

The HEAP Act would allow parents to deposit up to \$5,000 per child each year in a college savings account with a maximum allowable deduction of \$15,000 per year. When money is withdrawn from a HEAP account for education purposes, one-tenth of that amount would be included in the gross income of the beneficiary for tax purposes over a 10-year period. The legislation also includes a 10-percent penalty for money withdrawn from a HEAP account for purposes other than paying for higher education.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides a HEAP of relief for middle class families who are often not eligible for low-interest student loans and other Government aid. By encouraging these families to save for their children, we help give future generations access to all the advantages of higher education. I urge my colleagues to support the HEAP Act and pay tribute to those who shaped this worthy legislation.

ISRAEL H. MILTON HONORED

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1995

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, next week Israel H. Milton, the Assistant Dade County Manager responsible for human services programs, will retire from our county government. I want to join with his many friends and admirers throughout our entire community in extending to him our thanks for his outstanding service and our congratulations for a job well done.

Israel Milton is a public servant in the very highest and best sense of the word. He is a veteran of more than three decades hard work and achievement in the area of social services.

Never one to shy away from difficult assignments, Israel Milton began his career in Dade County in 1967 as a social services administrator at the Kendall Children's Home. He also served as director of the Office of Neighborhood Service Centers and director of the Model Cities Program; became director of the Department of Human Resources in 1982; and rose to assistant county manager in 1992.

The talents and judgment he brought to these jobs and the breadth and depth of his experience will be sorely missed; people of his calibre are not easily replaced. He has always been accessible to the people of our community, constantly working to provide quality services and a better life for all our citizens.

Israel Milton is a graduate of Dorsey High School in Miami and Bethune-Cookman College. He received his Master's Degree in social work from Atlanta University.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my best wishes to Israel Milton and to his wife, Thelma Milton. Our community thanks you for your service and for the contribution you have made to the lives of so many people.

“PAID VOLUNTEERISM”: AN OXY-MORONIC IDEA

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I commend George Will's article in the Saturday, January 28th edition of the Washington Post for your attention:

TWO LIBERAL LOSERS

(George F. Will)

President Clinton's turbid State of the Union address was a metaphor for modern government—sprawling, metastasizing, undisciplined, approaching self-parody. It underscored the fact that his administration now is politically almost harmless, but is aesthetically excruciating.

The address was heavily larded—exactly the right word, that—with semi-conservative words about cutting taxes, spending and regulations. However, regarding two matters Clinton considers crucial—the American Corps “national service” program and the minimum wage—the address was half-baked and half-hearted liberalism.

AmeriCorps, says Clinton, will revive American volunteerism. The approximately 80 million Americans who volunteer their time to religious and civic organizations may wonder who needs reviving and how much it matters whether AmeriCorps eventually produces 100,000 more volunteers. Today 2.9 million of America's 80 million volunteers are ages 18 to 25, the ages of AmeriCorps “volunteers.”

To Americans who use the English language to communicate thoughts rather than parody them, the use of the word “volunteer” in connection with AmeriCorps' recruits must seem like the latest redundant evidence that Washington is stark raving mad. To plain-speaking Americans, a volunteer is someone who contributes his or her unpaid labor. Clinton's “volunteers” will be paid a \$7,400 annual stipend, plus \$9,450 worth of college expenses over two years. And this is not all that Clinton's little puddle of government-manufactured “volunteers”—little relative to the 80 million true volunteers who need neither financial incentives from, nor organization by, government—will cost taxpayers.

In addition to the health and childcare entitlements for AmeriCorps members, and AmeriCorps' Washington bureaucracy, money is spent to locate “volunteers” to take AmeriCorps money. The Omaha World-Herald says that AmeriCorps gave Nebraska's state government a \$457,622 grant to recruit 23 AmeriCorps members. That \$19,896.60 per recruit calls into question the effectiveness of the \$1.7 million AmeriCorps paid a Washington PR firm for national advertising.

