TASCIONE: amt		1-1
	. 1	EXECUTIVE SESSION
	2	
	3	THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1977
	4	
A Frank	5	United States Senate,
	6	Committee on Finance,
	· 7	Washington, D.C.
x	8	The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:05 a.m. in
*	9	room 2221, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Russell B.
•.	o 10	Long (Chairman of the Committee) presiding.
1	7 11	Present: Senators Long, Ribicoff, Gravel, Curtis,
c	10	Hansen, Packwood and Roth.
	13	The Chairman. The Committee will come to order.
0.000	14	While the other members are arriving on the scene, I will
C	- 15	save the Deputy Secretary until we have other members on
0	16	the scene and go further down the list.
¢.	17	Let me call Mr. Frank Libassi, nominated to be General
G	18	Counsel of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
	19	Is he here?
	20	Mr. Stern. He is not here yet:
	21	The Chairman. How about Mr. Jerome Kurtz, nominated to
	22	be Commissioner of Internal Revenue?
Ċ	23	Mr. Kurtz, would you have a seat, sir?
	_24	You have worked up here before. Your face is very
ੱ	25	familiar.
		1

C

ۍ ا

		1-2			
	1	I will ask that your resume be inserted at this point			
	2	in the record.			
-	3	(The biographical data of Jerome Kurtz follows:)			
	4	COMMITTEE INSERT			
-	5				
	6				
	7				
	8				
	9				
 ○ 	10				
\$ u 1772	11				
C	12	· · ·			
	13				
	14				
C	15				
	16				
e C	17				
	18				
	19				
	20				
	21 22				
, •	22				
\bigcirc	_23 _24				
	. 24 25				

.

ļ.

STATEMENT OF JEROME KURTZ

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

72

10-17A

5

مىسى ئەرىپى

C

£****.

C

 \sim

Mr. Kurtz. Yes, sir. I was Tax Legislative Counsel in the Treasury Department from 1966 to 1968, to the end of 1968.

The Chairman. I seem to recall you were around here from time to time. What were some of the tax bills that you helped us put together?

Mr. Kurtz. Before this Committee, do you mean in those years?

The Chairman. While you were here before.

Mr. Kurtz. Those were the years of the investment credit suspension and reinstatement, and the Tax Lien Act was in those years, and a number of other, or minor, things. The Chairman. I see.

You are practicing law, I take it, now?

Mr. Kurtz. Yes. I have been practicing law since then and before then with a firm in Philadelphia.

The Chairman. My impression is when a good tax lawyer comes to work here, he loses money. Would this be a financial sacrifice?

Mr. Kurtz. Yes.

The Chairman. Can you give us some idea of the dimension of the sacrifice you will have to make to take the job.

Mr. Kurtz. Substantially more than 50 percent.

1 The Chairman. I want you to know it takes a good deal 2 of statesmanship and political courage for me to vote for 3 that pay raise bill. I did it because we needed people of 4 your competence here. I am sorry that it is still necessary 5 for men like yourself who are willing to come back and do 6 a tour of duty in government to make a substantial financial 7 sacrifice to do it.

8 Personally, I think you are very well-qualified, Mr. Kurtz. I know you will do a good job for the country, if confirmed. I certainly will recommend it.

Mr. Kurtz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Senator Packwood?

9

10

11

12

23

24

25

*

C

(¹2

C

C

Senator Packwood. I talked to Mr. Kurtz in my office, 13 but I want to go over once more the subject of taxation and 14 fringe benefits. 15

You are aware of the Treasury Department's apparent 16 17 intention to issue some regulations right at the beginning of the last Administration, and those were withdrawn. 18 What are your personal views on whether or not Treasury and IRS 19 should tax airline rides of airline employees, parking 20 spaces, and a variety of fringe benefits that the Treasury 21 was thinking about at the time? 22

Mr. Kurtz. Well, it is obviously a very difficult area. History proves that when that discussion draft came out, there was substantial disagreement within the government about the

conclusions reached in that discussion draft. Obviously, substantial disagreement with industry and those affected. My own'view is that it requires a careful balancing of fairness or equity on the one hand and administration on the other.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

21

23

24

25

C3

1 1

C

Sec. 1

<u>___</u>

¢.

 \sim

0

There is no question that within the definitions of income in the Internal Revenue Code, a great number of these items are properly income. They are benefits to employees given because of employment.

Senator Packwood. Although presently untaxed. Mr. Kurtz. Although many of them are presently untaxed. That is the other side of that scale, that is the question of administration and the feasibility of including and requiring the maintenance of records on various fringe benefits.

I think one cannot lump all fringe benefits into a package. 16 There are some that are of very substantial value and 17 accountability is not extremely difficult, and presumably 18 they ought to be included as income. There are others that 19 are of small value and difficult to account for. There, the 20 cost of administration might outweigh the requirement for inclusion. 22

Senator Packwood. The standard of fairness is not if they are big or small benefits. I hope that we have not come to that standard of fairness in this country.

Mr. Kurtz. I used the question of being large and small as difficulty of accountability.

Senator Packwood. Do you think that the tuition, free tuition, that is given to relatives of teachers of private schools, to their dependents, should be taxed as income?

Mr. Kurtz. The tax-free nature of that, at the moment, is a question of regulation, regulations which have been outstanding for a very long time. Let me say I have a personal view on that which I will tell you in a moment. Let me qualify by saying that things frequently look different from the inside than they do from the outside in this respect.

From the outside, the theoretical arguments are more easily perceived, and perhaps are more compelling. Getting into the organization, you face another set of considerations. That is, the difficulty of doing it, the disruption it may cause, the administrative problems. Those I have not come completely to grips with.

19 On a theoretical basis, the basis of my view is that I 20 think they should be taxed.

21 Senator Packwood. You think in fairness that they should 22 be taxed?

Mr. Kurtz. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

23

24

25

- -

.....

 \mathbf{C}

<u>___</u>

 \sim

0

Senator Packwood. What about airline employees riding on airplanes?

