

**The original documents are located in Box 30, folder “Presidential Meetings with Members of The House of Representatives, 10/75” of the Loen and Leppert Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.**

### **Copyright Notice**

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

10/3/75

This schedule proposal has been turned down. Forsythe and Ruppe have been invited in to see the P. for the GOP Leadership meeting on Tuesday, 10/7/75 - 8 to 9:30 a.m. in Cabinet Room - to discuss 200 mile fisheries bill.

Neta



WASHINGTON  
THE WHITE HOUSE

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

SCHEDULE PROPOSAL

DATE: September 22, 1975  
 FROM: Charles Leppert, Jr.  
 THRU: Max L. Friedersdorf  
 Vern Loen  
 VIA: Warren Rustand

MEETING: Reps. Edwin B. Forsythe (R-NJ) and  
 Don H. Clausen (R-Calif) et al

DATE: Open

PURPOSE: To discuss with the President, H.R. 200, the  
 "Marine Fisheries Conservation Act of 1975"

FORMAT: Cabinet Room (20 minutes)

PARTICIPANTS: List of Participants attached at Tab A

CABINET PARTICIPATION: See Tab A

SPEECH MATERIAL: Talking points to be provided by National Security  
 Council and Department of Commerce

PRESS COVERAGE: White House photographers only

STAFF: Charles Leppert, Jr.

RECOMMENDED: Max L. Friedersdorf

OPPOSED: None

PREVIOUS PARTICIPATION: None

BACKGROUND:

1. Rep. Forsythe is the Ranking Minority member of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Rep. Bob Leggett (D-Calif.) is the Subcommittee Chairman. Rep. Don H. Clausen (R-Calif) is interested in the fishing resources of the Pacific coast.
2. H.R. 200, the "Marine Fisheries Conservation Act of 1975" was reported from the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on July 31, 1975 by recorded vote of 36-3-1 (voting "nay" were

Anderson, Calif.; McCloskey, Calif.; and Treen, La. -- de la Garza, Tex. voted present.)  
H. R. 200 has strong bipartisan support in the House and is co-sponsored by 131 Members of the House.

3. Rep. Forsythe will represent H. R. 200, as a bill which establishes a comprehensive federal fisheries management program. It does not preclude foreign fishing within the 200 mile zone and recognizes a U. S. obligation to share our fishery resources with the world. Establishment of the 200 mile fisheries zone is delayed until July 1, 1976, subsequent to the next session of the Law of the Sea Conference.
4. Passage and enactment of H. R. 200 is unilateral action by the U. S. which will provide the international safeguards the U. S. must seek to obtain in an international treaty and prompt the Law of the Sea Conference, and the group of 77 countries in particular, to negotiate an international treaty with a greater sense of urgency and provide the U. S. with a positive negotiating posture.
5. Passage and enactment of H. R. 200 has definite political consequences for Republican Members from coastal districts because passage of the bill by the Democratic majority is a reasonable certainty. Forsythe and Clausen view a veto of the legislation as a disaster for Republican Members.
6. The record of the hearings before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee for the past five years provide overwhelming evidence that the once abundant fisheries resources of the U. S. coastal waters have been severely depleted or destroyed by Soviet, Polish and Eastern European fishing interests in the Northwest Atlantic off New England and the Soviets and Japanese off the states of Alaska and Washington. Existing fishery commissions are totally inadequate to settle the issues.
7. Progress in negotiation of a new bilateral Law of the Sea treaty has been only procedural to the extent that a so-called "Single Negotiating Text" has emerged. Substantive progress toward a

resolution of the issues has not begun. Establishment of a 200 mile "economic zone" is hotly disputed. In addition, the minimum requirements encompassing our national security interests, fisheries and regime for deep seabed mining are controversial and in dispute.

8. It is highly unlikely that any treaty will emerge from the Law of the Sea Conference in 1976, and only somewhat realistic to assume that a treaty can be negotiated before 1977, with ratification of such a treaty requiring several more years. There is a leadership crisis in the U.S. delegation to negotiate such a treaty because the Members lack the qualifications for such an important assignment.

Participants to meet with the President on H. R. 200, the  
"Marine Fisheries Conservation Act of 1975"

The President

Rep. Edwin B. Forsythe (R-NJ)  
Rep. Don H. Clausen (R-Calif.)  
Rep. David F. Emery (R-Me)  
Rep. Joel Pritchard (R-Wash.)  
Rep. Philip E. Ruppe (R-Mich.)  
Rep. Don Young (R-Alaska)

Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger  
Secretary of Commerce Rogers C. B. Morton

Richard N. Sharood      Minority Counsel, Comte on Merchant  
Marine and Fisheries

General Brent Scowcroft (staff)  
Charles Leppert, Jr. (staff)

LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN, MO., CHAIRMAN

THOMAS L. ASHLEY, OHIO  
 JOHN D. DINGELL, MICH.  
 THOMAS N. DOWNING, VA.  
 PAUL G. ROGERS, FLA.  
 JOHN M. MURPHY, N.Y.  
 WALTER B. JONES, N.C.  
 ROBERT L. LEGGETT, CALIF.  
 MARIO BIAGGI, N.Y.  
 GLENN M. ANDERSON, CALIF.  
 E (KIKI) DE LA GARZA, TEX.  
 RALPH H. METCALFE, ILL.  
 JOHN B. BREAUX, LA.  
 FRED B. ROONEY, PA.  
 PAUL S. SARBANES, MD.  
 BO GINN, GA.  
 GERRY E. STUDDS, MASS.  
 DAVID R. BOWEN, MISS.  
 JOSHUA EILBERG, PA.  
 RON DE LUGO, V.I.  
 CARROLL HUBBARD, JR., KY.  
 DON BONKER, WASH.  
 LES AU COIN, OREG.  
 NORMAN E. D'AMOURS, N.H.  
 JERRY M. PATTERSON, CALIF.  
 LEO C. ZEFERETTI, N.Y.  
 JAMES L. OBERSTAR, MINN.

PHILIP E. RUPPE, MICH.  
 CHARLES A. MOSHER, OHIO  
 PAUL N. MCCLOSKEY, JR., CALIF.  
 GENE SNYDER, KY.  
 EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, N.J.  
 PIERRE S. (PETE) DU PONT, DEL.  
 DAVID C. TREEN, LA.  
 JOEL PRITCHARD, WASH.  
 DON YOUNG, ALASKA  
 ROBERT E. BAUMAN, MD.  
 NORMAN F. LENT, N.Y.  
 MATTHEW J. RINALDO, N.J.  
 DAVID F. EMERY, MAINE

**U.S. House of Representatives**  
**Committee on**  
**Merchant Marine and Fisheries**  
 Room 1334, Longworth House Office Building  
 Washington, D.C. 20515

CHIEF CLERK  
 FRANCES STILL  
 MINORITY COUNSEL  
 RICHARD N. SHAROOD

September 19, 1975.

MEMORANDUM

To: Charles Leppert, Jr.,  
 Special Assistant for Legislative Affairs,  
 The White House.

From: Dick Sharood, Minority Counsel.

Re: Request on behalf of Congressman Forsythe and  
 Congressman Clausen to meet with the President -  
H.R. 200, Marine Fisheries Conservation Act of 1975.

Pursuant to your request, I am summarizing in the following paragraphs the main points which Congressman Forsythe and Congressman Clausen wish to make to the President with respect to the pending consideration in the House of H.R. 200. The overall purpose of this meeting is to impress upon the President the strong bipartisan support which this bill enjoys in the House, and to convince him that the Administration should adopt at least a neutral stance with respect to House passage of this bill. The question of veto is somewhat premature but may be raised. The specific points the Members wish to make are as follows:

(1) Fisheries Resources - the Urgent Need to Act.

The record of hearings before the Merchant Marine Committee extending back over the past five years provides overwhelming evidence that once abundant resources of United States coastal waters have been severely depleted. The resources of the Northwest Atlantic off New England have been virtually destroyed. Largely it is the result of Soviet, Polish and

other Eastern bloc fishing. Existing fishery arrangements such as the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries have proven to be totally inadequate. The extensive resources off Alaska and Washington, although not depleted to the degree of our New England fisheries, are headed in the same direction as a result of both Russian and Japanese fishing efforts. It is conservatively estimated that the reduction in fish stocks of only two species - haddock off New England, and sardines off California - have resulted in a cumulative loss of over one-half billion dollars. This loss continues to escalate at a rate of over \$100 million a year.

