Meltzer on Welfare and Pension Legislation

Senator John Kennedy, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension legislation, requested Professor Bernard D. Meltzer, of the Law School, to comment on various bills for the regulation of welfare and pension plans. Professor Meltzer, after his written comments were received, was invited to testify at the hearings on the pending bills. After his testimony on July 1, 1957, Professor Meltzer prepared a supplemental memorandum for the sub-committee. Because of the widespread interest in the legislation involved, Professor Meltzer's memorandum is (except for the introductory paragraph) reproduced below, following a summary of his oral testimony.

In his testimony, Professor Meltzer emphasized the need for avoiding legislation which would produce an unmanageable mass of reports, but at the same time he questioned the basis for the various exemptions from comprehensive disclosure regulation embodied in the various bills. He pointed also to the practical and legal obstacles to the enforcement of fiduciary obligations by private litigation, and he urged that federal legislation should go beyond disclosure requirements and should prohibit transactions incompatible with fiduciary standards. He suggested that the penal provisions of the pending bills which sought to do this were unduly vague and indicated how they could be made more specific. He recommended also that penal provisions should be supplemented by provisions authorizing civil suits in the federal courts on the part of both the enforcement agency and the aggrieved beneficiaries. Finally, he presented the reasons for making the Securities and Exchange Commission, rather than the Secretary of Labor, the enforcement agency.

In his supplemental memorandum Professor Meltzer stated:

My testimony on July 1 emphasized both the substantial administrative difficulties involved in general disclosure regulations and the reasons for doubting the effectiveness of such regulation unless it was supplemented by provisions incorporating and implementing fiduciary standards. I did not, however, explicitly challenge the desirability of comprehensive disclosure on the motion of non-exempt plans, as part of a total regulatory program.

I feel it appropriate to supplement my testimony because further consideration has persuaded me that such automatic disclosure is probably not necessary for effective regulation and that legislation which concentrated on the definition and enforcement of fiduciary standards would be a preferable alternative.

Such an alternative program would contain the following elements, which are developed more fully below:

(1) Prohibitions against specified violations of fiduciary standards, implemented by both criminal sanctions and civil actions in the federal courts;

(2) Provisions requiring adequate and accurate disclosure to beneficiaries, implemented by criminal sanctions and injunctive relief at the request of the enforcing agency;

(3) Provisions authorizing the enforcing agency
   (a) by regulation to prescribe record-keeping requirements for health and welfare plans;
   (b) by regulation, subject to veto by either House of Congress, to prohibit additional classes of transactions deemed incompatible with fiduciary standards;
   (c) to call for comprehensive reports from, to subpoena and/or to inspect the books and records of, or pertaining to, particular welfare and pension plans selected by the agency.

The foregoing proposals would, I believe, have the following advantages over the general and automatic disclosure provisions which are a central feature of pending bills:

(1) They would avoid the logical and political difficulties raised by exemptions which are deemed necessary to keep the enforcement job manageable, but which are highly controversial.

(2) They would more directly and effectively attack the central problem of misconduct by fiduciaries.

(3) They would involve less cost to the government and to properly managed plans, which presumably represent the overwhelming majority of all plans of any type.

Before I examine the merits of general disclosure regulation and the alternative program outlined above, it is appropriate that I make explicit my assumptions concerning the primary purposes of the contemplated legislation. I assume these purposes to be: (1) the deterrence of misconduct, i.e., malfeasance, by fiduciaries; (2) provision for adequate and accurate disclosure to beneficiaries; and (3) the enforcement of appropriate criminal and civil sanctions against delinquent fiduciaries. I assume, moreover, that the pending bills are not designed to insure wise, as distinguished from honest, administration. They are, for example, not directed at achieving actuarial soundness in pension plans or wise investment policies.

I consider this limitation of the legislative purpose desirable, and I will not extend this memorandum by examining the many problems involved.