Mr. Kurtz. That, again, falls into the same category. I think it should be taxed. Let me say that we get into a question there of valuation, of what a ticket is worth to the person. They are very difficult questions, to which I do not have an answer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

· 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

C

C

£....

C

1000 and 1000

Senator Packwood. It is not difficult to determine what the ticket is worth to the person, what the person would have to pay if he did not ride for nothing.

Mr. Kurtz. We know what the price of a ticket is, but I am not sure exactly what the rules are for airline employees riding. My understanding is that they ride on the basis of space available, and therefore on standby. That gives them less rights than an ordinary ticket holder may have. It may affect the value of a ride, things of that kind.

Senator Packwood. They would pay the same price, if they had to pay it, that any passenger would have to pay, except that they are an airline employee and do not have to pay. I think they should be taxed on that.

Mr. Kurtz. In my view, it would be fair to tax them on some value. I am not certain what that value would be. Senator Packwood. What about parking spaces provided by companies for their employees?

Mr. Kurtz. That is a very hard one. I do not know the answer to that.

Senator Packwood. I am curious as to what you would be

recommending. What do you think we should do? Should we make a recommendation to change the law?

Mr. Kurtz. Let me say, Senator Packwood, before I would recommend anything I would want to do a lot more work in the There is a lot of background material that has been area. The cases are far more diverse and widespread developed. than one can imagine.

Being a practicing lawyer --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

.24

25

مرويه

C

C

C

ς.

 \mathbf{C}

C?

Senator Packwood. I am familiar with the cases. I want to know what your sense of equity is.

Mr. Kurtz. My sense of equity is where, because of employment, an employee gets a benefit which is other than trivial and which is something of value to him so he is in a better economic condition than somebody else may be earning the same amount of money, or having personally to pay for these things, that represents income under the definition of the Internal Revenue Code.

Senator Packwood. You would not recommend changing the 18 law. You would simply say, if it is administratively feasible, these benefits should be taxed. 20

Mr. Kurtz. They are two different questions. One is 21 under existing law, obviously. There I see a statutory 22 requirement that they be taxed, if they can be. 23

As to whether the law ought to be changed, two things on that. One, that is not primarily within my jurisdiction and and secondly, if it were, it depends on how it would be changed and what the result of the change would be.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- 15

16

17

18

19

21

23

. 24

25

C* . ∆ · .× * .

5

£.....

 \sim

 $\langle \cdot \rangle$

I have not given any real thought to developing a statutory scheme which would somehow draw the line between these benefits and other kinds of income or to sort out one benefit from another benefit.

It may be possible to do. I just have not addressed myself to that guestion.

Senator Packwood. Let me see if I can summarize your attitude fairly.

Assuming it is administratively feasible, you would prefer that the law be drafted so that all fringe benefits be taxed as income.

Mr. Kurtz. Well, assuming it is administratively feasible, I think the law requires that they be taxed. As to whether a statute could be drawn which could equitably exclude some of those and not others, I do not know the answer to that.

Senator Packwood. We exclude premiums now.

Mr. Kurtz. I would not want to see the law amended to 20 say that fringe benefits in some broad definition was excluded. The problem I have with that is while today we 22 know, or have some notion of what the existing fringe benefits are, what their magnitude is, who gets them, if an exclusion were drawn for it, I believe if taxpayers respond

in the way they respond generally to exclusions, more and more compensation would be channelled into those fringe That, I think, would be unfortunate. benefits.

Senator Packwood. The policy of this government is to try 4 to have a policy of fringe benefits to make those not 5 taxable. 6

Mr. Kurtz. That is correct.

Senator Packwood. That is not a bad policy to achieve those benefits.

Mr. Kurtz. If Congress decides those are benefits to 10 be encouraged, obviously, that is the way to implement it. 11 Senator Packwood. In the construction trades, building dams, this takes three, four or five years. I understand the present ruling is for those construction workers who have to drive extreme distances to work, the ruling is that only for one year will the assistance or transportation costs be passed. After that, you presume that that is compensation. There is no housing close to the dam. You have notschanged the residence or location. You are still driving sixty, seventy miles. Why the year cut-off?

Mr. Kurtz. Well, I do not know the answer as to why there is a year cut-off. That has been a policy of quite longstanding in the service, supported by a number of cases. Senator Packwood. What pragmatically happened was that it was not seriously enforced. It is becoming more seriously

C 5 \sim C \mathbf{C}

 \mathbb{C}

- 3

1

2

3

7

8

9

12

13

14

- 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

enforced, I think unjustifiably, and it is bothering the building trades.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1 3

 \sim

Ċ

1.00

0

0

 \square

What is your policy? Should it be enforced? At the end of the year, the fact that you have to drive another three years and you have no housing either, should at the end of the year the cost now be charged?

Mr. Kuttz. Senator Packwood, I do not know the answer to that. I have not looked into that question very carefully.

The considerations are distinguishing, as I am sure you know, distinguishing between the business expense and commuting expenses and if an individual has a steady job, for example, and chooses to live thirty or forty miles from that job, no deduction is allowed for commuting expense, nor do I think it should be.

On the other hand, if it is a question of what is a temporary job and what is an unusual, unanticipated kind of expense which may make it business.

19 The Chairman. If I may interject, I am going to have to 20 leave at 10:00 o'clock in order to take over the tax bill 21 on the Floor. What I would like to suggest is that we take 22 care of these confirmations, the qualifications of these 23 men. When we get through with that, as far as I am concerned. 24 you can have the gavel and you can examine this witness 25 about fringe benefits to your heart's content. I know of your interest in this matter. I am sure he can provide you with some very useful thoughts in connection with it. I would like to urge, however, that we simply look at

these men's qualifications for the job at the moment and see how many of them we can recommend for confirmation. At the conclusion of that, we will call Mr. Kurtz back for you and you can get all the information that you want.

Senator Packwood. I like Mr. Kurtz. I move his nomination to send it to the Floor.

The Chairman. I do not want to deny you the right to find out everything you want to know about this man's views. I would certainly appreciate it. We do need to get this confirmed between now and 10:00 o'clock if we can.