The State Department argument in opposition to enactment of legislation to give the United States management control over our fisheries resources totally ignores the urgency of the problem, and seems to be predicated upon the false assumption that we are in some kind of holding pattern with respect to the decline of our fisheries. This is totally untrue.

(2) Status of the Law of the Sea Negotiations.

The President has been advised apparently that significant progress has been made in the negotiation of a new Law of the Sea treaty. While progress of a procedural nature has indeed been made to the extent that a so-called "Single Negotiating Text" has emerged, substantive progress toward the resolution of issues has barely begun. While there is a clear consensus in favor of a 200-mile economic zone, the conditions under which the United States would agree to the establishment of such a zone are hotly disputed.

In the first place, the United States has insisted from the outset of these negotiations that we would only accept a treaty that meets all of our minimum requirements encompassing national security aspects, fisheries and the regime for the deep seabed. Progress in any one of these areas is meaningless in and of itself, since it is negotiation of the comprehensive package that will determine our final acceptance or rejection of the treaty.



Progress with respect to fisheries has not been matched by progress in the field of the seabed regime and deep sea mining. The seabed regime issue is the most difficult aspect of the package to negotiate, since it is with respect to this problem that the developing nations are most paranoid. There is overwhelming sentiment in the United Nations on the part of the Group of 77 against a seabed regime, which would permit exploitation of seabed resources by the developed or capitalist nations. The adoption of a seabed regime overwhelmingly controlled by developing nations cannot be accepted by the United States, and yet the likelihood is that this will occur.

To a somewhat lesser extent, we have a similar problem with respect to our security interests. Accordingly, the negotiation of a treaty which the U.S. can accept is far from a certainty. The likelihood of any treaty emerging in 1976, since we are only on the threshold of substantive negotiation, is very slight. It is, therefore, realistic to assume that even if a treaty can be negotiated, this will not occur before some time in 1977. Finally, in this regard ratification will require several more years on a conservative basis. The U.S. proposal for general implementation of the treaty pending ratification has never received wide acceptance.

(3) The Bureaucratic Bias.

The President should view with a high degree of skepticism the optimistic prognosis of the State Department that a Law of the Sea treaty can be negotiated successfully whether in 1976 or later. There is serious disagreement within the executive agencies over the U.S. negotiating position with key elements - the Treasury and Interior Departments - taking a very conservative view of the desirability of the treaty from the standpoint of long-range U.S. interests.

The State Department, of course, is calling the shots at this point and has been able up to now to pretty much mask these internal disagreements. There is, we believe, a strong bias in the State Department in favor of a treaty almost without regard to its substance. There are a number

of key individuals in the State Department and the Law of the Sea Task Force who are, in all candor, building their careers on the negotiation of this treaty. We question seriously whether they are in a position to give the President and the Secretary of State an honest appraisal of our prospects for a treaty that will satisfy the interests of the United States.

Further in this regard, there have been serious problems with respect to the staff of the Law of the Sea delegation. John Stevenson, who has in the past very ably headed the U.S. delegation, is out, and Carlisle Maw is replacing him on an interim basis. It is strongly felt that Maw lacks the qualifications to undertake this extremely important job. The head of the Interagency Task Force on the Law of the Sea, John Moore, is not well-respected on the Hill, and does not seem capable of resolving the many internal conflicts within the U.S. delegation. There is, in essence, a leadership crisis within the U.S. delegation which will compound our difficulties when the conference resumes next year.

(4) The Provisions of H.R. 200.

The text of H.R. 200, as reported by the Merchant Marine Committee, primarily establishes a comprehensive federal fisheries management program. It incorporates all of the basic proposals of the Department of Commerce with respect to fisheries management that will be required regardless of whether U.S. management responsibility comes about through unilateral action or through the eventual ratification of a treaty. It is a reasonable and well-thought-out program.

It was exhaustively considered by both the Subcommittee and the Full Committee. The legislation does not preclude foreign fishing within the 200-mile zone. To the contrary, it expressly recognizes the obligation of the United States to share our fishery resources with the world. It reflects all of the tenets of the U.S. negotiating position with regard to fisheries management, and which will serve as a model to the world of rational fisheries conservation.

The President should note that the establishment of a 200-mile fisheries zone is delayed until July 1, 1976, following the next scheduled session of the Law of the Sea conference. Enactment of the legislation now will provide the lead-time which is essential for establishment of the management mechanism that will be needed in any event.

(5) Impact of H.R. 200 on Law of the Sea Negotiations.

It is urged by the State Department that enactment of H.R. 200 would frustrate the Law of the Sea conference. In other words, the participating nations, particularly the Group of 77 countries, would simply pick up their marbles and go home, thereafter adopting their own 200-mile zones, which would probably not provide the international safeguards we hope to obtain in a treaty. The rest of the world would use the U.S. initiative as an excuse for declaring 200-mile territorial seas. We feel strongly that this is a terribly simplistic argument, and that there is far more likelihood that the enactment of H.R. 200 will serve as a catalyst. It may well prompt considerable vituperation on the part of certain Group of 77 nations, but the overwhelming majority of the nations engaged in the conference will be prompted to negotiate with a greater sense of urgency. There will not be a general walk-out. A hard-nosed attitude on the part of the United States, while involving some risks, will on balance lead to a more productive conference. We have allowed the Group of 77 to dominate these negotiations for the past three years. The conference has been misused. This will not change unless the United States and other developed nations adopt a totally different negotiating posture.

(6) Domestic Political Aspects of H.R. 200.

The passage of this legislation and its enactment into law is a life-and-death political issue for Congressmen Forsythe, Clausen and virtually every other Republican Member from a coastal district. Passage of the legislation by the Democratic majority is reasonably certain. A veto by the President would be a disaster for Republican Members.

At least one TV network is planning a major program on the issue to coincide with House consideration of the bill. Local coverage in all coastal areas will be extensive, particularly in the New England states, Alaska and the Pacific Northwest.

RNS:vln.

LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN, MO., CHAIRMAN

THOMAS L. ASHLEY, OHIO  
JOHN D. DINGELL, MICH.  
THOMAS M. DOWNING, VA.  
PAUL G. ROGERS, FLA.  
JOHN M. MURPHY, N.Y.  
WALTER B. JONES, N.C.  
ROBERT L. LEGGETT, CALIF.  
MARIO BIAGGI, N.Y.  
GLENN M. ANDERSON, CALIF.  
E (KIKI) DE LA GARZA, TEX.  
RALPH H. METCALFE, ILL.  
JOHN B. BREAUX, LA.  
FRED B. ROONEY, PA.  
PAUL S. SARBANES, MD.  
BO GINN, GA.  
GERRY E. STUDDO, MASS.  
DAVID R. BOWEN, MISS.  
JOSHUA EILBERG, PA.  
RON DE LUGO, V.I.  
CARROLL HUBBARD, JR., KY.  
DON BONKER, WASH.  
LES AU COIN, OREG.  
NORMAN E. D'AMOURS, N.H.  
JERRY M. PATTERSON, CALIF.  
LEO C. ZEFERETTI, N.Y.  
JAMES L. OBERSTAR, MINN.

PHILIP E. RUPPE, MICH.  
CHARLES A. MOSHER, OHIO  
PAUL N. MCCLOSKEY, JR., CALIF.  
GENE SNYDER, KY.  
EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, N.J.  
PIERRE S. (PETE) DU PONT, DEL.  
DAVID C. TREEN, LA.  
JOEL PRITCHARD, WASH.  
DON YOUNG, ALASKA  
ROBERT E. BAUMAN, MD.  
NORMAN F. LENT, N.Y.  
MATTHEW J. RINALDO, N.J.  
DAVID F. EMERY, MAINE

**U.S. House of Representatives**  
**Committee on**  
**Merchant Marine and Fisheries**  
Room 1334, Longworth House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

CHIEF COUNSEL  
ERNEST J. CORRADO  
CHIEF CLERK  
FRANCES STILL  
MINORITY COUNSEL  
RICHARD N. SHAROOD

September 19, 1975.

**MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Charles Leppert, Jr.,  
Special Assistant for Legislative Affairs,  
The White House.

**From:** Dick Sharood, Minority Counsel.

**Re:** Request on behalf of Congressman Forsythe and  
Congressman Clausen to meet with the President -  
H.R. 200, Marine Fisheries Conservation Act of 1975.