I exclude also from the legislative purposes the collection of comprehensive data concerning the general impact of welfare and pension plans on employee-employer relationships or on our economic life generally. This is not to deny that such data might be interesting and useful and might have implications for public policy. Nevertheless, the data necessary for such purposes can be collected by means which are much less costly than disclosure regulation. Furthermore, the collection of such data generally
proves more useful if it is prompted by specific problems rather than by the vague hope that the information will come in handy. Finally, any attempt to use disclosure regulation for the collection of comprehensive data would clash with the objective of using such regulation for the purpose of promoting proper conduct by fiduciaries. This is true because the policing of fiduciaries, if the administrative burden is to be kept manageable, requires the narrowing of coverage so as to exempt plans in which danger of abuse is negligible, whereas the accumulation of complete data demands comprehensive coverage. For these reasons, in the discussion which follows, disclosure requirements and alternatives thereto will be tested solely by their probable contribution to the observance of fiduciary standards; any collateral benefits arising from the availability of comprehensive data regarding welfare and pension plans will be disregarded.

Legislation which relies largely on general disclosure requirements involves two fundamental difficulties. The first, which has been a principal concern of the Committee, is the need for exemptions with three characteristics: (1) They must be numerically significant so as to avoid either enormous administrative costs or a mass of reports, most of which cannot be carefully examined. (2) They should be based on principles with a rational relationship to the legislative purposes, i.e., the exempted plans should be an identifiable class in which the probability of fiduciary abuse is low both in relation to non-exempt plans and as an absolute matter. (3) Finally, the exemptions must, of course, command the necessary political support. The second difficulty of disclosure regulation, which has apparently been of less concern to the Committee, is the uncertainty as to whether such regulation, even though appropriate exemptions are made and an adequate enforcement staff provided, would significantly advance the legislative purposes. I turn now to a discussion of each of these difficulties.

As my testimony indicated, each of the exemptions contemplated by the various bills (except the Administration bill) involves a serious question as to whether it is rationally related to the legislative purposes. There is no need to repeat my testimony, but I do wish to supplement my discussion of the proposed exemption for level-of-benefit plans. Such plans, according to the Committee’s data, constitute by far the largest single class of plans and are usually administered solely by the employer. For this reason, my comments concerning the level-of-benefit exemption are to a large extent applicable to the exemption for employer-administered plans contemplated by S. 1813.

Fiduciary misconduct disclosed by recent investigations has been concentrated in jointly-administered plans which, at present, generally provide, not for a specified level of benefits, but for a specified level of expenditure. Despite this fact, a statutory exemption for level-of-benefit plans seems unwarranted, for the following reasons: First, such investigation involved level-of-benefit plans administered by large, respected and publicly exposed companies, such as General Motors. The result of such investigation plainly cannot properly be viewed as a certificate of good character for all such plans. Secondly, such plans are susceptible to the abuses, such as split commissions and kickbacks, which have occurred in other kinds of plans. And a flat statutory exemption for level-of-benefit plans might well generate pressure by strong and unscrupulous union officials to transform existing or future plans so as to bring the exemption into play. If such pressure proved successful, a statutory exemption would on practice operate to exempt plans and administrators quite different from those contemplated when the exemption was embodied in the statute.

It is true, of course, that an employer has an incentive to keep the cost of the level-of-benefit plans low. But the term “employer” is an abstraction which obscures the fact particular employees may not be averse to feathering their personal nests. Furthermore, the “employer’s” incentive operates only as to his actual costs, as opposed to his ostensible costs. He has no incentive, for example, to forego kickbacks and the like so long as they go back to the enterprise. On the contrary, he may have an incentive to arrange for such transactions in order to inflate the ostensible costs of the benefits. This is true because the costs of specified benefits are in effect wages, and the total
of such actual or ostensible costs will be a factor in collective bargaining negotiations. High costs, actual or ostensible, will provide arguments against requested increases in the level of benefits or the level of conventional wages. Since the ostensible costs are wages, the employees are entitled to an adequate quid pro quo in the form of benefits which are not diluted by excessive commissions, kickbacks, and the like. In connection with the employer's cost cutting incentive, it should also be noted that companies making cents-per-hour contributions also have an incentive, albeit a more indirect one, to get the most for their money in the form of employee benefits. Benefits attract and hold efficient employees—a not unimportant consideration in a period like the present when there is vigorous competition for such employees. Furthermore, the employer's cost-cutting incentive, even assuming its effectiveness, does not achieve one of the objectives of the proposed legislation, namely fair and adequate disclosure to the employees.