All in favor, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

ł

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

23

24

25

10

1. 1.

C

(

ζ.

C

 \sim

 \bigcirc

The Chairman. Mr. Kurtz, we are going to recommend you. Thank you very much.

Mr. Kurtz. Thank you.

The Chairman. Senator Ribicoff would like to have a
chance to pass on the confirmation of the man I asked for the
first time, Mr. Frank Peter Libassi. He is still not
here.

How about Mr. Robert Carswell, nominated to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury?

		1-13				
	1	The Chairman. Mr. Carswell, I do not think you are				
	2	any stranger to us yourself. You have been around here				
	3	before. I will ask that your resume be put into the record				
	4	at this point.				
	5	(The biographical data of Robert Carswell follows:)				
	6	COMMITTEE INSERT				
·	7	· · · ·				
	8					
	9					
ور. ا	10					
and Antonia	11					
C.	12					
	13					
c c	14					
C	15					
1.20 P	16					
	17					
C M2+ **	18					
	19					
	20					
	21 22					
	22					
	_24					
•	25					
	~~	·				
		·				

C

с; С

. • •

STATEMENT OF ROBERT CARSWELL

1

ene rn "45

C.

C

C

6

 \square

 \mathbf{C}

2 Mr. Carswell. I was here from 1952 to 1955. I served 3 as Special Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. The Chairman. Who were you serving under at that time? 4 5 Mr. Carswell. Douglas Dillon for the first two and a half years. The last part, for Henry Bower. 6 The Chairman. You have some familiarities with the 7 duties you will be asked to perform as Deputy Secretary of 8 9 the Treasry? Mr. Carswell. It is somewhat out of date, but yes. 10 . The Chairman. You have consulted with our staff and 11 also with your people about possible conflict of interest 12 and conclude that that has been resolved? 13 Mr. Carswell. I think I have resolved everything, sir. 14 The Chairman. Thank you very much. - 15 Are there any questions, gentlemen? 16 Senator Packwood, No questions. 17 The Chairman. Thank you very much, sir. 18 Mr. Carswell. Thank you. 19 Senator Ribicoff. Mr. Chairman, I move the approval of 20 Robert Carswell. 21 The Chairman. Without objection, we will recommend 22 him. 23 Next, let us hear from Mr. Daniel H. Brill, nominated -24 to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Economic 25

		1	d	
			*	1~
		1	policy.	
		2	Your resume will be put into the record.	
		3	(The biographical data of Daniel H. Brill follows:)
		4	COMMITTEE INSERT	
		5		
		6		
		7		
		8		•
		9		
	1. 1. 1. 1.	10		
		11		
	<u> </u>	12		
C		13		
****	(, ⁻	14		
	C ²	15		
	C C	16		
	C	17		
		18		
		19		
		20		
		21		
		22		
Ċ	-	23		
		. 24		
()	-	25		
		ł		

٠

1~15

•

		1-16
	1	STATEMENT OF DANIEL H. BRILL
	2	The Chairman. Mr. Brill, you have had previous
	3	service in government?
)	4	Mr. Brill. Yes, sir. I was with the Federal Reserve
	5	for many, many years.
	6	The Chairman. You come here from the Commodity Credit
	7	Corporation, I take it?
	. 8	Mr. Brill. Control Data Corporation.
	9	The Chairman. I see.
	10	It says Commodity Credit Company, Baltimore subsidiary
	11	credit, Control Data Corporation.
	12	Mr. Brill. Yes, sir.
	13	The Chairman. You are senior advisor and Chief Economist
	14	to the Federal Open Market Committee?
	15	Mr. Brill. Yes, sir.
يەرىپىر دومىر	16	The Chairman. When you have more time I would like for
C	17	you to educate me a little more on that particular operation.
	18	I would like to know more about it.
	19	Mr. Brill. It would be my pleasure.
	20	The Chairman. Are there any questions?
	21	Senator Ribicoff?
	22	Senator Ribicoff, No, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Brill seems
	23	qualified. If there is no objection, I would recommend that
•	_24	we recommend that he be confirmed.
·	25	The Chairman. Senator Packwood, do you have any

Ċ

් •

1 questions of this witness? 2 Senator Packwood. No. 3 The Chairman. If there is no objection, we will 4 recommend confirmation. 5 Mr. Brill. Thank you. The Chairman. Mr. Robert C. Altman, nominated to be 6 Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Capital Markets and 7 8 Debt Management. We will have your resume put into the record at this 9 10 point. (The biographical data of Robert C. Altman follows:) 11 COMMITTEE INSERT 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 _ 24 25

1021121

<u>.</u>...

C

e

C.,

÷#PRCs F

C

Ç.

 \sim

STATEMENT OF ROBERT C. ALTMAN

1

10

0

1000

C.

 \mathbf{C}

C...

5....

2 The Chairman. Mr. Altman, I see you have had considerable 3 financial experience. Have you explored the possibility of 4 a conflict of interests and resolved that to the satisfaction 5 of counsel in Treasury as well as our Committee staff? Mr. Altman. Yes, sir. 6 The Chairman. Are there any questions? 7 Senator Ribicoff. I have no questions. 8 9 The Chairman. Senator Packwood? Senator Packwood, I have no questions. 10 Senator Ribicoff. I move that we recommend confirma-11 tion. 12 The Chairman. Without objection, we will recommend 13 14 confirmation. Mr. William J. Beckham, Jr., nominated to be Assistant 15 Secretary of the Treasury for Administration. 16 We will put your biographical sketch in the record at 17 this point. 18 (The biographical data of William J. Beckham, Jr. 19 follows:) 20 COMMITTEE INSERT 21 22 23 24 25

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM J. BECKHAM, JR.

The Chairman. Mr. Beckham, have you explored with Counsel in Treasury, as well as with our Committee staff, any possible conflicts of interest of problems and undertake to resolve those satisfactorily?