Pursuant to your request, I am summarizing in the following paragraphs the main points which Congressman Forsythe and Congressman Clausen wish to make to the President with respect to the pending consideration in the House of H.R. 200. The overall purpose of this meeting is to impress upon the President the strong bipartisan support which this bill enjoys in the House, and to convince him that the Administration should adopt at least a neutral stance with respect to House passage of this bill. The question of veto is somewhat premature but may be raised. The specific points the Members wish to make are as follows:

(1) Fisheries Resources - the Urgent Need to Act.

The record of hearings before the Merchant Marine Committee extending back over the past five years provides overwhelming evidence that once abundant resources of United States coastal waters have been severely depleted. The resources of the Northwest Atlantic off New England have been virtually destroyed. Largely it is the result of Soviet, Polish and

other Eastern bloc fishing. Existing fishery arrangements such as the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries have proven to be totally inadequate. The extensive resources off Alaska and Washington, although not depleted to the degree of our New England fisheries, are headed in the same direction as a result of both Russian and Japanese fishing efforts. It is conservatively estimated that the reduction in fish stocks of only two species - haddock off New England, and sardines off California - have resulted in a cumulative loss of over one-half billion dollars. This loss continues to escalate at a rate of over \$100 million a year.

The State Department argument in opposition to enactment of legislation to give the United States management control over our fisheries resources totally ignores the urgency of the problem, and seems to be predicated upon the false assumption that we are in some kind of holding pattern with respect to the decline of our fisheries. This is totally untrue.

(2) Status of the Law of the Sea Negotiations.

The President has been advised apparently that significant progress has been made in the negotiation of a new Law of the Sea treaty. While progress of a procedural nature has indeed been made to the extent that a so-called "Single Negotiating Text" has emerged, substantive progress toward the resolution of issues has barely begun. While there is a clear consensus in favor of a 200-mile economic zone, the conditions under which the United States would agree to the establishment of such a zone are hotly disputed.

In the first place, the United States has insisted from the outset of these negotiations that we would only accept a treaty that meets all of our minimum requirements encompassing national security aspects, fisheries and the regime for the deep seabed. Progress in any one of these areas is meaningless in and of itself, since it is negotiation of the comprehensive package that will determine our final acceptance or rejection of the treaty.

Progress with respect to fisheries has not been matched by progress in the field of the seabed regime and deep sea mining. The seabed regime issue is the most difficult aspect of the package to negotiate, since it is with respect to this problem that the developing nations are most paranoid. There is overwhelming sentiment in the United Nations on the part of the Group of 77 against a seabed regime, which would permit exploitation of seabed resources by the developed or capitalist nations. The adoption of a seabed regime overwhelmingly controlled by developing nations cannot be accepted by the United States, and yet the likelihood is that this will occur.

To a somewhat lesser extent, we have a similar problem with respect to our security interests. Accordingly, the negotiation of a treaty which the U.S. can accept is far from a certainty. The likelihood of any treaty emerging in 1976, since we are only on the threshold of substantive negotiation, is very slight. It is, therefore, realistic to assume that even if a treaty can be negotiated, this will not occur before some time in 1977. Finally, in this regard ratification will require several more years on a conservative basis. The U.S. proposal for general implementation of the treaty pending ratification has never received wide acceptance.

(3) The Bureaucratic Bias.

The President should view with a high degree of skepticism the optimistic prognosis of the State Department that a Law of the Sea treaty can be negotiated successfully whether in 1976 or later. There is serious disagreement within the executive agencies over the U.S. negotiating position with key elements - the Treasury and Interior Departments - taking a very conservative view of the desirability of the treaty from the standpoint of long-range U.S. interests.

The State Department, of course, is calling the shots at this point and has been able up to now to pretty much mask these internal disagreements. There is, we believe, a strong bias in the State Department in favor of a treaty almost without regard to its substance. There are a number

of key individuals in the State Department and the Law of the Sea Task Force who are, in all candor, building their careers on the negotiation of this treaty. We question seriously whether they are in a position to give the President and the Secretary of State an honest appraisal of our prospects for a treaty that will satisfy the interests of the United States.

Further in this regard, there have been serious problems with respect to the staff of the Law of the Sea delegation. John Stevenson, who has in the past very ably headed the U.S. delegation, is out, and Carlisle Maw is replacing him on an interim basis. It is strongly felt that Maw lacks the qualifications to undertake this extremely important job. The head of the Interagency Task Force on the Law of the Sea, John Moore, is not well-respected on the Hill, and does not seem capable of resolving the many internal conflicts within the U.S. delegation. There is, in essence, a leadership crisis within the U.S. delegation which will compound our difficulties when the conference resumes next year.

(4) The Provisions of H.R. 200.

The text of H.R. 200, as reported by the Merchant Marine Committee, primarily establishes a comprehensive federal fisheries management program. It incorporates all of the basic proposals of the Department of Commerce with respect to fisheries management that will be required regardless of whether U.S. management responsibility comes about through unilateral action or through the eventual ratification of a treaty. It is a reasonable and well-thought-out program.

It was exhaustively considered by both the Subcommittee and the Full Committee. The legislation does not preclude foreign fishing within the 200-mile zone. To the contrary, it expressly recognizes the obligation of the United States to share our fishery resources with the world. It reflects all of the tenets of the U.S. negotiating position with regard to fisheries management, and which will serve as a model to the world of rational fisheries conservation.



The President should note that the establishment of a 200-mile fisheries zone is delayed until July 1, 1976, following the next scheduled session of the Law of the Sea conference. Enactment of the legislation now will provide the lead-time which is essential for establishment of the management mechanism that will be needed in any event.

(5) Impact of H.R. 200 on Law of the Sea Negotiations.

It is urged by the State Department that enactment of H.R. 200 would frustrate the Law of the Sea conference. In other words, the participating nations, particularly the Group of 77 countries, would simply pick up their marbles and go home, thereafter adopting their own 200-mile zones, which would probably not provide the international safeguards we hope to obtain in a treaty. The rest of the world would use the U.S. initiative as an excuse for declaring 200-mile territorial seas. We feel strongly that this is a terribly simplistic argument, and that there is far more likelihood that the enactment of H.R. 200 will serve as a catalyst. It may well prompt considerable vituperation on the part of certain Group of 77 nations, but the overwhelming majority of the nations engaged in the conference will be prompted to negotiate with a greater sense of urgency. There will not be a general walk-out. A hard-nosed attitude on the part of the United States, while involving some risks, will on balance lead to a more productive conference. We have allowed the Group of 77 to dominate these negotiations for the past three years. The conference has been misused. This will not change unless the United States and other developed nations adopt a totally different negotiating posture.

(6) Domestic Political Aspects of H.R. 200.

The passage of this legislation and its enactment into law is a life-and-death political issue for Congressmen Forsythe, Clausen and virtually every other Republican Member from a coastal district. Passage of the legislation by the Democratic majority is reasonably certain. A veto by the President would be a disaster for Republican Members.

At least one TV network is planning a major program on the issue to coincide with House consideration of the bill. Local coverage in all coastal areas will be extensive, particularly in the New England states, Alaska and the Pacific Northwest.

RNS:vln.

LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN, MO., CHAIRMAN

THOMAS L. ASHLEY, OHIO  
 JOHN D. DINGELL, MICH.  
 THOMAS N. DOWNING, VA.  
 PAUL G. ROGERS, FLA.  
 JOHN M. MURPHY, N.Y.  
 WALTER B. JONES, N.C.  
 ROBERT L. LEGGETT, CALIF.  
 MARIO BIAGGI, N.Y.  
 GLENN M. ANDERSON, CALIF.  
 E (KIKI) DE LA GARZA, TEX.  
 RALPH H. METCALFE, ILL.  
 JOHN B. BREAUX, LA.  
 FRED B. ROONEY, PA.  
 PAUL S. SARBANES, MD.  
 BO GINN, GA.  
 GERRY E. STUDDS, MASS.  
 DAVID R. BOWEN, MISS.  
 JOSHUA EILBERG, PA.  
 RON DE LUGO, V.I.  
 CARROLL HUBBARD, JR., KY.  
 DON BONKER, WASH.  
 LES AU COIN, OREG.  
 NORMAN E. D'AMOURS, N.H.  
 JERRY M. PATTERSON, CALIF.  
 LEO C. ZEFERETTI, N.Y.  
 JAMES L. OBERSTAR, MINN.