According to the New Citizenship Project, a conservative advocacy group, of AmeriCorps' first 20,000 “volunteers,” 1,200 are working for agencies of the federal government. The New Citizenship Project warns that AmeriCorps is ripe for politicization, citing a Washington Monthly report that a 1993 pilot project became an exercise in identity politics and political correctness, developing ethnic and homosexual caucuses. And the Los Angeles Times reported that a 1994 pilot project in San Francisco used its “volunteers” to protest “three-strikes-and-you're-out” crime legislation.”

Clinton calls AmeriCorps the achievement “I would say I was most proud of.” No minimum wage increase will be rival for that title.

In 1992 candidate Clinton endorsed increasing the minimum wage. During 1993 and 1994, when he had a congressional majority that would have done it, he did not ask for it, primarily because some sensible Democrats told him it was a dumb idea. Al From, head of the centrist Democratic Leadership Council, which once advertised Clinton as a New Democrat, says of the minimum wage proposal: “It's anachronistic, it's a loser, it's got no bite with the middle class. And it screams old Democrat.”

Now that there is a Congress that Clinton knows will not enact an increase, he calls it urgent. However, during Tuesday night's oration, when he was pitilessly detailed about almost everything, he remained reticent about how much the minimum wage should be increased. Leaving aside the unwisdom of government telling employers what to pay employees, it is generally true that when you increase the cost of something, people buy less of it. There is evidence that is true of labor at the low end of the wage scale.

The first federal minimum wage—25 cents an hour—was enacted in 1938. Since then, the longest time between increases was from 1981 to 1990. During that span, teenage unemployment (teenagers are a third of all minimum wage earners) fell from 23.2 percent to 15.5 percent, and black teenage unemployment fell from 48 percent to 31 percent. Then the forces of compassion struck, raising the minimum wage twice, in 1990 and 1991. In 1992 teenage unemployment went up to 20 percent.

Now, it is problematic establishing causation for any phenomenon as complex and varied as joblessness. And some studies, including one by associates of the current secretary of labor, purport to show that the minimum wage can be increased somewhat without increasing unemployment. However, the question is academic because a former academic—Rep. Dick Armey, the ex-professor of economics who now is majority leader—says he will oppose an increase “with every fiber of my being,” and he will have much company.

But this is of more than academic interest: The minimum wage is now \$4.25 an hour. Clinton is said to be thinking about seeking \$5 an hour. The New Citizenship Project calculates that AmeriCorps “volunteers” earn more than \$7 an hour.

SALUTE TO CHICAGO ATTORNEY AND FORMER ALDERMAN LEON DESPRES, ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 87TH BIRTHDAY

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1995

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to salute a gentleman who is a Chicago institution and a lifelong friend of the underdog and of the working Chicagoan. Leon Despres, who turns 87 years young today, played a crucial role in the Chicago City Council during the senior Richard Daley's tenure as mayor of Chicago. This role, that of the loyal and principled opposition, is one that my Democratic colleagues and I are growing to appreciate more and more as we settle into our new roles in the 104th Congress. Unfortunately, I did not have the honor of serving in the Chicago City Council during the 20 years that Mr. Despres served there. However, he served as Parliamentarian of that body under the late, great

Mayor Harold Washington during my first few years in the Council. Len Despres is well known as a tireless advocate of such bread-and-butter issues as racial equality, civil rights, fair housing and open government. Unlike so many of his contemporaries, he advocated many of these controversial issues during a time before they were fashionable and frequently did so in the face of great opposition. Mr. Speaker, the *Chicago Tribune* published an article about Mr. Despres in its January 22, 1995 edition, and I submit this article, which captures the essence of Mr. Despres quite accurately to be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in honor of Mr. Despres' 87th birthday.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 22, 1995]

STILL IN THE SWIM

(By M. W. Newman)

Leon Despres gets to bed around 9 o'clock on most weeknights and sleeps the sleep of babes and sages. At 4:50 a.m. he's up and ready to go. That's the Despres way.