Mr Beckham. Yes, I have.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

ģ

10

11

12

13

14

· 15

16

17

18

21

24

25

~ ~

: 7

C

C

and the second second

 \mathbf{C}

5

 \frown

C

The Chairman. I see you were Chief Executive Assistant to Mayor Young of Detroit.

Mr. Beckham. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. You will not have as many fiscal headaches here as you may have experienced there, but I cannot guarantee it, by any means. You will find it just moving in on a bigger stage.

You served, sir, as an aide to Senator Philip Hart? Mr. Beckham, Yes.

The Chairman. You have had some experience in the Senate?

Mr. Beckham. Yes.

19 The Chairman. I se you started out on the Capitol
20 Police Force here in 1962.

Mr. Beckham. That is correct.

The Chairman. Did you go to college while you wereworking here?

Mr. Beckham. Yes, I did.

The Chairman. I think that is of great credit to you.

	1-20
1	Are there any questions, gentlemen?
2	Senator Ribicoff. Mr. Chairman, I move that we recommend
3	the confirmation.
4	The Chairman. Without objection, we will recommend the
5	confirmation of Mr. William J. Beckham, Jr.
6	Mr. Joseph Laitin, nominated to be Assistant Secretary
7	of the Treasury for Public Affairs.
8	We will have your biographical sketch put in the record.
9	ât this point.
10	(The biographical data of Joseph Laitin follows:)
11	COMMITTEE INSERT
12	
13	
14	
- 15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
. 24	
25	
	N

•

ر م مدينية

10 ,en

C

Ċ

C

°

.

STATEMENT	OF	JOSEPH	LAITIN
-----------	----	--------	--------

The Chairman. Mr. Laitin -- is that how you pronounce your name?

Mr. Laitin. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

23

-24

25

5 m

6

1

٢.

-

Concerne and the second

 \frown

0

The Chairman. Have you looked into the possible conflict of interest problems and are satisfied that they have been resolved to the satisfaction of Treasury Counsel as well as to the satisfaction of the Finance Committee staff?

Mr. Laitin. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Are there any questions, gentlemen? Senator Ribicoff. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee recommend Mr. Laitin.

The Chairman. Without objection, then, Mr. Laitin will be recommended.

Mr. Laitin. Thank you, sir.

The Chairman. Mr. Frank Peter S. Libassi, is he here now?

18 Mr. Stern. Mr. Chairman, Senator Talmadge had an 19 amendment that he has introduced to a bill that he asked 20 for Committee consideration of. He was unable to be here. He asked that it be explained. 21

The Chairman. Which of these measures do we have to 22 act on immediately? What is our time situation? Mr. Stern. Both items two and three are related to the Congressional Budget schedule and have to be reported by May 15th. In the case of the Maternal and Child Health Amendment, Senator Talmadge's amendment is an amendment to a bill that the Human Resources Committee reported out. They are going to be taking it up next week. There is a time deadline.

The Chairman. I would suggest that we see if we can take care of this maternal and health and medicaid amendments, and then clear that with all members of the Committee. iff there is no objection, I would suggest having discussed that, we poll the Committee and see if it is all right with those who are not here, and if so, we could report this matter. Senator Talmadge dropped me a note about this matter, if I can find it here.

He says, "Because of my responsibility as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, I will be unable to attend today's Executive Session of the Senate Finance Committee. I will therefore authorize you to vote my proxy as interested in an amendment here."

Would you explain that?

Mr. Mongan. Very quickly, Senator Talmadge had introduced an amendment last week from a building from the
Kennedy Health Subcommittee, a bill that come to the
Committee from the House. The vast majority of that bill
dealt with changes in the Public Health Service Act, but
folded into that bill were two provisions relating to maternal

 \bigcirc

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

19

and child health and medicaid.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- 15

16

22

23

24

25

1.

C

 \mathbf{C}

C

Senator Kennedy recognized that they did not fall in within the jurisdiction of his Committee and he stripped them from their Committee bill.

Senator Talmadge put in an amendment which would reinclude those two provisions in the bill. He would like the Committee, if the Committee were to support his amendment, he would raise it as a Committee-supported amendment next week when this bill goes on the Floor.

The substance of the two amendments is as follows. The first deals with maternal and child health. That is our present formula grant program to the states for the care of mothers, infants and crippled children. The current authorization level under that program is \$350 million. The authorization has gradually edged up to where it is close to that authorization level. It was \$347 million last year.

Senator Talmadge's amendment would raise the authorization ceiling by 15 percent in order to give these programs
an inflationary increase so they would not have to cut
back on some of the activities which they are currently
sponsoring.

The second activity would relate to the funding of nursing home inspectors under the Medicaid program. Twice in the past, the Congress has voted to fund those inspectors at 100 percent Federal matching, so that the states would

have ample funds to hire appropriately trained personnel to survey the nursing homes and intermediate care facilities. The Administration has requested that 100 percent Federal matching be extended to 1980 at a cost of about \$20 million per year.

The Chairman. Is that the only amendment that he is recommending?

Mr. Mongan. Those two.

ł

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- 15

16

17

18

25

50

C~-

100

5.

A series

€

C

 \mathbf{C}

The Chairman. Senator Talmadge is recommending that? Mr. Mongan. Senator Talmadge favors both of those. The Chairman. Does it sound like a good idea to you? Mr. Mongan. Yes, it does.

The Chairman. Why do we not propose that we poll the Committee; if it is all right with the Committee will will go ahead and report it in that fashion.

Without objection, then, we will poll the Committee and see if that is agreeable with them, and the time aspect of this.

Now, with regard to the International Trade Commission, 19 having heard the witnesses, I would be curious as to what the 20 Committee thinks about it. Offhand, it may be that we want 21 22 to take more time on this.

23 Mr. Cassidy. Yesterday, rather, on Monday, the House 24 passed their ITC bill. A summary has just been handed to It was referred to the Committee yesterday. We now have you.

a bill.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- 15

16

The Chairman. It seems to me, in view of the significance of what we are asking the International Trade Commission to do, we should recommend the budget request of the Commission. That is my personal feeling, but I would be glad to abide by the Committee on the latter.