PHILIP E. RUPPE, MICH.  
 CHARLES A. MOSHER, OHIO  
 PAUL N. MCCLOSKEY, JR., CALIF.  
 GENE SNYDER, KY.  
 EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, N.J.  
 PIERRE S. (PETE) DU PONT, DEL.  
 DAVID C. TREEN, LA.  
 JOEL PRITCHARD, WASH.  
 DON YOUNG, ALASKA  
 ROBERT E. BAUMAN, MD.  
 NORMAN F. LENT, N.Y.  
 MATTHEW J. RINALDO, N.J.  
 DAVID F. EMERY, MAINE

**U.S. House of Representatives**  
**Committee on**  
**Merchant Marine and Fisheries**  
 Room 1334, Longworth House Office Building  
 Washington, D.C. 20515

CHIEF COUNSEL

ERNEST J. CORRADO

CHIEF CLERK

FRANCES STILL

MINORITY COUNSEL

RICHARD N. SHAROOD

September 19, 1975.

MEMORANDUM

**To:** Charles Leppert, Jr.,  
 Special Assistant for Legislative Affairs,  
 The White House.

**From:** Dick Sharood, Minority Counsel.

**Re:** Request on behalf of Congressman Forsythe and  
 Congressman Clausen to meet with the President -  
H.R. 200, Marine Fisheries Conservation Act of 1975.

Pursuant to your request, I am summarizing in the following paragraphs the main points which Congressman Forsythe and Congressman Clausen wish to make to the President with respect to the pending consideration in the House of H.R. 200. The overall purpose of this meeting is to impress upon the President the strong bipartisan support which this bill enjoys in the House, and to convince him that the Administration should adopt at least a neutral stance with respect to House passage of this bill. The question of veto is somewhat premature but may be raised. The specific points the Members wish to make are as follows:

(1) Fisheries Resources - the Urgent Need to Act.

The record of hearings before the Merchant Marine Committee extending back over the past five years provides overwhelming evidence that once abundant resources of United States coastal waters have been severely depleted. The resources of the Northwest Atlantic off New England have been virtually destroyed. Largely it is the result of Soviet, Polish and

other Eastern bloc fishing. Existing fishery arrangements such as the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries have proven to be totally inadequate. The extensive resources off Alaska and Washington, although not depleted to the degree of our New England fisheries, are headed in the same direction as a result of both Russian and Japanese fishing efforts. It is conservatively estimated that the reduction in fish stocks of only two species - haddock off New England, and sardines off California - have resulted in a cumulative loss of over one-half billion dollars. This loss continues to escalate at a rate of over \$100 million a year.

The State Department argument in opposition to enactment of legislation to give the United States management control over our fisheries resources totally ignores the urgency of the problem, and seems to be predicated upon the false assumption that we are in some kind of holding pattern with respect to the decline of our fisheries. This is totally untrue.

(2) Status of the Law of the Sea Negotiations.

The President has been advised apparently that significant progress has been made in the negotiation of a new Law of the Sea treaty. While progress of a procedural nature has indeed been made to the extent that a so-called "Single Negotiating Text" has emerged, substantive progress toward the resolution of issues has barely begun. While there is a clear consensus in favor of a 200-mile economic zone, the conditions under which the United States would agree to the establishment of such a zone are hotly disputed.

In the first place, the United States has insisted from the outset of these negotiations that we would only accept a treaty that meets all of our minimum requirements encompassing national security aspects, fisheries and the regime for the deep seabed. Progress in any one of these areas is meaningless in and of itself, since it is negotiation of the comprehensive package that will determine our final acceptance or rejection of the treaty.

Progress with respect to fisheries has not been matched by progress in the field of the seabed regime and deep sea mining. The seabed regime issue is the most difficult aspect of the package to negotiate, since it is with respect to this problem that the developing nations are most paranoid. There is overwhelming sentiment in the United Nations on the part of the Group of 77 against a seabed regime, which would permit exploitation of seabed resources by the developed or capitalist nations. The adoption of a seabed regime overwhelmingly controlled by developing nations cannot be accepted by the United States, and yet the likelihood is that this will occur.

To a somewhat lesser extent, we have a similar problem with respect to our security interests. Accordingly, the negotiation of a treaty which the U.S. can accept is far from a certainty. The likelihood of any treaty emerging in 1976, since we are only on the threshold of substantive negotiation, is very slight. It is, therefore, realistic to assume that even if a treaty can be negotiated, this will not occur before some time in 1977. Finally, in this regard ratification will require several more years on a conservative basis. The U.S. proposal for general implementation of the treaty pending ratification has never received wide acceptance.

(3) The Bureaucratic Bias.

The President should view with a high degree of skepticism the optimistic prognosis of the State Department that a Law of the Sea treaty can be negotiated successfully whether in 1976 or later. There is serious disagreement within the executive agencies over the U.S. negotiating position with key elements - the Treasury and Interior Departments - taking a very conservative view of the desirability of the treaty from the standpoint of long-range U.S. interests.

The State Department, of course, is calling the shots at this point and has been able up to now to pretty much mask these internal disagreements. There is, we believe, a strong bias in the State Department in favor of a treaty almost without regard to its substance. There are a number

of key individuals in the State Department and the Law of the Sea Task Force who are, in all candor, building their careers on the negotiation of this treaty. We question seriously whether they are in a position to give the President and the Secretary of State an honest appraisal of our prospects for a treaty that will satisfy the interests of the United States.

Further in this regard, there have been serious problems with respect to the staff of the Law of the Sea delegation. John Stevenson, who has in the past very ably headed the U.S. delegation, is out, and Carlisle Maw is replacing him on an interim basis. It is strongly felt that Maw lacks the qualifications to undertake this extremely important job. The head of the Interagency Task Force on the Law of the Sea, John Moore, is not well-respected on the Hill, and does not seem capable of resolving the many internal conflicts within the U.S. delegation. There is, in essence, a leadership crisis within the U.S. delegation which will compound our difficulties when the conference resumes next year.

(4) The Provisions of H.R. 200.

The text of H.R. 200, as reported by the Merchant Marine Committee, primarily establishes a comprehensive federal fisheries management program. It incorporates all of the basic proposals of the Department of Commerce with respect to fisheries management that will be required regardless of whether U.S. management responsibility comes about through unilateral action or through the eventual ratification of a treaty. It is a reasonable and well-thought-out program.

It was exhaustively considered by both the Subcommittee and the Full Committee. The legislation does not preclude foreign fishing within the 200-mile zone. To the contrary, it expressly recognizes the obligation of the United States to share our fishery resources with the world. It reflects all of the tenets of the U.S. negotiating position with regard to fisheries management, and which will serve as a model to the world of rational fisheries conservation.

The President should note that the establishment of a 200-mile fisheries zone is delayed until July 1, 1976, following the next scheduled session of the Law of the Sea conference. Enactment of the legislation now will provide the lead-time which is essential for establishment of the management mechanism that will be needed in any event.

(5) Impact of H.R. 200 on Law of the Sea Negotiations.

It is urged by the State Department that enactment of H.R. 200 would frustrate the Law of the Sea conference. In other words, the participating nations, particularly the Group of 77 countries, would simply pick up their marbles and go home, thereafter adopting their own 200-mile zones, which would probably not provide the international safeguards we hope to obtain in a treaty. The rest of the world would use the U.S. initiative as an excuse for declaring 200-mile territorial seas. We feel strongly that this is a terribly simplistic argument, and that there is far more likelihood that the enactment of H.R. 200 will serve as a catalyst. It may well prompt considerable vituperation on the part of certain Group of 77 nations, but the overwhelming majority of the nations engaged in the conference will be prompted to negotiate with a greater sense of urgency. There will not be a general walk-out. A hard-nosed attitude on the part of the United States, while involving some risks, will on balance lead to a more productive conference. We have allowed the Group of 77 to dominate these negotiations for the past three years. The conference has been misused. This will not change unless the United States and other developed nations adopt a totally different negotiating posture.

(6) Domestic Political Aspects of H.R. 200.

The passage of this legislation and its enactment into law is a life-and-death political issue for Congressmen Forsythe, Clausen and virtually every other Republican Member from a coastal district. Passage of the legislation by the Democratic majority is reasonably certain. A veto by the President would be a disaster for Republican Members.

At least one TV network is planning a major program on the issue to coincide with House consideration of the bill. Local coverage in all coastal areas will be extensive, particularly in the New England states, Alaska and the Pacific Northwest.

RNS:vln.



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 20, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: VERN LOEN  
CHARLIE LEPPERT

FROM: TOM LOEFFLER *TL*.