Under the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, an employer is, of course, obliged, when requested by a union representing his employees, to furnish data as to actual costs where that is relevant to collective bargaining negotiations. But this obligation is plainly not the same as an obligation to make periodic reports to the employees concerning the costs and the benefits under a plan. This difference is underscored by the increasing tendency toward longer term collective bargaining agreements. Furthermore, employers have apparently resisted demands for disclosure on the ground that their duty is discharged when they provide the level-of-benefits contracted for. This attitude is inconsistent both with employers' insistence in other contexts that fringe costs are indistinguishable from wage costs and with the uncontentious proposition that employees are entitled to know the level of their wages. In view of the foregoing considerations, level-of-benefit plans, even if exempted from the duty to disclose to the government, should not be exempted from a requirement of adequate disclosure to the beneficiaries of the plans.

On the basic issue raised by the level of benefit exemption, the probability of malfeasance in administration, it is, I believe, fair to say that all contemplated exemptions, it has the strongest claim to support on the basis of investigations thus far. But the investigation obviously did not consider the possibility that strong and unscrupulous elements in the labor movement might exert effective pressure to secure the benefits of this exemption for improper purposes. And, as already indicated, the investigations were limited, and the abuses they disclosed in other plans could occur, and may have occurred, in level-of-benefit plans. For these reasons, the exemption of such plans from disclosure regulation rests on grounds that are questionable.

The foregoing objections to the "level-of-benefit" exemption have been urged by organized labor, whose opposition may, of course, defeat any legislation. Such opposition is, doubtless, reinforced by the fear that such an exemption would involve the distasteful implication that abuses result only when unions are the sole administrators of plans or jointly participate in their administration. As my testimony indicated, the practical political problems resulting from such opposition are a matter on which the Committee needs no comment from outsiders. Nevertheless, it is significant that one consequence of such opposition may be legislative proposals for disclosure regulation so comprehensive in their coverage that they would involve the dilemma of either an unmanageable mass of reports or a mammoth and very costly enforcement staff. Such a dilemma, for example, appear to be the necessary result of the enactment of the Administration bill, which does not provide for any exemption at all. Such possibilities reinforce more fundamental considerations indicating that the disclosure regulation contemplated may, in the context of pension and welfare plans, be the wrong way to attack the problem of fiduciary abuse.

Disclosure requirements alone obviously do not prohibit improper transactions. All they do is to make them known. Their effect as a deterrent depends in part on the sense of shame of those who would otherwise engage in improprieties and in part on the effect-
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supplemental Committee Reports which fill in a few of the gaps. But because the amendment, for practical considerations, had to be pushed through Congress rapidly, there unfortunately are a number of questions about it which are vexing, to say the least. In fact, some experts have suggested that technically there is doubt whether the legislation is adequate to reverse the Supreme Court decision which set it in motion. Moreover, even assuming it does this much, there is a disquieting rumor that the Treasury will again thwart the intention of Congress by adopting a very narrow construction in its forthcoming proposed regulations. In the meantime we are very much at sea since the Service refuses to issue any rulings on the vital questions. Under these circumstances, things at the moment are almost as unsettled as they were before passage of the amendment. Perhaps by this time next year we will have some definite word in the form of Regulations and will be able to make our plans with confidence. We can only hope that the Treasury will see the light and interpret the Amendment reasonably so that we won't have to ask Congress to amend the Amendment."

In view of the fact that I chose this excerpt only as a sample, I am sure you will understand my omission of the author's name. I hope that he, too, will be understanding.

Finally, there is one other item concerning the 1967 Institute program which candor compels me to reveal. On the opening day there is a dinner session. The announcement of it, which is set in exceptionally bold type, reads as follows: "This session is reserved exclusively for entertainment; absolutely no speeches of any kind will be permitted."

**Meltzer—**
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tiveness of sanctions against improper conduct once it is disclosed.

I will not speculate on the sense of shame of those involved in the serious abuses uncovered by the Committee, beyond saying that those disclosures do not warrant any optimism. The inescapable danger under the pending legislation is that disclosure regulation, unaccompanied by effective sanctions against improprieties disclosed, would have no significant effect on the conduct of thick-skinned and faithless fiduciaries. Disclosure regulation which at best produces confessions, without repentance, scarcely justifies the heavy burdens which such regulation would impose on honestly administered plans and on the government.