Thirty-five minutes later, he's downstairs at 59th Street and Stony Island Avenue, waiting in the icy darkness for the CTA's No. 6 express bus. It's a January morning, 4 degrees above zero. A prairie wind shivers in. No problem: Despres has had 86 years of getting used to it. Nearly 87.

The No. 6 at this hour is a working folks' bus. The passengers are regulars. As on most mornings, Despres is the only white person aboard. Almost certainly he is the only 86-year-old. Beyond doubt, on this trip he is the only Loop lawyer, former alderman and certified civic role model, all in one.

The bus swings downtown along South Lake Shore Drive. Despres loves the lakeside run but notes the pileup of parking lots and convention halls and traffic rams where trees or open water once held sway.

"Civicide" is one of his words for voluntary treeslaughter. Until a few years ago, he enjoyed bicycling to work on the lakefront until he was rammed from behind and knocked cold by another biker.

"I took that as a warning; you can't hear a bicycle," he says—and gave up the bike for early-a.m. swimming.

By about 5:50 on this morning, as on all weekday mornings, he's in the University Club, a polished neo-oldie cloister at 76 E. Monroe St. The club building dates from 1908, the year Despres was born at 41st Street and Michigan Avenue. It has dark wood paneling and baronial fireplaces, but he skips all that and is in the basement pool by 6 a.m.

Despres is not there to float around. He does his 52 laps, a half-mile, moving from backstroke to breast stroke to crawl as steadily as a swimmer a quarter of his age.

Usually a half-dozen other swimmers join him. But no one else even shows up on this ice-cold morning.

"The whole gang chickened out," he says with a laugh.

He's in the water by himself for 42 minutes, comes out lit up and follows with poolside coffee, rolls and bagels: the Despres routine.

"It makes my day," Despres says in that strong, clear voice of his. "Absolutely makes my day."

But his day is just starting. By 7:45, Monday through Friday, he's in his office at 77 W. Washington Blvd. for a full round of work. He doesn't knock off till 5:15.

Leon Despres, generally known by his nickname of Len, is an enduring natural wonder of Chicago. For 20 years ending in 1975, Despres was the City Council's independent icon, the finger-wagging conscience from Hyde Park snipping at old Boss Mayor Richard J. Daley and the party machine.

Daley has been dead since 1976 and the machine long since has lost firepower, but Despres goes on. He thrives on lawyering, the hands-on kind. He relishes phone calls, conferences, clients new and old.

He's not a man for long lunches, and sometimes grabs a salad at Morton's Cafeteria, an old-line hangout for old-line Lop types at 120 W. Madison St. He takes time out only for a half-hour afternoon nap "to recharge my batteries." Office routine elates him.

"I enjoy clearing titles, drafting wills, advising people," he says. Mind you, this has been going on since he started practice in 1929.

The man is an institution: the Phi Beta Kappa liberal, independent Democrat and best friend of underdogs who wouldn't go along and consequently never got to be a judge or a congressman.

In his time in office you couldn't beat City Hall, and Despres didn't. But now try walking with him anywhere near that hall without someone coming up and saying, "Hello, Alderman."

"Everybody wants Leon's blessing," says his friend Herbert M. Kraus, a veteran publicist and civic doer. "He's a Renaissance man in hustling Chicago."

Despres may not hustle, but he gets there just the same. He's tall and erect, with an assured manner, handsome features, silvery hair and a silver tongue to go with it. These days he's trying to take off 10 or 15 pounds. Otherwise he doesn't look all that different than he did during his warrior times in the council.

"Leon was born with a great deal of energy and can do whatever he sets out to do," says his wife, Marian. She is an eminent Chicagoan herself and a member of the Chicago Landmarks Commission. But when he gets up early to go swimming, she confides, "I roll over and go back to sleep."

