

LEGISLATION TO ELIMINATE THE SOURCE TAX

HON. BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, States with a source tax levy a tax on the retirement income of retirees who no longer reside in the State. Thousands of seniors across the country receive tax bills from States even though many of these retirees have not lived in that State for years. In every Congress since 1988, I have introduced legislation to prohibit the source tax.

I was very pleased last spring, when the Senate unanimously passed a source tax bill. I was even more pleased when, in the final week of the 103d Congress, the House also passed a bill to prohibit the source tax. Unfortunately, the Senate and House versions were not identical and there was no time for a conference.

Today I am again introducing a proposal to prohibit the source tax. The bill I am introducing will exempt all retirement income from State income tax if the individual receiving the income is not a resident of the State. This legislation will not place any cost on the Federal Government and may even cause a modest increase in Federal revenues.

This measure differs in two ways from the bill I sponsored in the 103d Congress. That bill included a cap on the amount of lump-sum distributions exempted from the source tax. My new bill will have no caps. Also, for the 104th Congress the measure covers all retirement plans, not just those that qualify for special tax treatment by the Federal Government. These changes, which extend the measure to all retirement income, make the bill more fair because it will treat all retirees equally.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support me in this cause. Retirees across the Nation will thank you.

TOWN OF SCHODACK CELEBRATES BICENTENNIAL IN 1995

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, it's been my privilege since entering Congress in 1979 to return home nearly every weekend.

That's not only a wise policy for a Member of Congress, it's good for a Member's peace of mind. It's necessary to get away from this artificial world of Washington, DC, and get back to the real world where real people have real jobs and raise real families.

Our 22d district is a largely rural area, and it is the tried and true virtues of our small towns and villages that have made this country great, as recognized as early as the 1830s by French visitor Alexis de Tocqueville. And today, I'd like to single out one of those communities, the Rensselaer County town of Schodack.

Schodack will celebrate its bicentennial in 1995, a celebration that will culminate in a gala-dinner dance on March 18.

Having visited Schodack many times during my 16 years of Congress and 6 years in the

State assembly, I can personally vouch for the town's embodiment of all of those smalltown virtues, the hard work, the patriotism, the spirit of volunteerism and helping one's neighbor.

Notwithstanding my new duties as chairman of the House Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, I still intend to return home as many weekends as possible to visit the good people of Schodack and all the other small communities that will always reflect the true heart and true character of America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and other Members to join me in congratulating the town of Schodack on this occasion of its 200th birthday.

EMPLOYEE COMMUTE OPTION

HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, today is truly a landmark day in the history of this country. On November 8, the citizens spoke out against big government and unfunded mandates.

We have a unique opportunity to curtail many, if not all, unfunded mandates this Congress. One key mandate is the employee trip reduction contained in the Clean Air Act of 1990.

If you thought the electorate was angry in November, wait until they hear about this restriction on their ability to drive their own car to work. The employee trip reduction, known also as the employee commute option, requires businesses with over 100 employees in certain areas to force their employees to carpool to work. Thus, the employee commute option is really a misnomer, because if the States do not enforce this mandate, they stand to lose much needed highway funding. In my own State of Illinois, that is \$700 million in the balance.

In other words, implement mandated carpooling, or else. That's not much of an option.

Affected areas are designated "severe" nonattainment regions based on 1987-1988-1989 statistics, even though recent data shows these regions have cleaned-up their air before these mandates take effect.

The bill I am introducing today allows the States to decide if they want carpooling to be part of their clean air plan. It will not change the goals of the Clean Air Act but simply gives States the option to utilize carpooling as a tool to help clean the air in their specific region.

My legislation sends a message to the EPA that the voters voiced back in November—we need common sense and flexibility in the law.

In Illinois, it is estimated that this mandate alone will only reduce air pollution levels by an average of 1 percent. That small percentage has a price tag estimated at \$200 million for businesses to enforce. This is a huge price tag, for a very small benefit. There are cheaper and better ways to achieve the same goals, but the States should have the flexibility to figure that out.

Please join me and the many Members who have cosponsored my bill in giving the States back the authority to improve their own air quality. Cosponsor and pass my bill to make the employee commute option truly an option.

BASEBALL FANS AND COMMUNITIES PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Baseball Fans and Communities Protection Act of 1995. It is time that Congress finally steps up to the plate and ends baseball's antitrust exemption which is at the root of the current strike and which has hijacked the national pastime away from the fans and communities that have supported it for so long.

