state trafficking in drugs and in some cases the Bureau will become involved in significant intrastate violations.

I might note here that the origination of narcotics drugs outside the country is just the opposite situation from the so-called "dangerous drugs" which for the most part originate within the United States.

This specialized mission of the Bureau in dealing with narcotic drugs at the source level necessitates and has resulted in close cooperation and coordination with the Customs Bureau, whose jurisdiction includes the smuggling of narcotics into this country.

The existing and necessary close inter-relationship between these two sister agencies of the Treasury Department could very well be seriously jeopardized by the removal of the Bureau of Narcotics from the Treasury Department.

Similarly, the existing close working relationship between the Bureau of Narcotics and the IRS referred to earlier could be significantly hampered by a transfer.

Now, it is easy enough for someone to say that existing cooperation and coordination will continue and will be unaffected by any transfer. But, I don't believe this would be the case.

As a simple practical matter, existing coordination among sister agencies of one department is going to be impaired by the removal of one of those agencies from the Department.

We saw this happen, I believe, not very long ago with the transfer of the Coast Guard from the Treasury Department to the Department of Transportation.

The Coast Guard's activities included close cooperation with other Treasury agencies in a number of areas. When the question of its transfer arose, the same argument was set forth that this coordination and inter-relationship would not be impaired.

An examination of the situation would show, however, I believe, that this has just not proven to be the case.

Thus, what I am saying here in effect is that whereas a main argument being made for the transfer of the Bureau of Narcotics to Justice is that it will result in greater overall coordination, in fact, the transfer is very likely to lead to less coordination concerning the responsibilities of the Bureau of Narcotics, and especially its vital and primary mission of cutting off illicit drugs at the source level.

As I said earlier, my objections are not only to the removal of Narcotics from Treasury, but also to its transfer to Justice.

The Bureau of Narcotics has been extremely successful in establishing close working relationships with various local and State officials and agencies in attempting to control the illicit drug problem. As I pointed out, the Bureau has trained many local and State officers and since the Bureau specializes in controlling the source of supply level, State and local officials have played a major role in controlling illicit traffic within their own areas.

This has resulted in a balanced effort on the part of local and Federal law enforcement officers in dealing with the drug abuse problem, an effort which is important and quite valuable.

The attempt to bring the fight against drugs within the framework of the Justice Department raises the specter of our taking a step closer to a national law enforcement concept.

A gathering up of various Federal law enforcement agencies presently operating throughout the Federal Government and placing them under one roof at the Justice Department will not necessarily lead to overemphasis on a national approach to the crime problem.

But what is important to realize is that this could be the result.

It is the result which I oppose and which I believe must be carefully and conscientiously avoided.

For the reasons I have stated, I am in opposition to the reorganization as it has been proposed by the President. I hope that this committee similarly will see fit to recommend to the Members of the House that it reject this reorganization being considered here today.

Chairman BLATNIK. The hearings for today are adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Thereupon, at 4:08 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Thursday, March 21, 1968.)