

Two industrial giants, Reynolds Metal Co. and Alcoa, received \$42,000 and \$22,000 respectively for farms in Kentucky.

Oil barons, who receive a record number of tax breaks from the Federal Government, also have learned to tap the Federal faucet for farm payments.

In Louisiana, two oil companies drew payments of \$40,000 and \$29,000 each for their farms. In Texas, a drilling company dug up a subsidy of \$37,000.

Numerous land development companies collected huge subsidies in the South last year. One New Orleans land company collected \$195,000. Two other Louisiana land developers got over \$50,000 apiece.

In Florida, a land developer collected \$73,000 and in Mississippi another developer received just a little less than \$60,000.

Three years ago Congress put a \$55,000 ceiling on subsidy payments for cotton, wheat, and feed grain crops. Many large farms have avoided this payment limitation by the simple device of subdividing the land and incorporating under various names.

My choice for the biggest subsidy subterfuge comes from Brownfield, Tex. In that town there are 15 subsidies listed in 15 different names but all at the same address. Twelve owners received identical payments of \$54,390 apiece, and the other three each got \$54,265. Together, the owners shared a total of \$815,000.

In South Carolina, four members of one family plus two family corporations divided up payments of \$310,000 six ways. Four coowners of a Texas farm split up a total of \$295,000. In Alabama, three members of a family and a family corporation collected almost \$160,000.

The next time you are pushing a grocery basket, trying to balance the family budget with the outrageous price of food, think about why food prices are so high.

One reason is the wasteful farm subsidy program. It pays farmers not to grow some crops, and for other crops it underwrites an expensive system of price supports and supplements.

I got a laugh out of some of the names of farms that received large payments. The "Hard Scramble Plantation" and "Shoestring, Inc." are two that stand out. They collected payments of \$52,000 and \$27,000 last year.

With subsidies like these when food prices are so high, it is not the farmer who is scrambling on a shoestring—it is the consumer.

CONGRESS MUST INVESTIGATE THE CIA

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress in January 1969, I received invitations from many Government agencies to visit their offices and see how they worked. Eagerly I accepted many of them and one with particular interest, the CIA. Along with 18 other freshmen Congressmen, I went to the CIA headquarters in McLean, Va., for breakfast. There the then Director Ri-

chard Helms gave us background material on the CIA and its operation. At the conclusion of his address he said we now had our first—and probably last—opportunity to ask the CIA any question we wanted to.

I raised my hand and asked:

How many employees do you have and what is the size of your annual budget?

His response was:

There are only 2 questions which I cannot answer and those are the two.

I said:

Are you telling me that as a Member of Congress I do not have access to the records which would show me your annual payroll since I vote on that?

His response was:

The CIA's appropriation does not appear in the annual budget passed by the Congress and is buried in some other department.

I responded:

Are you telling me that your appropriation might be included under Social Security?

He said:

We haven't used that one yes but it's a good idea.

I recall that story now because of recent events involving the CIA.

I called the attention of this House last February 6 to the fact that the CIA in violation of the 1947 act which created it, was giving special training to local law enforcement officers, including 14 officers from the police department of the city of New York. It was revealed that at least 12 local law enforcement agencies throughout the country had received CIA training in the last 2 years. I asked our colleague, Chairman CHER HOLIFIELD, to investigate the matter. He took it up with the CIA and advised the House on March 5 that as a result of his discussions with the new Director, James R. Schlesinger, he had received assurances that such activities would be undertaken in the future only in the most compelling circumstances and with the Director's personal approval.

Within the last week we have been alerted through the diligence of newspaper reporters, and not, I am sorry to say through the efforts of Members of Congress, that the CIA was linked to the burglary of the office of Dr. Daniel Ellsberg's former psychiatrist. It is reported in today's New York Times that:

Gen. Robert E. Cushman, Jr., the Marine Corps commandant who in 1971 was Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, authorized the use of Central Intelligence Agency material and research in the burglary of that office.

The National Security Act of 1947 provides that the CIA shall have no police, subpoena, law enforcement powers, and internal security functions. The CIA has violated that law in at least these two cases. I suspect these two are the tiniest tip of the iceberg. I have asked Chairman HOLIFIELD today by letter to undertake an extensive review of the CIA activities; and not simply rely on the assurances of the Director of the CIA that this particular kind of violation will not be repeated. We must ascertain how many activities of this kind about which we have no

knowledge at all, have taken place since 1947.

I recognize the need to maintain the legitimate confidentiality of CIA operations. But there is a balance to be maintained and the Congress has a responsibility to be sure that an agency does not violate the law which created it. If Congress is duped once by an agency, then the Congress can say it made a mistake. But if Congress is duped twice and does nothing, then it is no longer duped; it becomes a conspirator in the violation of the law. These violations of law are always couched in the pretext that national security interests are being protected. I trust this response will no longer satisfy anyone today.

SEX DISCRIMINATION BY THE AIR FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, blatant sex discrimination persists in the U.S. Air Force, despite recent attempts at reform to bring the armed services into line with the Constitution.

That such repugnant unequal treatment of our men and women in uniform still exists was forcibly brought to my attention recently by the case of 1st Lt. Regina Fleissner, a constituent of mine.

I am today introducing legislation to correct part of the problem, but since it is the discriminatory application of existing law which has afflicted Lieutenant Fleissner, I ask the help of all my colleagues in persuading the Air Force to abandon its archaic and regressive implementation of the law of the United States.

Lieutenant Fleissner is currently being denied BAQ, and may be subject to reimbursement claims for the costs of transportation, housing, and medical care, otherwise freely given, because of the mistaken application by the Air Force of the law which defines the dependency status of her adopted daughter. It is important to remember in the following recitation of Lieutenant Fleissner's case that none of her present problems would have occurred if she were male.

In 1971, while stationed at Grand Forks, N. Dak., Lieutenant Fleissner, as a single parent, adopted an 18-month-old child of Sioux Indian descent. Shortly after the adoption procedure was completed, except for the final decree, Lieutenant Fleissner married a sergeant who is also in the Air Force and who shortly after their marriage began a tour of duty at CCK Air Force Base, Taiwan. In the meantime, Lieutenant Fleissner applied for and was granted a "Joint Spouse Tour" and application was made for authorization for travel allowance for herself and her dependent and shipment of household goods. Lieutenant Fleissner and her daughter joined Sergeant Fleissner on December 6, 1972, in Taiwan where they presently reside.

During the latter part of December, the Fleissners were advised that a question had arisen regarding the eligibility