What can you tell us aboutthat.

Mr. Cassidy. They asked for \$12,187,000 for fiscal year 1978, slightly over a 2 percent increase over 1977, and as a result of the House action, the House recommended a cut of \$665,000 from that request. Almost all of that cut would come out of self-initiated reports which the Commission might be carried on.

You asked, incidentally, the other day that the Commission submit a list of those reports. They have done so.

Senator Ribicoff. On that, I think to stop the Commission
from self-initiated reports would really be retrogressive.
In setting up the 1974 Trade Act, it was definitely our
intention that this should be a meaningful Commission
that had much to do.

Just as an indication, during the hearing-- I regret that Senator Packwood was not here -- we requested you, Senator Talmadge and myself, for the Commission to make a study for us in relation to the President's energy proposals as they

(**

C

 $\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{c}}$

impact upon American industry. The public, on the so-called rebate to be paid for purchases of small cars, especially if it would apply to rebates to foreign cars.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

· 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

£70 M

 \sim

C

C

C

C

 \sim

C

That alone has such implications and is so important, not only in the trade field, but the tax field, that we are going to be faced with in the energy proposal. They have done some outstanding work. It is controversial. It is a controversial Commission, because it can never satisfy everybody.

There is such swirling around in this country, pros and cons on the whole export-import business, but to cut them out from making these reports would be undermining the main purpose of the Trade Act itself that we pass.

The Chairman. I do not know who but a mindreader or a crystal ball gazer could know in effect how many investigations will be desirable to be made by that Commissions.

Who would know how many investigations the Commission might find it necessary to make, how many they might not.

For example, on this Committee, Senator Packwood came to me awhile back. He wanted a whole bunch of things investigated. As Chairman of the Committee, I said, if he wants information, let's see if we can get it. He will have the General Accounting Office doing a lot of work.

Who can predict, at this moment, even what investigations he himself might want the Commission to make before the two-

year period is out.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

 \sim

100

C

C

C....

 \square

 \square

5

It seems to me that the logical thing is to give them enough money to do what they think they will be needing and then if it looks as though they can save some money, it may be that they will send some back in.

That is a far better thing than, for example, let us suppose Senator Roth wants an investigation made. You come up here and say, all right, this should be investigated, then you find at the last moment that they do not have any money. The money has all been used up.

Then you are in a position of having to get an appropriation authorization, a supplemental, to have something investigated that you want investigated. I think it is better to have enough money over there to hope that they would not have to come back for a supplemental.

If they do not need it, turn it back in the way it is now. The idea of having some people do a job where you cannot predict in advance where it is going to be, I think makes no sense.

Furthermore, if you look at all of the matters that are investigated where these people thought these things needed to be looked into and they did, we fellows get very busy over here on this Finance Committee, the same thing on the Ways and Means Committee. People get busy with other things. The people working in that trade area, it is their job

to maintain surveillance. Where the trouble spots appear to be developing, such as musical instruments, scientific instruments, sweaters, body support garments. If there appears to be a problem, look into it.

I think it makes the Commission look good if we say we want to know about the very serious situation that seems to be developing with regard to fish nets. They say, we have been thinking about it, Senator, and we have the information right here.

I think it is all to the better that they be right on top of their job.

For example, I never knew that we had any problems with regard to luggage. I see they have been looking into it. So much the better. We do not make any luggage in Louisiana.

If anybody does, he has the problem. There is the information he is looking for. I think we should recommend the budget they are asking for and the House will undoubtedly compromise with us to reduce it some.

One, recommend the budget; two, leave them the flexibility. I do not want to be the guy trying to decide whether a person over there ought to sign his name with a lead pencil or a fountain pen. Let them decide for themselves. They appear to be competent people.

The only real basis I can see for the Houæ being somewhat difficult with that Commission is that the House feels that

 \frown

18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

23

24

- 22
- - 25

is a Senate Commission, frankly, and they have to come before us for confirmation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

7. *

Ś

C

3

C.

C

 $\mathbb{C}^{2N_{1}}$

 \mathbf{C}

C....

I have told our House friends from time to time that if they want to make suggestions on whether or not we should confirm people or not, it is all right with me.

I would just hope that the Commission will establish a better line of communication with that House Committee. Frankly, I think we ought to do it too. I would like, Senator Ribicoff, for you and your Trade Subcommittee to hold a meeting now and then with those people, socially or a business meeting, however you want to do it, to let them get off their chest whatever they think about matters. Maybe they feel that they are more a part of what is going on.

Senator Ribicoff. I think also, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be better if they talked with the Committee about any survey and research and reports that they have in mind, for us to determine whether, in our judgment, they are worthwhile.

19 There always has to be a priority. It is obvious. Some 20 of the research problems, balance of payments analysis, you requested the factors affecting world petroleum prices, which are certainly important; soft wood forecasting, Senator Packwood may understand what that means.

Senator Packwood, That description does not mean anything

to me.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

11

12

13

14

- 15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

25

ه، بے

5

 \sim

C

 \mathbf{C}

6.2

0

 \mathcal{C}^{2}

Senator Ribicoff. I would do that, Mr. Chairman. Have the staff keep in touch at any time they think is advisable to call a meeting at regular intervals to be brought up to date as to their work.

I would certainly do that. I would expect, Mr. Cassidy, to keep us informed, both on the majority and minority side. 7 I would not like to cut them out.

The Chairman. I think that would work out fine. 9 I do not see anything wrong with that. 10

If there isono objection, why do we not recommend the budget they requested? It has been our judgment -- what we did was make that Commission as independent as we could make them, so if they request their budget and it does not go through the Bureau of the Budget, the problem we have we would have people down at the White House, down there, who tried to make the people in the State Department -- they are very liberal, you know. Those people had not turned in their Santa Claus costumes yet.

Those people decided they are going to give away some 20 American industry to ingratiate themselves with some foreign nation. In order to implement that decision, they proceed to go through the White House, tell the White House that that is what they want done. . Then they try to get the White House 24 to dictate to the Commission what the Commission should do.