'HORATIO AT THE BRIDGE'

Despres' fan club includes some members who at times crossed swords or at least words with him. Seymour Simon, now 79 and a former justice of the Illinois Supreme Court, was an alderman and ward committeeman in the Daley vs. Despres years. He calls Despres "the best alderman in the United States."

"He was Horatio at the bridge," says Simon. "Wise, brilliant, with a great grasp of details and sense of humor."

John Hoellen, 80, served with Despres from 1955 to 1975. Hoellen was that exotic aldermanic import, a Republican.

He and Despres once got into a row over a James Baldwin novel that was required reading at Wright Junior College. It wasn't any of the City Council's business, but Hoellen challenged Despres to read aloud some of the homoerotic passages. Despres replied by asking Hoellen if he would ban the Bible because it had sex in it.

But all that was 30 years ago. Hoellen now describes Despres as a "super person, thoughtful, considerate, decent, compassionate."

Probably nobody, however—starting with Despres—expected him to go on being a successful lawyer into his late 80s. He is at a peak of achievement, says his 45-year-old partner, Thomas Geoghegan.

Despres long has been an attorney for labor union, and his clients in the firm of Despres, Schwartz and Geoghegan now include the Teamsters under the reform leadership of Ron Carey.

In the 1980s, Geoghegan was the firm's point man in an embittering fight to win a settlement for the bereft employees of Wisconsin Steel after it shut down. A \$14.8 million payout was awarded in 1988. Despres'

Steeltown ties go back a long way—to the days when there really was a Steeltown.

Ed Sadlowski once was the youngest district director in the United Steel Workers of America, with Despres as his attorney. Sadlowski hadn't even been born in 1937 when Chicago police killed 10 labor demonstrators at a Memorial Day gathering. The shooting came to be known in labor history as the Republic Steel Massacre.

In the stunned aftermath, a protest rally was held in the Civic Opera House. "Did you know Despres helped to organize the rally?" says an admiring Sadlowski.

"He's had 60-odd years of being consistently good. He was over at my house the other day and he's as sharp as ever. I wonder what he drinks that keeps him that way."

Said Sadlowski's wife, Marlene: "Exercise!"

REMEMBERING CLARENCE DARROW

Like Cole Porter penning a lyric, Despres always seems to know what his next word should be. He can spout in four languages and quotes Thucydides, Ovid, Homer, Shakespeare and the fabled Chicago lawyer of yesteryear, Clarence Darrow.

Darrow died in 1938, but Despres recalls a long talk he once had with the brooding old titan. "He had an office right in this same building," he says. "We keep his photograph in our conference room. He was an inspiration, a great trial lawyer—selflessly interested in the fight against discrimination and the death penalty."

Every year on the anniversary of Darrow's death, Despres helps to conduct a memorial ceremony for him in Darrow's beloved Jackson Park.

Despres, of course, is not the rumpled, suspenders-thumbing showman and yarn-spinner that Darrow, was. He keeps his hair combed, wears a pressed suit and a neat tie, and cannot be accused of cracker-barrel charisma.

But Despres has shown how to bring "justice to the city," Geoghegan wrote in "Which Side Are You On?" his impassioned book about organized labor published in 1991.

Despres never has left much doubt about which side he is on. The elder Daley's gumshoes spied on him for years, it turned out after Despres left the council. They may have wondered why they bothered, because he seemed to favor lost causes and oddball fancies like racial equality and fair housing, civil rights, open government, budget economy, freedom from censorship, controls on lead-paint poisoning.

Despres was even tailed to a Halloween benefit party in 1972 at the First Unitarian Church on 57th Street.

Buy a funny thing happen on the way to the 21st Century. Musclebound Chicago loosened up. Despres has lived long enough to see many of his causes embraced or least grudgingly accepted by the party wheelhorses.

"You don't have the top-heavy load of payrollers anymore," says Hoellen. "There's more sensitivity to problems."