The sanctions now applicable to maladministration of the plans involved have, as the Subcommittee's investigation has indicated, been inadequate in practice and may remain so. In this connection, it is important to note that notwithstanding the superficial resemblance between the contemplated disclosure legislation and the Securities Act of 1933, there is a basic difference between them. In the securities field, there is a drastic and well-known sanction supplementing the criminal provisions for false disclosure. A stop order by the SEC will, in general, make the securities unmarketable. No comparable sanction exists for disclosure in the context of welfare and pension plans. Furthermore, it seems clear that in exercising its authority to issue stop orders, the SEC considers not only the adequacy of disclosure but also any overreaching or unfairness in a securities offering. The SEC is thus in effect exercising a regulatory authority, which would not be available to the enforcing agency under the pending legislation.

It is possible, of course, that the contemplated disclosure requirements, coupled with effective federal-state cooperation, might lead to more effective enforcement on the state level by state agencies as well as by the beneficiaries of the plans. But the variety of state regulatory systems and the substantial obstacles to effective enforcement by beneficiaries which would persist leaves this matter in considerable doubt.

The foregoing discussion suggests that (1) disclosure regulation, without direct and effective sanctions against malfeasance by trustees (as distinguished from sanctions for false reports) may be ineffective in advancing the statutory purposes; and (2) there is, accordingly, a serious question as to whether the conjectural benefits of such legislation justify the heavy burdens involved. Alternative means of regulation, which do not involve general disclosure requirements
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could, I believe, achieve the statutory objectives more effectively and with significantly less cost to the government and the legitimate private interests involved.

The alternative regulation would incorporate the following elements:

(1) Criminal provisions against embezzlement of the assets of a plan and against the following kinds of specified misconduct, by any trustee, administrator, or employee of any plan or by any employee or officer of any enterprise or organization establishing a plan (all of whom are herein included in the term “fiduciary”);

(a) Receipt of any compensation, direct or indirect, from any person or company, selling, directly or indirectly, insurance or any other service to the plan involved or to any other welfare or pension plan.

(b) Owning the securities of, or having a property interest in (other than an interest resulting from the issuance of personal insurance policies in the ordinary course of business), or serving as an officer, employee, or member of the board of directors, of any company, firm, person, agency, broker, selling insurance or other services to the plan involved or to any other welfare or pension plan. This provision should, however, be so limited as to be inapplicable to banks, trust companies, investment advisors, actuarial experts and the like, which are not involved in the purchase of insurance or other services for a plan but only carry out investment functions or other functions which do not involve any possibility of conflicting interests in enterprises selling insurance or other services to a plan. Furthermore, in order not to prohibit, in appropriate cases, ownership of insurance companies or of medical clinics, etc., by welfare and pension funds, there should be a provision for administrative exemption from this restriction. Such an exemption might, for example, be granted to the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America with respect to insurance companies owned by funds administered by that union. (See p. 41 of Final Rept. of Sen. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Rept. No. 1734, 84th Cong. 2d Sess.)

(c) Lending money to, or borrowing money from, a plan of which he is a fiduciary.

(d) Selling property or assets of any kind, directly or indirectly, to the plan unless the market value thereof is independently established by transactions on an organized securities exchange or the like and the price to the plan is not in excess of the price so established.

(e) Purchasing property from the plan unless the market value thereof is independently established (as above) and unless the purchase price is at least as high as the price so established.

(f) Receiving direct or indirect compensation from the plan for services rendered to it if the fiduciary, during the calendar year in which such services are rendered, was employed by an employer or union establishing, or contributing to the plan, or participating in its administration, or representing employees who are beneficiaries of the plan, at an annual rate of compensation in excess of $3,500.

(2) Criminal sanctions against any person who is not a "fiduciary," who knowingly participates in the violation of any of the foregoing provisions by a fiduciary.

A portion of the French delegation at the Conference of the International Association of Legal Science: Counsellor of State Marc Ancel, Counsellor of State Andre Letourner, and Andre Bertrand, Secretary-General of the Association.
(3) The provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) above would be enforceable by civil as well as criminal actions.

