

On the question of mail covers, I know that the committee is interested in it, I have no new information to add to it. I know that——

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speiser, in reply to your comment on income tax returns and one which I am not quite sure I am in agreement with, in reference to the House Committee on Government Operations, it takes full committee approval of a resolution on each individual case in order to have such permission to review such reports. I thought you might like that for the record. It is not a very easy thing to get. However, I agree, it is potentially a very dangerous thing.

Mr. SPEISER. I think that does have some measure of control. I fail to see, however, why the wide range of years is necessary as requested for all of these committees. I can't see any justification for asking for income tax returns back to 1947, for example.

There was a certain degree of notoriety concerning the inspection of trash here in the District of Columbia, and a complaint was made by the local affiliate of the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Capital Civil Liberties Union. The trash of a wife of an attorney was being segregated. Apparently the practice has ended, although we are not quite sure, because the response that was received from General Duke, who is on the Board of Commissioners, was that the city department never has engaged in trash snooping, and furthermore, it wasn't going to do it any more in the future.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Is that in response to my letter?

Mr. SPEISER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. GALLAGHER. It was rather ambiguous.

Mr. SPEISER. On the question of peepholes, we have urged that the use of peepholes for surveillance of public restrooms be ended as invasion of privacy, that there are other ways of policing. Apparently it is considered a vital police function to seek out homosexuals. Whether the police have discontinued the practice at the present time is unknown.

One of the ways in which Government agencies feel that they can invade privacy has been the development of a wide range of regulations. For example, although a search warrant supposedly is required for criminal prosecution to search a home, we have health inspectors, and this has been upheld by the Supreme Court, unfortunately, as well as housing inspectors, who can go into homes without probable cause and without, perhaps, advance notice.

I think that the problem is the Government here is setting patterns for the rest of society. With wiretapping, for example, the Government treats wiretapping, I think, rather flippantly, although we have on the books a law which, I believe along with others, prohibits wiretapping, the Department of Justice, and the Attorney General, has interpreted this only to prohibit intercepting and divulging, which they interpret to mean divulging outside of the Government agency.

The fact of the matter is that wiretapping is done by law enforcement agencies throughout the country. Never are there any prosecutions for tapping for violating section 605 of the Federal Communications Act of law enforcement officers unless they do it not for law enforcement purposes, but for private gain. That is the only time the Government gets excited about invasions of privacy. When individuals engage in invasions of privacy and the justification