inclusion of housing payments in kind not in excess of $25 is most unpopular among the States. To determine the value of in kind income, State agencies must develop expertise in estimating the value of housing or obtain guidance on the matter through other agencies or organizations. In either case, any possible savings to the program are more than offset by the complexities, if not impossibilities, of effectively administering this provision. Further, this provision would permit housing payments in kind to be disregarded for purposes of income, and thus be treated consistently with the way in which other payments in kind are handled under the food stamp and other welfare-type programs.

The revision of Subsection 5(b) further deletes the provision prohibiting the participation of certain tax dependents in the food stamp program. In its decision in the case of *Murry v. USDA*, 413 U.S. 508, the Supreme Court ruled that the "tax dependency" provision of the Act is unconstitutional. Thus, the "tax dependency" provision in the current Act is not enforceable.

This provision was introduced at the request of the administration in the 93rd Congress, but no action was taken.

SECTION 4

This section of the bill revises Section 10(e)(7) of the Act.

Subsection (e)(7) is revised to give a State agency an option to establish a system under which a food stamp household may elect to have its charge for the coupon allotment withheld from its public assistance check. The Act now mandates a State agency to offer such a system. This service is costly and of questionable value. An optional system would permit a State to operate the system in an area where it would be helpful, such as rural localities lacking adequate transportation. The State would not be required to bear the cost of administering such a system in larger metropolitan areas where public assistance withholding is not only of minimal usefulness but also subject to abuse. Giving the States this option could serve to gain their increased cooperation in other areas of greater program importance.

This provision was introduced at the request of the administration in 93rd Congress, but no action was taken.

SECTION 5

This amendment deletes from the household definition, Section 3(e), the language on eligibility of supplemental security income recipients. The current temporary provision under which supplemental security income recipients may automatically participate in the program will expire on June 30, 1975. On July 1, 1975, the complicated and costly provisions of Public Law 93–86 will become effective.

Subsection (b) of this section therefore contains a new provision governing the eligibility for food stamps of supplemental security income recipients. It would become effective July 1st.

Under the provision all SSI recipients in all states would be automatically eligible for food stamps. It is estimated that at least 90% of the SSI recipients do in fact have net food stamp income below the national guidlines. The administrative expense of investigating the 1 million SSI participants, to weed out the few ineligibles, would in all probability be greater than certifing for minimum bonus the few SSI recipients slightly above the cut-off line.

Public assistance recipients (AFDC) are automatically eligible under food stamp regulations. This amendment would extend that system to SSI recipients on a permanent basis and elevate the regulation to law.

SECTION 6

Section 6 removes the requirement that food stamp recipients who are housebound, feeble, physically handicapped, or otherwise disabled must be over 60 years of age to use stamps for meals-on-wheels.

Without this section, many incapacitated persons under 60 who receive meals-on-wheels have to pay cash for the meals even though they have food stamps. Purchase of delivered meals with food stamps would still be limited to incapacitated persons.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. PATMAN's remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. PATMAN's remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

A BILL TO PROHIBIT INCREASES IN PRICE OF FOOD STAMPS

(Ms. HOLTZMAN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under a Department of Agriculture directive, to go into effect March 1, 1975, the cost of food stamps will be increased to 30 percent of the recipients' monthly incomes. In order to prevent this callous attack on the elderly and poor by the Ford administration, I am reintroducing today with 46 cosponsors legislation introduced on the first day of the session of the 94th Congress. This legislation prohibits increases in the purchase price of food stamps.

No group has suffered more from inflation than senior citizesn. Most live on incomes which are fixed or have risen at a snail's pace, while living costs—particularly for the cheaper kinds of food—have skyrocketed. Instead of being able to live in dignity, some elderly persons have been forced to steal food, others to eat pet food. Many live on the edge of survival.

In the face of this national disgrace, President Ford proposed a brutal and unconscionable cut in food stamp aid to the elderly and the poor. By increasing the amount which more than 90 percent of all recipients must pay for food stamps, the administration hopes to save from $300 million to $1 billion. Nearly every penny of that savings will come from the food budgets of our most desperately poor citizens, most of whom will lose from $8 to $13 per month.