SUBJECT: LIG Meeting -- HR-200, the 200-Mile  
Fisheries Bill

The 200-Mile Fisheries Bill is anticipated to be considered by the Congress <sup>(House)</sup> around the first of October. At a LIG meeting on Wednesday, September 17, it was agreed that State, Transportation, Defense and the White House would contact assigned Members of Congress in an effort to ascertain their position on this legislation. The following Members are to be contacted by the White House:

Carl Albert	Lou Frey
John Anderson	George Hansen
Bill Broomfield	Wayne Hays
Clarence Brown	Del Latta
Garry Brown	John McFall
Phil Burton	Bob Michel
Barber Conable	Jim Quillen
Ed Derwinski	John Rhodes
Jack Edwards	Dave Satterfield
Millicent Fenwick	Joe Waggoner

These White House contacts should be made by Thursday, September 25. Les Janka intends to convene another LIG meeting on this topic on or about Friday, September 26.

**THE WHITE HOUSE**

**WASHINGTON**

10/14/75

Hold in file until Bennett contacts us for mtg w/P. His Sept. 8th ltr to P. requested a delay until he reviewed stockpile situation again.

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

*check w/WH.  
for attachments*  
SCHEDULE PROPOSAL

DATE: August 28, 1975  
THRU: Max Friedersdorf  
FROM: Charles Leppert *CL*  
VIA: Warren Rustand

MEETING: Rep. Charles E. Bennett (D-Fla.)

DATE: As soon as possible

PURPOSE: To discuss with the President the strategic stockpile guidelines

FORMAT: The Oval Office - 10 minutes

PARTICIPANTS: The President  
Rep. Charles E. Bennett  
Lt. Gen. Brent Scowcroft  
Charles Leppert (staff)

SPEECH  
MATERIAL: Talking points to be provided by NSC

PRESS  
COVERAGE: White House Photographer only

RECOMMEND: John Marsh

BACKGROUND: 1. Mr. Bennett requested this meeting with the President in letters dated March 27 and April 16, 1975.

2. Rep. Bennett received a classified response dated April 11 from Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, John J. Bennett.

3. Rep. Bennett is third-ranking Democratic member on the Committee on Armed Services and chairs the Subcommittee having jurisdiction over strategic and critical materials.

4. He has declined to consider Administration disposal bills since the guidelines were changed in early 1973. He wants a return to the earlier guidelines.

APPROVE \_\_\_\_\_ DISAPPROVE \_\_\_\_\_

October 16, 1975

Dear Trent:

Enclosed are the pictures taken during your meeting with the President on October 8.

I am pleased to send them to you with the best wishes of the President.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Vernon C. Loen  
Deputy Assistant  
to the President

Honorable Trent Lott  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

VCL:vh	enclosures	black and white
	(1)	8OC75A6829-13A
	(1)	8OC75A6829-22A



October 16, 1975

Dear Marjorie:

Enclosed are the pictures taken during your meeting with the President on October 8.

I am pleased to send them to you with the best wishes of the President.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Vernon G. Loeb  
Deputy Assistant  
to the President

Honorable Marjorie S. Holt  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

VCL:vh

enclosures black and white  
(1) 80C75A6829-11A  
(1) 80C75A6829-12A



October 16, 1975

Dear John:

Enclosed are the pictures taken during your meeting with the President on October 8.

I am pleased to send them to you with the best wishes of the President.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Vernon C. Loen  
Deputy Assistant  
to the President

Honorable John H. Rousselot  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

VEL:vh

enclosures    black and white  
(1)            8OC75A6829-13A  
(1)            8OC75A6829-11A



October 16, 1975

Dear Clair:

Enclosed are the pictures taken during your meeting with the President on October 8.

I am pleased to send them to you with the best wishes of the President.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Vernon C. Loen  
Deputy Assistant  
to the President

Honorable Clair W. Burgener  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

VCL:vh                   enclosures   black and white  
                          (1)           8OC75A6829-15A  
                          (1)           8OC75A6829-17A



October 16, 1975

Dear Del:

Enclosed are the pictures taken during your meeting with the President on October 8.

I am pleased to send them to you with the best wishes of the President.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Vernon C. Loen  
Deputy Assistant  
to the President

Honorable Del Clawson  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

VCK:vh                      enclosures    black and white  
(1)                      80C75A6829-11A  
(1)                      80C75A6829-15A





October 16, 1975

Dear Dave:

Enclosed are the pictures taken during your meeting with the President on October 8.

I am pleased to send them to you with the best wishes of the President.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Vernon C. Loen  
Deputy Assistant  
to the President

Honorable David C. Treen  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

VCL:vh                      enclosures   black and white  
(1)                      8OC75A6829-17A  
(1)                      8OC75A6829-11A  
(1)                      8OC75A6829-12A



October 16, 1975

Dear Bill:

Enclosed are the pictures taken during your meeting with the President on October 8.

I am pleased to send them to you with the best wishes of the President.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Vernon C. Loen  
Deputy Assistant  
to the President

Honorable William L. Dickinson  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

VCL:vh	enclosures	black and white
	(1)	80C75A6829-15A
	(1)	80C75A6829-17A
	(1)	80C75A6829-12A



October 15, 1975

Dear Tom:

Enclosed are the pictures taken during your meeting with the President on October 8.

I am pleased to send them to you with the best wishes of the President.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Vernon C. Loen  
Deputy Assistant  
to the President

Honorable Tom Hagedorn  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

VCL:vh    enclosures    black and white

(1)            8OC75A6829-12A  
(1)            8OC75A6829-22A



October 16, 1975

Dear Sam:

Enclosed are the pictures taken during your meeting with the President on October 8.

I am pleased to send them to you with the best wishes of the President.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Vernon C. Loen  
Deputy Assistant  
to the President

Honorable Samuel L. Devine  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

VCL:vh

enclosures black and white

(1) 80C75A6829-22A  
(1) 80C75A6829-12A



October 16, 1975

Dear Bill:

Enclosed are the pictures taken during your meeting with the President on October 8.

I am pleased to send them to you with the best wishes of the President.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Vernon C. Loen  
Deputy Assistant  
to the President

Honorable William L. Armstrong  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

VCL:vh	enclosures (1)	80c75A6829-22A
	black and white	
	(1)	80C75A6829-13A
	(1)	80C75A6829-17A
	(1)	80C75A6829-15A



15A

l. b. n.  
11 Trent Lott.

11 Del Clawson

11 Same Trees

III Bell Armstrong

411 Bell Dickinson

4110  
4111 Clan Burgener

John Russell ✓

next to P

11 Sam Deane

11 Mary Holt

11 Tom Hagedorn

## PARTICIPANTS

*attended*

The President

### Executive Committee of the House Republican Study Committee

### SUBJECT

Rep. Marjorie S. Holt (Md.)	- (Chairwoman)	
<del>Rep. Barry M. Goldwater, Jr. (Ga.)</del>	<del>(Vice Chairman)</del>	
Rep. Tom Hagedorn (Minn.)	- (Vice Chairman)	Grain Exports
<del>Rep. Steven D. Symms (Idaho)</del>	<del>(Vice Chairman)</del>	
Rep. John H. Rousselot (Ca.)	- (Treasurer)	Housing
Rep. William L. Armstrong (Colo.)		Energy
<del>Rep. Robert F. Bauman (Md.)</del>		
<del>Rep. Robin I. Beard (Tenn.)</del>		
Rep. Clair W. Burgener (Ca.)		Food Stamps
Rep. Del Clawson (Ca.)		Common Situs
Rep. Samuel L. Devine (Ohio)		
Rep. William L. Dickinson (Ala.)		Post Card Registratio
<del>Rep. William F. Goodling (Pa.)</del>		
<del>Rep. Charles F. Crossley (Iowa)</del>		
<del>Rep. Jack F. Kemp (N.Y.)</del>		Job Creation
Rep. Trent Lott (Miss.)		
<del>Rep. Floyd Spence (S.C.)</del>		Consumer Protection
Rep. David C. Treen (La.)		