(4) A provision that fiduciaries should be under a duty (a) to administer the assets of the plan solely in the interests of its beneficiaries and (b) to avoid any transactions in the name of, or on behalf of, the plan, as a result of which, or in connection with which a fiduciary benefits directly or indirectly, except in his capacity as a beneficiary. This provision would be implemented by civil actions exclusively.

(5) A provision that third persons knowingly participating in a breach of the general duties imposed on fiduciaries by par. 4 (above) would also be subject to civil actions for damages.

(6) The enforcing agency would have authority by regulation to provide that specified classes of transactions would be subject to either criminal provisions or to the civil fiduciary standards. Such regulations prior to their promulgation would be filed with Congress while in session and would become effective only if neither House registered its dissent within a specified period.

(7) Both the enforcing agency and the beneficiaries would have a right to bring the civil actions provided for and to intervene in actions brought by the other. The enforcing agency, prior to instituting civil actions would give notice of its intention to do so, so as to permit the beneficiaries, within a specified waiting period to institute the action. Beneficiaries who established a serious breach by a fiduciary in actions which they filed or made a substantial contribution as intervenors in government-instituted actions would, in the court's discretion, be entitled to a reasonable counsel's fee. A judgment on the merits in a federal court would be bar to an action on the same transaction in a state court and vice versa. In order to prevent collusive actions, provision should be made for this bar to operate only if the enforcing agency was given prescribed notice as to filing of actions by private individuals so that the agency, in appropriate cases, could intervene. (If violations of the statute should occur in connection with level-of-benefit plans, there would be problems as to who would be entitled to the resulting damages. The employer-entity would generally seem entitled to the damages where such violations increased his net cost for the agreed-upon benefits. Nevertheless, in some cases, those owning all or the controlling interest in the employer-entity might be responsible for the abuse which may have been prompted by a desire to inflate the costs of the plan. In such a situation, recovery of full damages by the entity would seem anomalous. It is difficult to deal specifically with the variety of circumstances which may arise. Accordingly, the court should in its discretion be authorized to grant all or part of the damages to the employer, to the employees, or to the government, and should be directed to allocate damages so as to promote the statutory objectives.)

(8) The enforcing agency should be authorized to prescribe by regulations the content, auditing and the form of the accounts and records, etc., of the plans as well as the period which the accounts and records should be kept. Violations of such regulations should be made a crime.

(9) The statute should also provide:

(a) For periodic reports to the beneficiaries showing the total contribution made by the employer and the employees, respectively, and the benefits available or accrued under the plan.

(b) For authority in the enforcing agency to prescribe the form and content, including information in addition to that provided for in (a) (above), of such reports.

(c) That such reports to the employees should advise them of the name and address of the enforcing agency and should indicate that information as to improper conduct or as to inadequate disclosure in con-
nection with the administration of the plan should be sent to the agency.

(d) That a duly verified copy of such reports be filed and preserved by the custodian of the books and records of a plan, in accordance with the regulations of the enforcing agency.

(e) That wilful falsification in such reports, or wilful failure to make them, or wilful omissions therefrom constitute a crime.

(f) That designated persons (clearly described in the statute or by administrative regulation) shall be under a duty to make such reports to the beneficiaries. (This provision should, I believe, impose this duty on officers of employers in connection with plans established and administered solely by employers, on trustees of jointly-administered plans, and on union officers in connection with plans established and administered solely by unions. This provision should not require organizations such as banks and trust companies rendering services to plans to report directly to beneficiaries but should require such organizations to certify the data within their possession necessary for such reports. (Compare S 1122, Sec. 6(a) and 6(d) of S 1122.)

(10) The agency should be authorized, in its discretion, to require plans to furnish the information described in Section 6 of S 1122, to subpoena their books or to inspect their books at reasonable times and should be given similar subpoena and inspection authority with respect to the books of any person which are relevant to the administration of any plan.

The foregoing proposals are a tentative framework which could be vastly improved by the informed criticism of the Committee's staff and others. Consideration of these proposals by the Committee is, I believe, warranted because, as already indicated, they appear to have the following advantages over pending bills relying largely on general disclosure requirements.