My bill will prevent the administration from taking this action. It will prevent the Department of Agriculture from raising food stamp purchase requirements beyond those currently in effect.

President Ford would take food from the mouths of the elderly and poor, telling them instead to "bite the bullet." I do not believe the American people support this modern version of a "let them eat cake" policy. I urge my colleagues to work for the passage of my bill, and demonstrate that, even in a time of inflation and recession, this Nation will not let its people starve.

The co-sponsors are: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CARR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS, Mr. MCKINNEY, Ms. MEYNER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FULTON, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. MEZVINSKY, Mr. MINETA, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Ms. SCHROEDER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SOLARZ, Ms. SPELLMAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. VANDER VEEN, Mr. WIRTH, and Mr. WOLFF.

SPECIAL COUNSEL BILL

(Ms. HOLTZMAN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a bill (H.R. 540) which will provide for the appointment of a special counsel to represent the United States in any litigation involving the tape recordings and other Presidential materials of Richard Nixon.

At the end of the last session, Congress enacted a law which places custody and title of Richard Nixon's Presidential papers and tapes in the United States. This was necessary legislation, and I commend my colleagues on the House Administration Committee for bringing it to the floor.

The recently enacted law, Public Law 93–526, has the effect of abrogating the agreement between Richard Nixon and Arthur Sampson, director of GSA—which gave custody and control to Mr. Nixon of all Presidential papers and tape recordings generated during his administration. The law, thus, does away with one of the troublesome aspects of the aftermath of Watergate.

However, the new law fails to address an equally troubling problem. In any litigation involving these Presidential materials—whether the issue is one of ownership, fair compensation, the validity of the Nixon-Sampson agreement, or public access to these materials—the interests of the United States will be represented by the Justice Department. In fact, litigation is currently in progress between Mr. Nixon and the General Services Administration, and the Justice Department is representing the United States—in a posture adverse to Mr. Nixon.

The problem is that the Justice Department, in a memorandum from Attorney General Saxbe to President Ford, has already taken the position that all tapes and documents created by or in the files of former President Nixon belong to him. The Justice Department has also stated that it intends to represent Richard Nixon in certain civil litigations arising out of charges of misconduct in office. Richard Nixon has accepted this offer.

It is difficult to see how the Justice Department can adequately represent the interests of the U.S. taxpayers when it

file on this

has already conceded the central issue in the pending tapes case by saying the tapes and papers belong to Richard Nixon. Also, it would be difficult to envision how the Justice Department could vigorously litigate against someone it is defending as a client in other proceedings.

To remedy this situation, my bill provides for the appointment, by the President, with advice and consent of the Senate, of a special counsel to represent the interests of the United States in any litigation involving the Presidential materials of Richard Nixon. The special counsel would be independent of the Justice Department and the Attorney General.

If the courts are to decide the complex and important questions of ownership and custody of, and access to, Presidential materials, the United States is entitled to representation by counsel who has not committed himself publicly to the position of his adversary—Richard Nixon. My legislation will see to it that such counsel is provided.

STATEMENT ON PROHIBITING JUSTICE DEPARTMENT FROM DEFENDING RICHARD NIXON

(Ms. HOLTZMAN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, I introduced a bill (H.R. 1312) to prohibit the Justice Department from using public funds to defend Richard Nixon or any Watergate convict in civil suits arising out of misconduct in office.

This bill is necessitated by the Justice Department's announcement last September that it had offered to defend Richard Nixon in civil suits arising out of Watergate and related matters. Mr. Nixon accepted the offer.

It is ironic that the very conduct which resulted in Mr. Nixon's virtual impeachment and resignation from office in disgrace should at the same time make him the recipient of such generosity by the Government he sought to undermine. It may well result in a situation where the Justice Department and the Special Prosecutor's office find themselves on opposite sides of the courtroom in the same case—for example, if the Justice Department represents Mr. Nixon as a witness in a case being tried by the Special Prosecutor.

Two years ago in a similar situation, Judge Charles R. Richey disqualified the Justice Department from representing Charles W. Colson in a civil action brought by the Democratic National Committee, because the Justice Department was at the same time investigating criminal activities in which Mr. Colson may have participated.