### White House Staff members

John O. Marsh  
~~Robert T. Hartmann~~  
 James Lynn  
 Alan Greenspan  
 Max L. Friedersdorf  
 James Cannon  
 Bill Seidman  
 Lt. Gen. Brent Scowcroft  
 Vern Loen  
 Charles Leppert, Jr.  
 Tom Loeffler  
*Don Rumsfeld*  
*Paul O'Neill*  
*Carla Hills*  
*Earle Butte*  
*John Hill*

### Cabinet Participation

*yes* ~~Carla Hills~~ - 735-6417 *De*  
~~Rep. Dan Rostenkowski~~ - 523-8311 *nancy*  
~~John Hill~~ *instead of* ~~John~~ - 961-6081 *Ray*  
~~yes~~ - ~~Butte~~ - ~~AGRICULT.~~  
~~Rep. MORTON~~ *Europe* ~~COMMERCE~~



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 7, 1975

MEETING WITH MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, October 8, 1975

4:30 p.m. (45 minutes)

The Cabinet Room

Thru: Max Friedersdorf

From: Vern Loen VL

I. PURPOSE

To exchange information and views with the President on issues of major concern to the Members of the House Republican Study Committee

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS AND PRESS PLAN

A. Background:

1. This group of Republican House conservatives last met with the President on April 30, 1975.
2. They hope to maintain a continuing dialogue with the President and would like to hold these sessions about every six months.
3. There are a few Reagan supporters in the group, but they are overwhelmingly friendly to the President. Many are critical of the Vice President and Secretary Kissinger.

B. Participants: The President  
House Republican Study Committee (see attached)  
White House staff members (see attached)

C. Press Plan: Announce to press  
White House photographer only



## PARTICIPANTS

### The President

<u>Executive Committee of the House Republican Study Committee</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
Rep. Marjorie S. Holt (Md.) - (Chairwoman)	
Rep. Barry M. Goldwater, Jr. (Ca.) - (Vice Chairman)	
Rep. Tom Hagedorn (Minn.) - (Vice Chairman)	Grain Exports
Rep. Steven D. Symms (Idaho) - (Vice Chairman)	
Rep. John H. Rousselot (Ca.) - (Treasurer)	Housing
Rep. William L. Armstrong (Colo.)	Energy
Rep. Robert E. Bauman (Md.)	
Rep. Robin L. Beard (Tenn.)	
Rep. Clair W. Burgener (Ca.)	Food Stamps
Rep. Del Clawson (Ca.)	Common Situs
Rep. Samuel L. Devine (Ohio)	
Rep. William L. Dickinson (Ala.)	Post Card Registration
Rep. William F. Goodling (Pa.)	
Rep. Charles E. Grassley (Iowa)	
Rep. Jack F. Kemp (N.Y.)	Job Creation
Rep. Trent Lott (Miss.)	
Rep. Floyd Spence (S.C.)	Consumer Protection
Rep. David C. Treen (La.)	

### White House Staff members

John O. Marsh  
Robert T. Hartmann  
James Lynn  
Alan Greenspan  
Max L. Friedersdorf  
James Cannon  
Bill Seidman  
Lt. Gen. Brent Scowcroft  
Vern Loen  
Charles Leppert, Jr.  
Tom Loeffler

### Cabinet Participation

yes Carla Hills  
~~Dundee~~ (Regret)  
yes ~~Zart~~ (John Hill)  
yes Buty  
~~Morton~~ (Regret - in Europe)

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE WHO  
VOTED TO OVERRIDE THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE SCHOOL  
LUNCH BILL

---

Rep. Marjorie S. Holt (Md.)  
Rep. Barry M. Goldwater, Jr. (Calif.)  
Rep. Tom Hagedorn (Minn.)  
Rep. William L. Armstrong (Colo.)  
Rep. Robert E. Bauman (Md.)  
Rep. Clair W. Burgener (Calif.)  
Rep. Del Clawson (Calif.)  
Rep. William F. Goodling (Pa.)  
Rep. Charles E. Grassley (Iowa)  
Rep. Jack F. Kemp (N.Y.)  
Rep. Trent Lott (Miss.)  
Rep. Floyd Spence (S.C.)  
Rep. David C. Treen (La.)

THOSE WHO VOTED TO SUSTAIN

---

Rep. Steven D. Symms (Idaho)  
Rep. John H. Rousselot (Calif.)  
Rep. Robin L. Beard (Tenn.)  
Rep. Samuel L. Devine (Ohio)  
Rep. William L. Dickinson (Ala.)

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

SCHEDULE PROPOSAL  
DATE: September 18, 1975  
FROM: Vern Loen *VL*  
THRU: Max Friedersdorf  
VIA: Warren Rustand

MEETING: Executive Committee of the House Republican Study Committee

DATE: As soon as possible

PURPOSE: Meeting on a variety of legislative and political subjects

FORMAT: Cabinet or Roosevelt Room  
Minimum of thirty (30) minutes

PARTICIPANTS: The President  
Executive Committee of GOP Study Committee (see attached)  
White House staff members

SPEECH MATERIAL: Talking points to be provided

PRESS COVERAGE: White House photographer only

STAFF: See attached

RECOMMEND: Max Friedersdorf

PREVIOUS PARTICIPATION: The President met with this group on April 29, 1975

BACKGROUND: 1. Rep. Marjorie Holt (R-Md.), Chairwoman of this group, requested another meeting.

2. This group hopes to maintain a continuing dialogue with the President and would like to hold these sessions every six months.

3. There are a few Reagan supporters in this group and many Rockefeller and Kissinger critics. This meeting might help silence them.

APPROVE \_\_\_\_\_ DISAPPROVE \_\_\_\_\_

The President

Executive Committee of the House Republican Study Committee

- |                                     |                        |               |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| ✓ Rep. Marjorie S. Holt (Md.)       | - Chairwoman           |               |
| Rep. Philip M. Crane (Ill.)         | - Vice Chairman        |               |
| Rep. Barry M. Goldwater, Jr. (Ca.)  | Vice Chairman          |               |
| ✓ Rep. Tom Hagedorn (Minn.)         | - Vice Chairman        | grain exports |
| Rep. Steven D. Symms (Idaho)        | - Vice Chairman        |               |
| ✓ Rep. John H. Rousselot (Ca.)      | - Treasurer            | housing       |
|                                     |                        |               |
| ✓ Rep. William L. Armstrong (Colo.) | - Energy               |               |
| Rep. Robert E. Bauman (Md.)         |                        |               |
| Rep. Robin L. Beard (Tenn.)         |                        |               |
| ✓ Rep. Clair W. Burgener (Ca.)      | food stamps            |               |
| ✓ Rep. Del Clawson (Ca.)            | Common Sites, etc.     |               |
| Rep. Edward J. Derwinski (Ill.)     |                        |               |
| Rep. Samuel L. Devine (Ohio)        |                        |               |
| ✓ Rep. William L. Dickinson (Ala.)  | Post Card Registration |               |
| Rep. William F. Goodling (Pa.)      |                        |               |
| Rep. Charles E. Grassley (Iowa)     |                        |               |
| ✓ Rep. Jack F. Kemp (N.Y.)          | - Job Creation         |               |
| Rep. Trent Lott (Miss.)             | C.P.A.                 |               |
| ✓ Rep. Floyd Spence (S.C.)          |                        |               |
| Rep. David C. Treen (La.)           |                        |               |

White House Staff members

John O. Marsh  
 Robert T. Hartmann  
 James Lynn  
 Alan Greenspan  
 Max L. Friedersdorf  
 James Cannon  
 Bill Seidman  
 Lt. Gen. Brent Scowcroft  
 Vern Loen  
 Charles Leppert, Jr.  
 Tom Loeffler

lc py —  
~~Jim Cannon~~  
~~NSC~~ (grain)  
 Domestic Council  
 NSC (Grain Exports only)



## PARTICIPANTS

### The President

#### Executive Committee of the House Republican Study Committee

Rep. Marjorie S. Holt (Md.) - Chairwoman  
Rep. Philip M. Crane (Ill.) - Vice Chairman  
Rep. Barry M. Goldwater, Jr. (Ca.) Vice Chairman  
Rep. Tom Hagedorn (Minn.) - Vice Chairman  
Rep. Steven D. Symms (Idaho) - Vice Chairman  
Rep. John H. Rousselot (Ca.) - Treasurer

Rep. William L. Armstrong (Colo.)  
Rep. Robert E. Bauman (Md.)  
Rep. Robin L. Beard (Tenn.)  
Rep. Clair W. Burgener (Ca.)  
Rep. Del Clawson (Ca.)  
Rep. Edward J. Derwinski (Ill.)  
Rep. Samuel L. Devine (Ohio)  
Rep. William L. Dickinson (Ala.)  
Rep. William F. Goodling (Pa.)  
Rep. Charles E. Grassley (Iowa)  
Rep. Jack F. Kemp (N.Y.)  
Rep. Trent Lott (Miss.)  
Rep. Floyd Spence (S.C.)  
Rep. David C. Treen (La.)