BATTLING THE BOSS

But there's less comic relief. Despres' tiffs with Boss Daley, sire of the present mayor, had an "Odd Couple" sense of antic timing. The Boss was maximum leader of the troops, had the votes and presided over the City Council, so he couldn't lose.

Despres learned early to talk fast before the beet-fased mayor could grow irritated and cut off his aldermanic microphone. That happened at times. "I couldn't count on any 10 minutes," Despres explains.

Seymour Simon summons up remembrance of a Daley-Despres sideshow of the late 1960s. Despres "was the instigator" on that occasion, according to Simon, and was needling

the Boss about his choice of a new police superintendent. It was a ticklish matter. Chicago had never fully reclaimed face after a 1960 "burglars-in-blue" scandal that was all but etched on the city seal.

Daley flared back and called Despres "a faker," Simon remembers.

That brought Simon into the game. He urged the mayor to cool it. At the time, Simon had begun wearing his hair in a replay of Samson before Delilah got her shears. Baseball players and hard hats often look that way now. But in the 1960s hair around the ears looked like aldermanic heresy to the Boss.

"Why don't you go get a haircut?" he snapped at Simon.

Legend has it that Despres proposed that the council's forestry committee set standards for the foliage of aldermen, though he says he doesn't remember that quip now.

Even that wasn't the last word.

Two days later, Daley telephoned Simon.

"Sis [Daley's wife, Eleanor] tells me I got to apologize," he said.

"No need," Simon replied. "We're grown men."

"Sis tells me I got to apologize," the Boss repeated.

A CIVIC LANDMARK

Despres rarely heard apologies. Ald. Vito Marzullo despaired of him as a "nitwit." Ald. Thomas Keane, Machiavelli of the council, complained that Despres was a "loud-mouth." That was before Keane was sent up for mail fraud.

Aldermen who stayed clear of prison yelled "shut up" at Despres. He never did. What's more, he remained on the council scene after retiring from it by serving as parliamentarian for two mayors: Jane Byrne ("always interesting and she gave great parties") and Harold Washington ("a great mayor"). It was all in a day's routine for a man used to 100-hour work weeks when he was an alderman.

Despres never was your trademark civic father. He is a connoisseur of books, opera, theater, architecture, food, fine wines and world travel.

He founded the Friends of WFMT to support that FM radio station in a struggle with its board. His firm went into battle to ensure that the station would maintain its fine-arts character.

But Despres is first of all and most of all a Hyde Parker. He went to school there, he built his political base there. In 1967 he was mugged and shot there, on 55th Street, and lived to explain that it could happen anywhere.

He and his wife—who have a son, Robert, in Connecticut, and a daughter, Linda Baskin, in Chicago—have been married for 63 years. They celebrated their 60th by chartering a cruise boat and inviting some 200 friends to join them. In the Despres mode, the voyage was educational as well as sentimental: skyline sightseeing with a tour guide. The boat explored Chicago's Old Ma River, both branches, and Len says: "It's the greatest Chicago trip. You see the buildings in a way you never saw them before."

Despres will be 87 on Feb. 2, a Thursday. He expects it to be a workday as usual. He'll board the No. 6 bus in the darkness, swim 52 laps or maybe more, have a bagel and coffee, and get to work.

"I have been very fortunate," he says.

And that is Chicago's own good fortune.

THE IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1995

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the single biggest factor behind productivity growth is innovation. Two-thirds to 80 percent of productivity growth since the Great Depression is attributable to innovation. In an industrialized society, research and development is the primary means by which technological innovation is generated. However, because firms cannot capture fully the rewards of their innovation—the rate of return to society of innovation is twice that which accrues to the individual company—the market activity alone creates under-investment in R&D. The situation is aggravated by the high risk associated with R&D. Eighty percent of such projects are believed to be economic failures. Therefore, economists and technicians who have studied the issue are nearly unanimous that the Government should intervene to bolster R&D.