Then, if the Commission does not do what the White House thinks ought to be done, then they say to the Bureau of the Budget to cut their budget, to punish them for not doing, some function that the State Department thought should be done. Some nameless person we have never met and do not knowing consulters person to terms most and do not know, to Las To keeps that from happening, we said for the future, just bring their budget directly up here and request it. It seems to me as though they have made a good case, inc all of this penny-pinching on the budget to say, since you did not spend all of your travelling money last year, we are going to cut you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

 \mathcal{O}

C

C.

1.000

F

 \frown

C

Give them what they requested, a flat amount, and if you do not need all of it, turn in what is not necessary. If there is no objection, why do we not recommend that. Senator Ribicoff. I so move.

The Chairman. Without objection, we will do that much. Let me raise another question. It may have partisan overtones to it. If it is objected to, I will be able to guide myself by the views of the Committee.

One possible answer to this thing about the tie votes is to let the President appoint one more person to the Commission. 22 At least three must not be members of one Party, so you would have presumably three of one Party and four of another. That would mean ordinarily whoever is President would name

a majority. I would not want him to name the Chairman, but have a seven-man Commission rather than a six-man Commission. The argument for that, I think, would be that trade is no longer a partisan issue. It used to be. It used to be Democrats were the free traders and Republicans were not free traders.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

5

<u>ں</u>،

C....

erere

5

.....

 \sim

0

I would think if we -- that since we made the Commission as independent as we can make them, make it a seven-man Commission. If weddid that, it would tend to be the case, I assume, that you would have four men or women on there of the same party as the President and three who would be of the other Party.

Then, when a Republican President takes over, the majority would swing the other way around. If there were an appointment, he would name one, a Republican, to his place and one - 15 Democrat, if a vacancy occurred, so it would be a four-three Republican majority in a Republican Administration and a four-three majority in a Democratic Administration.

What is your thought on that, Senator Roth? 19 Senator Roth. To be candid, I have reservations about 20 that, not because of the partisan nature, because I am 21 confident we will have a Republican President in four years 22 and we will have a four-three advantage. Nevertheless, I 23 agree with some of your earlier statements that the Congress -24 has a special responsibility in the area of international 25

trade; because of that, we should keep out any connotation of partisan politics.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- 15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

20

ാ

C

0

C

Ç

I think it is much better to have -- it has been that way for thirty years, or something like that. Admittedly, there have been some problems recently. I think that those are problems that can be worked out.

I just feel very strongly that it would do a better job to keep trade out of partisan politics, to keep it as it is.

Senator Ribicoff. I think the problem you have, it is not the politics of who is on it, but there have been so many three to three votes that it really has tied up, not only the Commission, but the President and the Congress as to how it makes decisions.

We are going to have more and more opinions and decisions coming out of ITC and they are going to the President. He is going to take other attituces, Congress may take a different attitude of the ITC or the President.

But I think at least the decision-making process is 18 completely frustrated with three to three decisions.

Senator Gravel. I would feel similarly that, partisanship aside, the Commission of three-three does not make much sense. The only way to solve that is to break the impasse and appoint another person.

Senator Curtis. Mr. Chairman, we have to keep in mind that the real responsibility rests with Congress and the final decision should be made here. I am not so sure that we need to invest this Executive Agency with power for decisive action. It will result in one person making a decision for the entire nation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- 15

16

17

18

5

C

€***

¢...

C

C...

I think we are all right with three and three. If we want to make an odd number, we should go to five. These Commissions get too big.

The Chairman. The last thing on earth I want to do is to have a partisan fight about the Trade Commission and be in a position of ramming something through with a Democratic majority with the Republicans vehemently protesting about it.

There is too much bipartisan cooperation to break that tradition. I would not want to do it for the world.

I would be willing to go with the idea of three and three, if we can do this. Whoever is Chairman -- let's face it, the Chairman rotates under this law. He serves for eighteen months.

To say who is ever Chairman would have the power to
make administrative decisions, the housekeeping measures about
how you are going to assign your personnel, so the housekeeping thing would be under the control of the Chairman,
which rotates, so each person will have his chance in the
last eighteen months before his term expires, he is Chairman.
Then that Chairman has a housekeeping responsibility

unless overridden by a majority. Basically, that breaks the tie as far as housekeeping things are concerned, and the administrative type things -- can you give me an example of what those types of things are, Mr. Cassidy?

There, a lot of debate could be ended.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

22

23

24

25

5

 \mathbf{C}

0

0

 \sim

C

Mr. Cassidy. In the recent past, the Commission has spent a great deal of time on such measures as toilet paper, 7 light bulbs, pencils, et cetera. Most of the time, however, 8 it has been on more significant matters.

The Chairman. As I recall, there was something about decorating an office. For example, the Chairman did not want to repaint and redecorate his office. Somebody else said that reflects on them.

The question is whether you should redecorate. My 14 attitude is that if somebody wants his office painted, go 15 ahead and paint it. Let everybody decide for himself if 16 he wants the walls cleaned or a picture hung on the wall. 17 Mr Cassidy. The major area of contention has been the 18 reorganization of the Commission, which has been put in 19 effect theoretically on January 4th of this year. There are 20 a number of areas that have not been resolved. Most of those 21

involved senior staff of the Commission.

The Chairman. Here is what I would suggest. If we do it where we put the decision with the Chairman subject to a majority vote, then on a tie vote, then of course

the tie would go to the Chairman. That is how it would 1 work out. 2 The present Chairman has about a year to go. 3 Mr. Cassidy. Exactly a year. 4 The Chairman. After a year, he rotates out. Who will 5 be the next Chairman? 6 Mr. Cassidy. Mr. Parker, who is Vice Chairman, will 7 become Chairman in June, 1978. 8 The Chairman. What is his Party designation? 9 Mr. Cassidy. Republican. 10 The Chairman. Fine. 11 SenatorsPackwood. You do not mean a tie vote on substan-12 13 tive matters. The Chairman. We are talking about a tie vote on 14 administrative matters, for example. Name a few of them. - 15 Mr. Cassidy. Personnel budget, procurement. 16 Senator Gravel. They had tie votes on that? 17 Mr. Cassidy. That is where most of their tie votes 18 occur. 19 Senator Packwood. I have no quarrel with that. I am ?0 just reluctant to make it seven. :11 Any decision that the Commission takes is going to be a 22 decision to limit, not a decision to expand. I do not think 23 that is going to be good for this country. If they are 24

stuck with a tie vote, they cannot move.