(1) The alternative proposals would avoid the analytical and practical problems involved in carving out exemptions from disclosure regulation.

(2) They would avoid the great burdens which general disclosure requirements would impose on both the government and on honestly administered plans unless exemptions from such requirements could be devised for honestly administered plans in any class of plans, which seems unlikely.

(3) They would directly prohibit, and impose appropriate sanctions on, improper conduct; this promises to be more effective than the indirect requirement of disclosure, which is a doubtful method of deterring fiduciary abuses in this area.

(4) They would authorize administrative requirements for proper record-keeping, thereby facilitating proof of impropriety.

(5) They would permit the enforcing agency to be selective in its demands for comprehensive disclosure, thereby conserving its resources for situations which warrant scrutiny.

(6) They would encourage beneficiaries to enforce the fiduciary duties owed to them and would, at the same time, avoid the dangers arising from the concentration of enforcement in a single agency or group.

The foregoing proposal for the elimination of general, as opposed to selective, disclosure requirements involves judgments on difficult questions of degree. Accordingly, before I conclude this memorandum, it seems desirable to refer to considerations qualifying the position developed above.

General disclosure requirements would, of course, make some contribution to the legislative purposes, a contribution which would be increased if automatic disclosure to the government was part of a balanced program which included effectively implemented fiduciary standards. But this conclusion does not answer the underlying question, which is whether the return from disclosure regulation would justify both the resultant burdens and the logical and practical problems raised by an attempt to reduce such burdens by means of the various exemptions contemplated by the pending regulations. Although I have expressed my doubts about the adequacy of the return I recognize the difficulty of making firm judgments about the impact of disclosure requirements. Similarly there is no formula for determining the wisdom of the costs of enforcing a legislative program even when such costs can be reliably estimated, which is not the case here. Finally, as to the exemption problem, statutory exemptions are usually crude and imperfect qualifications on the legislative purposes, and exemptions which cannot neatly be supported on logical grounds often result from the practical need to reduce both the government's enforcement burden and the cost
of compliance by especially appealing interests, such as “small business.” Such necessarily practical and imperfect accommodation of conflicting objectives may be inescapable in connection with pension and welfare legislation.

The foregoing considerations, which weaken the objections to the disclosure and exemption features of the pending bills, are re-enforced by the large stakes involved in welfare and pension plans and the comparative helplessness of beneficiaries to protect their own interests.

However the issues as to general disclosure requirements and exemptions are resolved, it bears repetition that it seems unlikely that the regulatory burdens of such disclosure requirements would be justified unless they are coupled with an effectively implemented code of fiduciary conduct. Such a code appears to be an indispensable prerequisite for effective legislation. Furthermore, as my testimony indicated, the reasons for exemptions from disclosure requirements do not operate to justify exemptions from such a code; on the contrary, disclosure exemption increases the need for the applicability of fiduciary standards. Accordingly, I renew my recommendation that such standards should be made applicable to all plans, and especially to those plans which are exempted from general disclosure requirements.

Respectfully submitted,

BERNARD D. MELTZER

---

Book Review

The Administration of Technical Assistance—Growth in the Americas. By Philip M. Glick. The University of Chicago Press. 390 pgs. $5.50

Reviewed by Elmer Gertz

This is one of a series of books on technical cooperation in Latin America, sponsored by The National Planning Association. It is the first complete story of the organization and management of the technical assistance programs South of the Rio Grande, written by the former general counsel of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs and of the Technical Co-operation Administration and one of the drafters of the immortal Point Four Program. It is likely to become a classic in its special but increasingly important field.

During the more than thirty years that I have known Philip M. Glick, I have always been impressed by his earnestness, understanding and integrity, and the sort of subdued brilliance and quiet drive of the man. He was one of a group of classmates at the University, all personal friends, who rose to the manifold Governmental opportunities under the New Deal in its first auroled days. They were all, and none more so than Mr. Glick, highly articulate, social minded and dedicated men, who helped give tone and meaning to the new administration. There was nothing blase nor passive in their temperaments. They welcomed public service because of the larger opportunities it offered for men of vision. Each one was capable of filling remunerative posts in private business, but they