At least five suits have already been filed against Mr. Nixon, all of which the Justice Department has offered to defend. It is noteworthy that the Justice Department refused to release a copy of its letter offering to defend Mr. Nixon, saying that it related to confidential matters between a lawyer and his client.

It is intolerable to see Mr. Nixon become a client of the U.S. Government. It is unconscionable to use taxpayers' moneys to defend a man who resigned in the face of certain impeachment—for his "high crimes" against the American people. I hope that my colleagues will join with me in abrogating these new duties which the Justice Department has assumed.

CHILD CARE DEDUCTION

(Ms. HOLTZMAN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record.)

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week, I introduced a bill (H.R. 541) to improve the child care deduction provision of the Internal Revenue Code. By liberalizing these provisions my bill will facilitate women's participation in meaningful activity outside the home.

The current deduction for child care expenses is deficient in several respects. First, it is not available to married couples if one spouse is working part-time, even though the other spouse is employed on a full-time basis. Yet, one-quarter of the women in this country, comprising 13 percent of the population, work on a parttime basis. By not allowing the deduction in the case of part-time employment, we penalize these women. Furthermore, the current provision has the effect of forcing women to choose between full-time employment and full-time household and child care duties. It thus discriminates against those women who prefer to spend at least part of the day with their children and part of the day at work.

Second, the deduction is not available where one spouse is a full-time student. This has a harsh impact on women who wish to return to school, after having children, to prepare for a career. It is equally harsh on families where the husband is a full-time student, and the wife has to work full time.

Third, child care expenses are now deductible only as personal expenses rather than as ordinary business expenses. This means that the deduction is not available to families who use the standard deduction form. Since 74 percent of the families with earnings of $15,000 or less do not itemize deductions—as of 1972—they cannot take advantage of the present child care tax provisions. Yet, these are often the people who most need and most deserve assistance from tax relief.

Finally, the present child care deduction is not available to a person who has been separated from his or her spouse for less than the entire taxable year. Thus, an individual whose spouse has been absent for 11 months of the taxable year does not get the benefit of any part of the deduction.

My bill will correct these deficiencies and will give the benefits of the child care provision to those who legitimately need them:

First. It makes the child care deduction available to couples who work part time and to full-time students with working spouses;

Second. It allows the deduction as an ordinary and necessary business expense rather than as a personal expense. The deduction will be available on the same basis as any other business expense deduction subject to such rules and regulations as the IRS may provide;

Third. It makes the deduction available to a person whose spouse has been absent for more than half of the taxable year; and

In addition, my bill makes the following changes for purposes of simplicity: It replaces the monthly limitations on deductible expenses with an annual limitation. This will ease both the filing and administrative process. It abolishes the distinction in present law between care in the home and care outside the home. In addition, it eliminates the adjustment for disability payments.

I believe this bill will advance the cause of women's right to work. It is not intended to replace the necessity of a national child care system. It does not pretend to solve the problems of working parents and child care. Hopefully, comprehensive legislation will be enacted to make available high-quality child care facilities to our Nation's children. In the meantime, my bill will serve to ease the economic burden of countless moderate- and low-income families, eliminate discrimination in present provisions, and make a strong commitment to the special needs of working parents, particularly those women who must or want to work.

PROHIBITION OF INTERVENTION IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(Ms. HOLTZMAN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a bill (H.R. 1311) that prohibits any U.S. citizen or resident from offering a contribution to a U.S. Government agency in order to influence elections in a foreign country. My bill also prohibits any U.S. Government agency or employee from soliciting or accepting contributions in order to influence an election for public office in a foreign country.

The need for this bill was made apparent when we learned of ITT's attempt to give heavy financial contributions to the CIA, in an effort to block the election of Salvador Allende as President of Chile in 1970. We were treated to the specter of a Government agency's being used for private purposes.

Recent revelations in the press have made us painfully aware of the dangers—both to our foreign policy and to our democracy—of a supersecret government agency dedicated to undermining and "destabilizing" any country it believes poses a threat to our "national security." Equally serious is the growing tendency of our multinational corporations to use any means necessary to shape the environments in which they do business to conform to their economic needs. The combined power and arrogance of a CIA and an ITT poses a frightening picture of a future world.

This bill passed the Senate in the last Congress. It deserves passage by both Houses and enactment into law.