If the United States fails to provide U.S. companies with competitive incentives to conduct R&D, many U.S. firms in key industries— aerospace, electronics, chemicals, health technology, and telecommunications, to name a few—will find it harder to compete in an increasingly globalized marketplace, jeopardizing their leadership positions.

For the past 13 years we have had an R&D tax credit, designed to provide an incentive for companies to conduct additional R&D in the United States. Some, myself included, believe the credit structure can be improved to increase its effectiveness, especially regarding small business and high-technology industries. As the marketplace changes and industries mature, we must continue to improve the effectiveness and utilization of this important program. We have made such changes on no fewer than four occasions in the past. Most importantly, however, we must remove the uncertainty surrounding the credit's extension and once and for all permanently extend the provision. Study after study has established that the credit's uncertain future reduces its ability to continue stimulating additional increases in R&D expenditures.

To the extent that researchers in American laboratories are able to pioneer the new technologies, processes, and products that will drive global markets, we will be able to offer skilled and highly paid jobs to the next generation of Americans. That is why we must now underscore our permanent commitment to a leadership role in global technological advancement. If we fail to act, the R&D credit will expire in June of this year. Such failure is the opposite message we should be sending to U.S. businesses that are gearing up to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing, global marketplace.

As we prepare to enter the 21st century, we must remain committed to providing an environment that fosters technological investment and scientific exploration. America's continued economic well-being depends on it. Such investment creates more and higher paying U.S. jobs, increases productivity, and, in turn, increases the U.S. standard of living.

There is considerable discussion, on both sides of the aisle and within the Administra-

tion, about smaller government, less regulation, and market incentives as opposed to Government-dictated solutions. The R&D credit is an example of a successful program by which the Federal Government has encouraged market forces to dictate where and when innovation and technology should occur. The most recent study on the issue, prepared by KPMG Peat Marwick's policy economic group, concludes that "a one dollar reduction in the after tax price of R&D stimulates approximately one dollar of additional private R&D spending in the short run, and about two dollars of additional R&D spending in the long run." That, in turn, implies long run increases in GDP. Thus, an effectively targeted R&D credit can help set the pace of growth and should not be allowed to expire.

Currently the Government spends over \$71 billion per year on nondefense R&D. This spending will, and should, come under scrutiny with the rest of Federal spending. This spending can be cut without reducing our commitment to U.S. commercial leaders of the technological revolution. I believe a permanent R&D credit should be enacted as part of a meaningful, market-driven program to stimulate R&D, and I sincerely hope such action can be completed before the June 30, 1995, expiration date.

I am pleased to be introducing this legislation with my friends and colleagues, Representatives ROBERT MATSUI, WALLY HERGER, and RICHARD NEAL. I intend to work actively to ensure a permanent extension of the R&D credit and encourage all my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to work with me in this important endeavor.

AGRICULTURAL LANDS PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

HON. JOHN N. HOSTETTLER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1995

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Agricultural Lands Protection Act of 1995. This bill is meant to provide fundamental change in the approach taken toward deciding how land can be used. It grants owners of regularly farmed land freedom from overzealous regulators and it would end the withholding of farm program benefits as a penalty for farmers farming their land.

The Agricultural Lands Protection Act of 1995 will not jeopardize ground water quality. It will not inhibit the numerous private sector efforts to restore and conserve true wetlands.

How a property owner uses his or her land should determine how that land is classified. Water levels and vegetation types should not take precedence over the property owners' land needs. We can make significant strides toward helping farmers and ranchers economically by simply getting these burdensome regulations out of the way.

Farmers are the true conservationists. Nobody appreciates more the need to take care of the land. Their livelihoods depend on it. But a low spot in a field that holds water after heavy rain is not the ideal habitat for ducks. If it has been farmland, it should stay farmland until the property owner decides otherwise. I urge all members to cosponsor and support this valuable bill.