#### White House Staff members

bcc: ✓ John O. Marsh ①  
bcc: ✓ Robert T. Hartmann ②  
✓ Max L. Friedersdorf ⑤  
bcc: ✓ Alan Greenspan ④  
✓ Vern Loen ⑨  
✓ Charles Leppert, Jr. ⑩  
✓ Tom Loeffler ⑪  
✓ Jim Cannon ⑥ cc  
✓ Bill Siedman ⑦ cc  
✓ James Lynn ③ cc  
✓ Brent Scowcroft ⑧ cc



## PARTICIPANTS

*attended*

The President

### Executive Committee of the House Republican Study Committee

### SUBJECT

Rep. Marjorie S. Holt (Md.)	- (Chairwoman)	
<del>Rep. Barry M. Goldwater, Jr. (Ga.)</del>	<del>(Vice Chairman)</del>	
Rep. Tom Hagedorn (Minn.)	- (Vice Chairman)	Grain Exports
<del>Rep. Steven D. Symms (Idaho)</del>	<del>(Vice Chairman)</del>	
Rep. John H. Rousselot (Ca.)	- (Treasurer)	Housing

Rep. William L. Armstrong (Colo.)		Energy
<del>Rep. Robert E. Bauman (Md.)</del>		
<del>Rep. Robin L. Beard (Tenn.)</del>		
Rep. Clair W. Burgener (Ca.)		Food Stamps
Rep. Del Clawson (Ca.)		Common Situs
Rep. Samuel L. Devine (Ohio)		
Rep. William L. Dickinson (Ala.)		Post Card Registration
<del>Rep. William F. Goodling (Pa.)</del>		
<del>Rep. Charles F. Grassley (Iowa)</del>		
<del>Rep. Jack F. Kemp (N.Y.)</del>		Job Creation
Rep. Trent Lott (Miss.)		
<del>Rep. Floyd Spence (S.C.)</del>		Consumer Protection
Rep. David C. Treen (La.)		

### White House Staff members

John O. Marsh  
~~Robert T. Hartmann~~  
 James Lynn  
 Alan Greenspan  
 Max L. Friedersdorf  
 James Cannon  
 Bill Seidman  
 Lt. Gen. Brent Scowcroft  
 Vern Loen  
 Charles Leppert, Jr.  
 Tom Loeffler  
*Don Rumsfeld*  
*Paul O'Neill*  
*Carla Hills*  
*Earle Butz*  
*John Hill*

### Cabinet Participation

*YES* ~~Carla Hills~~ - 755-6417 *Delli*  
~~HUD~~  
~~Regent D. ...~~ 523-8211 *nancy*  
~~ATSOE~~  
~~John Hill~~ *instead of* ~~John~~ - 961-6081 *Regent*  
~~FEA~~  
~~451-3121~~ *miss Bloom*  
*YES* - ~~Paul~~ - ~~AGRICULT.~~  
~~MORTON~~ *Europe* ~~COMMERCE~~



## TALKING POINTS

### CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY

(Floyd Spence, South Carolina, opposes H.R. 7575, a bill to establish an Agency for Consumer Protection.)

- You already know my position on H.R. 7575. I indicated on September 4, 1975, in Seattle, Washington, that I plan to veto the bill. The Agency would add another layer of Federal bureaucracy, and add costs to taxpayers -- administrative costs alone would be \$60 million for the first three years -- at a time when we need to reduce both the size and the cost of government. Adequate protection of consumer interests in Federal agencies can be provided by the existing organizations.
- I understand that some of the business groups that oppose the Agency for Consumer Protection contend that they have 175 firm votes against H.R. 7575. This sounds high to me. How does it compare with your assessment?

## TALKING POINTS

### ENERGY

(Bill Armstrong of Colorado, who heads the Republican Task Force on energy and natural resources, (a) is strongly opposed to your proposal for the Energy Independence Agency, and (b) is concerned that Republicans do not get enough advance word on when the Administration decides to compromise further on energy policy issues.)

- I'm aware that there is opposition to my proposal for an EIA. The proposal runs counter to some principles that I consider very important. Nevertheless, I believe that this nation must take some very bold steps to increase energy production from domestic sources. We have resorted to strong Federal actions to raise capital and stimulate commercialization in other situations (e.g., synthetic rubber), and I believe the seriousness of our energy situation -- and the lack of action thus far -- warrants the major step I have announced.
- I recognize the importance of our working closely with you on energy policy legislation. We and the people in FEA try hard to keep you informed. I know we never do the job well enough, but we will keep trying.



TALKING POINTS ON

US/SOVIET GRAIN-OIL NEGOTIATIONS

-- The US is seeking to negotiate a five-year agreement on grain which will enable us to sell a predetermined minimum annual amount to the Soviets, with the opportunity for sales above that level. Sales would be divided between wheat and corn. There will be provisions for flexibility in the event of an extremely tight crop year in the US.

-- This agreement would stand on its own as beneficial to the American farmer and consumer. It would provide for greater stability in the grain market, enable American farmers to plan more accurately for increased exports, and thereby help to avoid price disruptions as a result of Soviet purchases.

-- Consummation of this agreement will also open the way for more grain sales after October 11, assuming our expectations for a favorable crop report are met.

-- We are also discussing an agreement on oil. Like the agreement on grain, we want this also to be able to stand on its own as beneficial to American interests. This would be a multi-year arrangement providing for US purchases of Soviet oil at attractive prices.

## FOOD STAMPS TALKING POINTS

We all share a conviction that the Food Stamp program must be controlled. Senator Jim Buckley and Congressman Bob Michel have put forward a proposal which sets out a strong position in this regard. In testimony before the Senate tomorrow Secretary Butz will present the specifics of the Administration's position which is geared to reduce the program and cut off eligibility at levels related to the poverty level. It is, we believe, a proposal which can be enacted by Congress and can bring the Food Stamp program under control.

## COMMON SITUS PICKETING

As you know, this is an issue which I have been following for some time and which I have discussed with Secretary Dunlop. I am aware of the emotions which surround the issue and of the concern which is expressed by many in the construction industry and elsewhere.

We need stability in the construction field. This is the objective toward which Secretary Dunlop is working. The passage of the Construction Industry Collective Bargaining Act would, coupled with an appropriate Common Situs Picketing Act, help stabilize this important sector of our economy. In his testimony before both House and Senate Committees Secretary Dunlop outlined the basic points which must be included in any legislation.

### Background

Over 60,000 letters were received at the White House last week urging veto of any Common Situs Picketing measure. Industry people do not believe the benefits of the proposed Construction Industry Collective Bargaining Act are sufficient to warrant acceptance of changes in the long standing treatment of the Common Situs issue.

The House has already passed the Common Situs Picketing Bill by a vote of 230 to 178. Most of the points of concern to Secretary Dunlop (and all of the points considered of major importance) were included in the Bill which passed. The House did not accept the suggestion of a thirty day limit on picketing or the creation of a special arbitration panel.

The House votes Tuesday night on the Construction Industry Collective Bargaining Act. (passed 302-95 Tuesday night)

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported out the Common Situs Bill on Monday, October 6. The Committee also reported out the companion Construction Industry Collective Bargaining Act, but has indicated its position on the question of what immunity to be granted to the national unions remains to be settled.

10/7/75

## TALKING POINTS

### POST CARD REGISTRATION

- I am opposed to the Voter Registration Act (authorizing citizens to register for Federal elections by post card) because, in my judgment, it will not significantly increase voter participation, it will be an administrative nightmare for State and local governments, and it will increase the potential and likelihood for fraud. Moreover, at a time when all levels of government are attempting to restrain levels of spending, the creation of a new Federal bureaucracy with almost unlimited authority to spend huge sums of taxpayers' money would be most imprudent.

## HOUSING

### ISSUE

On Friday, October 3, 1975, Congressman Rousselot made a protest vote against the HUD appropriations bill because it commits the American taxpayers to some very long-term payments. Specifically, the HUD appropriations bill provides \$662.3 million in contract authority for the Section 8 low-income housing assistance program. The term of the contracts under this program varies between 15 and 40 years and commits the taxpayer to paying approximately \$17 billion over the life of the contracts. The Congressman maintains that it was this kind of long-range commitment that got New York City into trouble.