1-36

 \mathbb{C}^{1}

10.33

25

The Chairman. We have the law in pretty good shape for tie votes. The way it stands now, on a tie vote, the President gets his choice, whichever way he wants to go.

If the President chooses one way, we have the option to go the other way.

Mr. Cassidy. That is correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

23

24

25

C

 \sim

C

5

C

C

The Chairman. If you have a three-three tie, the President can choose to take the side of Commissioners A, B and C as recommended by them, and if he chooses to go that way, we have the right to go with the Commissioners D, E and F and vote that way, if we have the votes to override. You know how difficult it is to vote a majority of both houses when you have to fight the President and half the Commission. Even so, that gives us the option of voting whatever way we want to go. Anytime you have a three-three vote, if you can get three votes for a position and the Congress wants to take that position, under the law, we have a right to imple-

ment that. Is that not right?

Mr. Cassidy. That is correct, on substantive issues; as I understand your proposal you are talking about only about administration. It would not affect the Commissioners. voting on substantive issues.

Senator Curtis. What the House did, it provides that the Chairman would be responsible for addministration, in all except three areas: employment, discharges and key employees,

external relations -- I do not know what that is -- and budget.

This whole thing revolves around whether or not you have a new General Counsel.

The Chairman. If it were my way, I would fire the General 5 Counsel. You have to decide who in the devil is in charge of this fool thing. At some point, somebody has to be in charge.

We investigated things about MacArthur and Harry Truman. MacArthur was right about the taxes and how you should fight the war. He was wrong that he did not have to obey Truman's orders.

As far as how the war should be fought, I sat through 13 that investigation. I am convinced that MacArthur was right about how you should fight the war. Truman was correct in - 15 that he was Commander-in-Chief.

If the Counsel cannot work for the Commission or for the 17 majority of the Commission to take orders, he should resign 18 or be fired, in my judgment. That is a different issue. 19 It seems to me that whoever is the Chairman, that the tie 20 should go to whoever the Chairman is. In other words, if 21 a majority wants to vote the Chairman down, they can, but 22 you should not vote the Chairman down by a tie vote. 23 That seems to me how you can break the tie. . 24

A year from now, Mr. Parker will be the Chairman, which is

0

1

2

3

4

6

7.

8

9

10

11

12

14

16

25

fine. That way we will break the tie. All I want to do is break it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

· 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10

C

0

5

C

. .

 \square

C

Senator Roth. I see no objection to that, Mr. Chairman. The Chairman. Why do we not recommend that? If there is no objection, we will recommend that in administrative matters the Chairman shall have charge of administration unless voted down by the majority. It takes four votes to vote down the Chairman.

Mr. Cassidy. Mr. Chairman, do you want to strike the House bill and report out the House bill with these amendments? How do you want to proceed?

The Chairman. Why do we not strike the House bill and report ours?

Without objection, then, we will report it in that fashion.

Senator Ribicoff. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Libassi did not understand the time. He apologizes for not being here at 9:00 o'clock. Mr. Libassi is in the room.

Senator Roth. Before he comes, I have one minor matter which is not controversial.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, we included language for the International Trade Commission to continue to make certain reports with respect to synthetic organic chemicals. That was included as a part of the report because there was never agreement, and we did not do so.

I would like to include that same language that we ۱ 2 included last year. Mr. Cassidy. In the bill, or in the report, sir? 3 Senator Roth. In the bill. 4 The Chairman. Without objection, agreed. 5 That will settle the Trade Commission. I would suggest 6 that you undertake to poll the absent members, if there 7 is no objection, so that they can all be on record as to 8 their position on this. 9 All right. 10 Mr. Frank Peter Libassi. Is he here? 11 Senator Ribicoff. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a 12 few remarks for Mr. Libassi. He comes from Connecticut and 13 I have known him for a number of years. I think he is 14 qualified by training and experience in his position. - 15 For the past nine years, he has worked to solve the 16 problems of American cities in Hartford Connecticut. He has 17 led an innovative private sector effort uniting political, 18 business and community leadership for the rehabilitation 19 of housing and for the economic and social revitalization of 20 the city. 21 In this job, he has dealt extensively with programs in 22

1-40

HEW, HUD and Labor. He has served at Federal and tstatevols. levels. During his Federal service, Mr. Libassi received his distinguished service award and superior service citation

Courses

23

- 24

25

)	1
		1	from the Department of HEW and the meritorious service award
		2	and superior performance award of the U.S. Commission on
		3	Civil Rights.
		4	Mr. Libassi is here to answer any questions.
		5	The Chairman. His biographical sketch will be made a
		6	part of the record.
	,	7	(The biographical data of Frank Peter S. Libassi
		8	follows:)
		9	COMMITTEE INSERT
	10	10	
	17. 2 ¹ *	11	· · · · ·
	C	12	
		13	
	Cur	14	
	C C	15	
	0	16	
	C	17	
	C	18	
		19	
	•	20	
		21	
		22	
Ċ	•	23	
		_24	
Ċ	•	25	

STATEMENT OF FRANK PETER S. LIBASSI

The Chairman. Have you explored the potential conflict of interest problems and resolved those satisfactorily, Mr. Libassi, with our staff and the counsel in your department?

Mr. Libassi, Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

 \bigcirc

.....

0

C....

 \mathbf{C}

 \sim

The Chairman. Are there any further questions, gentlemen?

Senator Ribicoff. There is a point that I would like to make, Mr. Chairman.

