailings. This mail is aimed at expanding the smut peddler’s market and is therefore directed to our youth and to adults as well.

In the case of our young people, President Nixon is proposing an anti-obscene mail law which is based on a New York statute already upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court. This law would place a flat ban on the sending of obscene materials to any young person under 18. The court has indicated that such a blanket prohibition on the mailing of offensive sex materials to under-18 Americans will be upheld because of the age of those involved.

The other two of the Nixon Administration’s anti-obscenity proposals involve mailings to adults. I strongly support these proposals as well as that dealing with young people. It is long past time that the courts recognize there must be a basis in law to support the desire of decent Americans to curb the smut peddler.

The people rightly are looking to the Federal Government for protection from the flood of pornographic mail. The laws now on the books have definitely proven inadequate.

President Nixon’s anti-obscenity proposals constitute a reasoned and workable approach to a most difficult problem. I intend to press for prompt enactment of his recommendations. I would expect that the Congress would welcome Mr. Nixon’s legislative initiative in this problem area.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are greatly alarmed, and justifiably, over the growing traffic in narcotics and the increasing use of drugs by our youth.

If there is any problem area in which the people want speedy and effective action, it is the area of narcotics peddling and drug addiction.

I believe the American people are well aware that offenses committed by drug addicts who need money to support their habit account in some areas for a majority of the major crimes occurring there. They recognize, too, that this is but one reason why Federal, state and local resources should be marshalled in a coordinated attack on the narcotics problem.

President Nixon, in the Message he has sent Congress today, is pointing the way toward a sorely needed comprehensive action program which must be carried out nationwide and with the greatest possible cooperation at all government levels if the narcotics problem is to be brought under control.

The President's proposals for dealing with the narcotics problem obviously constitute a broad, carefully planned program which should produce the maximum possible results if it receives the greatest possible support -- support it so well deserves.

I urge that the Congress act as quickly on President Nixon's legislative proposals as circumstances permit -- the revision and consolidation of the Federal narcotics statutes into a single and more effective Act, and the funding of administrative actions being taken to step up the fight against narcotics abuse.

Meantime, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the President for the administrative initiatives he has taken to deal more effectively with narcotics trafficking and drug abuse.

I would note that only through the sweeping approach adopted by President Nixon -- the strengthening of efforts to halt the production and sale of illegal narcotics, the improving of rehabilitation programs for drug addicts, and the educating of all Americans to the dangers of drug abuse -- can we begin to cope effectively with this most complex problem of drug addiction and its rise and spread.

# # #
NOTE TO NEWS MEDIA: I have today formally requested that the F.B.I. investigate the series of murders in the Ypsilanti-Ann Arbor area of Michigan. This request is based on the Lindbergh Law as statutory authority. My letter to the F.B.I. follows:

Dear Mr. Hoover:

I am writing you to formally request that the F.B.I. join in investigating the series of seven kidnapping-murders which have occurred in the Ypsilanti-Ann Arbor area of Michigan over a two-year period to the present.

The latest victim was Karen Sue Beineman, an 18-year-old Eastern Michigan University student from Grand Rapids, Michigan, in my congressional district.

There is reason to believe that all of the slayings were committed by the same killer, a sex fiend who strangles and beats his victims.

Since the Ann Arbor-Ypsilanti area is less than 50 miles from Toledo, Ohio, I think there can be a presumption that the killer has at some time or other crossed the state line with one or more of the girls he has lured to an early and horrible death.

Col. Frederic Davids, head of the Michigan State Police, has informed me that the Beineman case has offered local and State police authorities the best lead yet in this series of murders. That lead is the fact that Karen Sue Beineman was seen getting on a motorcycle behind a curly-haired young man and was never seen alive again.

The fact that Miss Beineman last was seen riding on a motorcycle leads me to believe that the killer may have crossed the Ohio state line with her. Certainly we can make that presumption, and this would provide the basis for the F.B.I. entering the case.

I have been besieged with telephone calls and telegrams from Grand Rapids parents urging that the F.B.I. come into the case. I personally feel that this is a case which requires a total mobilization of Federal, State and local investigative effort if it is to be solved.

There is even talk among some Grand Rapids residents to the effect that parents with young girls attending the University of Michigan and Eastern Michigan University should withdraw their daughters from school until this series of slayings is cleared up.

Please give this matter your immediate and most serious consideration. I hope and pray for a favorable decision.

Best regards,

Gerald R. Ford, M.C.
The United States will never fall to external enemies unless it has been weakened beyond redemption by the enemies within. America's internal enemies today are the criminals, the law-breakers and those who prey on the poor, the young, the weak and the innocent.

The Republicans in the House of Representatives are deeply aware of the dangers the scope and incidence of crime pose to our Nation. We are determined to institute actions wherever and whenever possible to give law enforcement officers at the national, state and local levels the tools to cope with crime and the courts the means with which to deal adequately with criminals.

At the same time we remain determined to provide justice under the law, to protect the innocent and to assure the Constitutional rights of all our citizens.

Failure to deal effectively with criminals and the causes of crime has resulted in what can only be termed major disaster. Crime has quadrupled since 1944. In 1968 alone, it increased by 17%.

Use of drugs has grown at an even more frightening rate. Between 1960 and 1967 juvenile arrests involving the use of drugs rose by almost 80% and the number of narcotics addicts in the United States is now estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands.
The flow of smut and obscenity through the mails has increased enormously in recent years, to the disgust of decent citizens and to the detriment of our children.

In the Nation's Capitol, while serious crime skyrockets, the criminal courts lack progressive, effective procedures.

Organized crime continues to wrap its tentacles about our society. It controls illegal gambling, the numbers racket and dope smuggling, and has infiltrated government and legitimate business.

We must devote new resources and knowledge to the curbing of juvenile delinquency; we must develop new techniques of prisoner rehabilitation, both institutional and extra-institutional; we must address the urgent need for penal reform.

Control of all areas of crime is absolutely necessary if we are to maintain the internal strength and security of our Nation, if we are to be safe in our homes and on our streets and if our children are to have the protection they deserve.

President Nixon has called upon the Congress, the States and localities—and each citizen to join in a national commitment to a war on crime. He has sent to the Congress a multi-faceted crime control package which includes a broad attack upon all aspects of organized crime, deals with the flow of smut through the mails, revises criminal statutes and reorganizes the court system in the District of Columbia and provides new approaches in the battle to control narcotics. Legislative proposals to meet and solve these and other critical problems have long been championed by Republican Representatives, but Congressional action has not been forthcoming.

The Republican Policy Committee of the House of Representatives recommends immediate consideration and passage of this vitally needed legislation to reduce and control the cancer of crime that now afflicts the American people.