### RECOMMENDED RESPONSE

The problem of housing low-income/disadvantaged American families is very difficult and expensive. We are hopeful that the approach outlined in the Section 8 program will be more viable than in the subsidized housing programs of the past. However, I share your concern over the long-term cost of this and other subsidized housing programs and intend to carefully examine the costs of the Section 8 program in the forthcoming budget deliberations.

### ISSUE

The housing industry's recovery is fragile and slow. New housing starts in August were at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 1,260,000 -- up 9% from last August. HUD projects the level of total housing starts for 1975 to be 1.2 million units, fewer than in 1974, which was considered a dismal year for the industry. Unemployment in the residential construction industry is running about 20%. Partial causes of the lagging recovery in the housing industry are high interest rates, escalating housing prices, and a lack of consumer confidence. The multi-family sector of the housing construction industry is particularly depressed. The rapid savings inflows of the last spring and early summer have slowed, tending to confirm the fears of many lending institutions that interest rates will rise during the coming months.

### RECOMMENDED RESPONSE

I am concerned that the housing industry is not recovering as rapidly as we hoped. I am concerned that increased Federal borrowing may push interest rates and further retard the recovery in the housing industry. We will continue to carefully watch activity in the housing industry.

## JOB CREATION

Evidence is mounting that the economy is undergoing a fairly substantial recovery. To that end, one must look to the long-term goals of fostering an economy that provides good jobs and produces goods and services at reasonable prices. Up until this point in time, most efforts have dealt with short-term needs for job creation. These have included: (1) increased Federal spending, (2) grants-in-aid to State and local governments, (3) public works projects, and (4) public service employment (PSE).

While these short-term policies do provide a degree of relief during economic difficulties, a viable job creation activity should be one that works to ensure a smooth and sustained recovery. We need to create "good" jobs and we need to be sure there is sufficient capital available to employ the Nation's labor force productively.

### Background

During the last two fiscal years Federal expenditures increased 38 percent -- from \$268 billion to about \$370 billion, but increased Federal spending creates jobs no more quickly than would increased private sector activity.

The effectiveness of grants-in-aid to State and local governments is also questionable. Grants-in-aid to State and local governments do not necessarily create new jobs. Frequently, Federal funds are used in place of State and local revenues.

While public works projects often produce more tangible long-term benefits, there are also difficulties in using this as a job creation tool. Most apparent of the liabilities of public works programs are the significant delays encountered in implementing these projects even when the mechanism for funding them at the Federal level is in place. Consequently, the maximum impact of a public works program initiated at the beginning of a recovery may occur after the economy has recovered.

Public service employment programs also present serious problems in terms of meaningful job creation. While they can create jobs in a short period of time, their impact can be greatly reduced over time by the substitution of federal funded public service employment for positions planned to be funded from local revenues. Further, it is difficult to phase out PSE programs once the economy improves.

10/7/75

TALKING POINTS  
TAX CUTS AND SPENDING RESTRAINT

1. During the past few weeks we have been reviewing the alternatives with respect to our position on the expiration of the Tax Reduction Act of 1975 and how our proposals might be tied with a spending

2. I came to two conclusions:

First, that our Nation is now at a crossroads where we must decide whether we will continue the present pattern of bigger Government, higher taxes, and higher inflation, or whether we will take a new direction reducing the growth of Government and permitting our individual citizens a greater voice in their future.

Secondly, that the 1975 Tax Reduction Act enacted by the Congress represents a further distortion of our tax system which does not provide sufficient benefits for middle income taxpayers.

3. In light of these two conclusions we developed a program, which I announced Monday evening, which proposes a substantial and permanent reduction in Federal taxes while at the same time placing a ceiling on the growth on Federal spending in fiscal year 1977.

4. The tax proposals were designed to make permanent changes in our tax system that would make it both more simple and more equitable. About three quarters of the proposed cuts are for individual taxpayers. These tax reductions would occur in three ways:

(a) By raising the personal exemption from \$750 to \$1000.

(b) By replacing the variable standard deduction and the low income allowance with a single standard deduction of \$1800 for single individuals and \$2500 for married couples.

(c) By lowering the basic personal income tax rates.

5. The tax cuts that I have proposed are permanent, as opposed to the temporary changes which the Congress passed that will expire on December 31, 1975. The reductions I proposed are substantial -- approximately \$28 billion in cuts from the 1974 law which would become effective upon the expiration of the 1975 temporary reductions. For example, a typical family of four, earning \$14,000 a year would be entitled to a permanent tax reduction of \$412 a year which represents 27 % of their tax liability.

6. The corporate tax cuts include an extension of the corporate rate and surtax exemption changes which benefit small businesses, a permanent extension of the increase in the investment tax credit to 10%, and a 2% reduction in the corporate rate from 48% to 46%.



I am also deeply concerned about the growth of Federal expenditure in recent years. Total Federal outlays in FY 1976 will reach \$370 billion. Simply projecting at their present levels, these programs would result in a \$423 billion budget for FY 1977. That would mean, with the tax cut, back-to-back \$70 billion deficits. As a country, we simply cannot afford that kind of extravagance. Accordingly, I will propose reductions in the growth of these Federal expenditures of \$28 billion which will hold Federal expenditures to \$395 in FY 1977.

8. I want to emphasize that this is a new approach that strikes out in a new direction -- a direction of reversing the enormous growth of Government in our land. It is also a program which is aimed at the Americans who bear the burden of Government spending -- those people who earn between \$10,000 and \$25,000 a year and who belong to our constituency. It is a program which promises a tax cut that is earned, not one that is irresponsible.
9. I am confident that this course of action is what the Nation needs and wants. It is a course of action that will move us in the direction of returning the power and initiative to the people where it belongs. With your support and assistance, we can be successful in their enterprise.

October 20, 1975

Dear Marjorie:

Enclosed is the signed photograph taken during your meeting with the President on October 3.

I am pleased to send it to you with the best wishes of the President.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Vernon C. Loen  
Deputy Assistant  
to the President

Honorable Marjorie Holt  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

VCL:vh

b & w enclosure (1) mounted and signed photo  
30C75A6768-7

TO MARJORIE S. HOLT  
WITH WARMEST PERSONAL REGARDS AND BEST WISHES  
JERRY FORD



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 3, 1975

MEETING WITH CONGRESSMAN MARJORIE HOLT

Friday, October 3, 1975

4:30 p.m. (10 minutes)

The Oval Office

From: Max Friedersdorf *M.G.*

I. PURPOSE

Mrs. Holt wants to tell you about her concern that you are not getting the views of her group on reform of food stamp legislation.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS & PRESS PLAN

- A. Background: Mrs. Holt has expressed concern that Paul O'Neill, Jim Cannon and others have not reported to you on the views of the House Republican Conference on Food Stamp Reform.
- B. Participants: Vern Loen and Jim Cannon, Paul O'Neill
- C. Press Plan: To be announced.

III. TALKING POINTS

- 1. I know of your concern on the need for food stamp reform. I share your concern--I am determined that the food stamp program will be reformed.
- 2. I've been working with Jim Cannon and others on various proposals. To date we've looked at five alternatives. The staff is still doing some work on another alternative that I've asked for.
- 3. I am determined that we will not only straighten out the administration of the food stamp program but will effect savings to the taxpayer by reducing the cost of the program. We've been working with Jim Buckley, Bob Michel and others on their ideas and will continue to consult with them. The only way that the reforms that I will propose will work is if they are enacted by the Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 2, 1975

MEETING WITH REP. MARJORIE HOLT (R-Md.)

Friday, October 3, 1975

4:30 p.m. (10 minutes)

The Oval Office

Via: Max Friedersdorf

From: Vern Loen VL

I. PURPOSE

To discuss the Administration's pending food stamp reform initiative in relation to the Michel-Buckley bill.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS AND PRESS PLAN

A. Background:

1. Mrs. Holt, President of the conservative Republican Study Group, is concerned that the pending Administration proposal for food stamp reform may clash with the sweeping Michel-Buckley bill.
2. She is aware that a decision is near and wants to be sure the President has Congressional input.

B. Participants:

The President  
Rep. Marjorie Holt (R-Md.)  
Jim Cannon (Domestic Council)  
Paul O'Neill (OMB)  
Vern Loen (Staff)

C. Press Plan:

White House photographer

III. TALKING POINTS

1. Marjorie, we have kept in close contact with Bob Michel on this bill.
2. Keep in touch with Paul O'Neill on this matter.