The General Counsel is required to review legislation passed by Congress and write opinions interpreting the law. My feeling is Counsel should provide the staff with such opinions if they are requested by members of the staff. There have been times when it is important for our staff to have thosecopinions, which we have not had. I think we should have those.

The Chairman. I would like to ask one or two questions. Senator Ribicoff. Is there any objection to giving staff the opinions that you give to the Secretary on legislative matters that reflect the work of this Committee?

Mr. Libassi. No, Senator, they would be available. The Chairman. Mr. Libassi, as General Counsel, you and your staff review some of the legislation passed by Congress and write opinions interpreting the law.

Would you provide for the Committee or the staff copies of such opinions, as they are requested?

Mr. Libassi. Yes, Mr. Chairman, we will do that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

24

 \sim

േ ന

6

C

The Chairman. We would like to have that information. Will you provide copies of briefs or memoranda you prepare or receive of court cases when they are requested?

Mr. Libassi. In connection with litigation matters? The Chairman. Yes.

Mr. Libassi. We will make briefs available to members of the Committee.

The Chairman. The Committee was responsible for writing the provisions in law to make parents support their children. One of those provisions required your Department to help them locate an absent parent.

I understand that there are some location difficulties caused by alleged invastion of privacy claims. Would you please furnish the Committee, on a continuing basis, with copies of all the opinions prepared or received by the Office of General Counsel about such claims concerning absent parents?

Mr. Libassi. I would be glad to provide the Committee, Mr. Chairman, with copies of legal opinions with respect to the rules governing disclosure. If I understood the question correctly, yes, we would make those opinions available to the Committee.

The Chairman. Let me repeat the question so you do not misunderstand.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

· 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C

C

C. .

5.

C

 \bigcirc

 \sim

Would you furnish the Committee, on a continuing basis, with copies of all opinions prepared or received by the Office of General Counsel about such claims? We are talking about claims concerning absent parents.

Mr. Libassi, Yes, Senator. I believe there would be no problem with that. I want to be very careful in making that agreement with the Committee that I may not be inadvertently be violating any statute that prohibits the Department from disclosing certain information to the fullest extent authorized by the statute and the rules of Congress. We would make available our opinion with respect to those matters.

The Chairman. Let me give you one example. A problem we have to contend with, you are in a situation where a father is making \$20,000 a year and well able to support his children. He leaves. He has a right to do that; I am not contesting his right to leave and abandon his family. He has a right to just take off if he wants to.

When he leaves and goes someplace else, he becomes interested in another woman, and perhaps they marry. A second family. All right.

He is divorced from the first wife and marries a second, that is still his child. There are some of us who are

concerned about making taxpayers pay to support that man's child by his first marriage where he is well able to support that child.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C

 \sim

f

 \mathbf{C}

 \sim

Admittedly, he cannot take his wife out to a swanky restaurant as often as he could otherwise if he is paying something to help take care of the bhildbyhhisffirstmarri marriage, but he can make a contribution, and for some time we had a difficulty there with your Department about someone claiming that there is a right of privacy in that Social Security number.

Here is the government trying to do right by the mother and the child and by the taxpayers. At that point, we want to know what the person's Social Security number is in order to call upon that man to do his duty.

Furthermore, we also had a fight to protect for the states the right to have the Social Security number on a driver's license or automobile registration papers. That helps us to find that person and to see if he is really in a position to make a contribution or not.

The Committee has prevailed in those areas.

While we respect the right of privacy, he does not have the right to be on the taking down end where he must identify himself when it comes his turn to do a duty that he owes to his government and his own family.

To say, oh, no, you do not have a right to know who I am,

it seems to me we have just about crossed that where you are claiming advantages from your government, and you do have a right to know who you are and where you live.

Can I take it that you will cooperate with that Committee in that respect for that information?

Mr. Libassi. Mr. Chairman, we certainly want to cooperate with the Committee. I think it is important that parents remain responsible for their children and before the general taxpayer is asked to provide financial support for any child that the parent of that child should be identified, located and required to provide financial support.

There is no reason why other hardworking families that are working very hard to support their own children should, in addition, support children when there is a parent, in fact, financially able to do so.

With the basic principle, I have no disagreement and will lend my full support to the Committee. I am a little cautious as to not making commitments to the Committee that I could not keep in terms of what the Department's present laws under which we are operating on the basic principle that the Committee has my full cooperation, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. You have outstanding credentials in the area of Civil Rights and nondiscrimination and I just want to point out to you that it is the worth kind of discrimination for us to tax one father to support some other father's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

_24

25

child when the father who is paying those taxes to do that is not as well able to support his own child as the man to whom he is paying the money by way of the government.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

· 15

16

17

22

23

er.,

C.

(The second sec

 \bigcirc

(100 Mg)

Mr. Libassi. It is that kind of injustice that brings discredit on very good programs, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Here is a father making \$10,000 a year. He is working very hard in supporting his family. Here is another guy making \$20,000 a year and has nobody to support, except himself. At least he is trying to escape his duty to make a contribution to his own child.

It is not right for this man making \$20,000 to be leaning on the fellow who is only making \$10,000 and has a big family to support.

Now and then we have to have sympathy towards our own people who are obeying the law and doing what is right. We must not discriminate against them, just as we do not want to discriminate against anybody.

When one relies upon the right of privacy to victimize the people who are doing what is right in this country, that is just unfair and it involves a discrimination of its own sort that I hope you would recognize.

Mr. Libassi. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Thank you very much.

24 Senator Ribicoff. Mr. Chairman, if there are no further 25 questions, I move that the Committee recommend F. Peter

Libassi for confirmation as HEW General Counsel?

The Chairman. Is there any objection?

Without objection, agreed. We will poll the Committee with regard to all of these nomineess. If anybody wants to make any objection, I would like to know it before we get to the Floor with it.

Thank you very much.

- 15

1.5

C

 \sim

C ...

 $\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{i}}$

 \mathbf{C}

(Thereupon, at 10:05 a.m. the Committee adjourned to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.)

- - -

1-48