Professional baseball is the only industry in the United States that is exempt from the antitrust laws without being subject to alternative regulatory supervision. There may have been a time when this unique treatment under our antitrust laws was a source of pride and distinction for the many who loved the game. But that time has ended. The continuing baseball strike of 1994—which ended the regular season, which ended the possibility of a World Series for the first time in 90 years and which has very nearly ended the love affair of the American people with their national pastime—has now become the Baseball strike of 1995. If Congress fails to take swift action in the 104th Congress, this lingering strike has the strong potential to destroy yet another season; and I, for one, am not going to stand by passively and watch that happen.

I am proud that the House Judiciary Committee at the close of the last Congress voted to repeal the nonstatutory antitrust exemption created by an anomalous Supreme Court decision in 1922. That decision created the notion that baseball somehow did not involve "interstate commerce" and thus was beyond the reach of the Federal Antitrust laws. The committee acted to end this illusion, which has now spawned very real and devastating economic consequences for our citizens.

The bill I am introducing responds to the current phase of the recurring labor crisis in baseball in a very limited, yet crucial, way: By subjecting the players' union and the owners to the Nation's antitrust laws in the event one party unilaterally imposes an anticompetitive term or condition of employment on the other. As introduced, the bill exempts minor league baseball from the scope of its coverage. It may be that the current situation will demand an even stronger response and a broader repeal. But, in my judgment, this is an appropriate starting point for developing a bipartisan consensus on the issue in the committee and in the full house.

The end result of baseball's special treatment has been the perpetuation of a closed, cartelized industry in which the few, incumbent club owners possess inordinate economic power and every other party—players, fans, municipalities, minor league club owners, potential expansion investors—remain economically marginalized. In a very real sense, the competitive landscape of major league baseball in 1995 resembles the very type of business arrangements that spurred Congress to enact the antitrust laws in the 1890's.

I am gratified by the bipartisan support received for this legislation in the last Congress, and the prospect that both sides of the aisle can work productively together to have swift

enactment of my legislation. While I realize that there are some who wish to concentrate solely on the provisions of the so-called "contract with America" in the first 3½ months of the new session, I would urge all of my colleagues to join with me in moving this to a high priority status so that spring training and the regulator season are not lost to the American people.

We have the opportunity and ability to rescue the national pastime from its current dispiriting condition. Let's not allow this opportunity to pass by or be deferred.

I urge all colleagues to join in the effort.

CREDIT BUREAU REPORTING OF COURT-ORDERED CHILD SUPPORT OBLIGATIONS

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as this historic 104th Congress convenes, I am reintroducing the Child Support Credit Bureau Reporting Act of 1995, to require all States to participate in a simplified, nationally uniform child-support credit-bureau reporting system.

I first introduced this bill in 1994. It is aimed at combatting the woefully low rate of child support payments in the United States, without creating a new Federal Government program to do it. Credit bureaus and, through them, individual lenders will know on a monthly basis whether or not parents are fulfilling this most basic obligation. With negligible Federal costs, this bill will begin to get the private sector involved in addressing those adults who don't pay their court-ordered child support.

Children are created by two people, and both of them must accept personal and financial responsibility for raising their children. In broken, or never-formed families, financial responsibility is often defined by court-ordered child support payments. Unfortunately, too many noncustodial parents fail to comply with the court orders.

A year ago, I received a letter from a constituent of mine in Warren, MI. This mother of two ran away from her husband, and moved into a shelter for abused women. She writes:

I have been working as a secretary for almost eight years now, and it still seems that there is never enough money. My ex-husband doesn't even pay the ordered \$55 per week, an amount so small it won't even buy them both new shoes or new coats. It won't pay for Little League registration * * * and if I saved every penny, it wouldn't put them half way through college. Why does he do this? Because he feels he can get away with it and I say he's right.

Unfortunately, she's not alone. The Office of Child Support Enforcement in the Department of Health and Human Services reports that of \$35 billion of cumulative court-ordered child support owed through 1992, \$27 billion remains uncollected. In 1992, nearly six million absentee parents made no child support payments at all.

This is simply wrong and my child support credit bureau reporting bill will help to change this.

Very simply, State agencies responsible for child support enforcement will report the status of all child support accounts to the Nation's

three major credit bureaus—TRW, Equifax, and Trans-Union. With this information appearing on credit reports, individual lenders will know on a monthly basis whether parents owe court-ordered child support and whether they are fulfilling this most basic obligation. After all, is a parent's obligation to pay court-ordered child support any less important than that parent's obligation to make a car payment or pay their credit card bills?

Last year, I asked the GAO to survey 16 States, credit bureaus, and some lenders regarding this proposal. I introduced my bill after receiving the favorable GAO report, entitled "Child Support Enforcement—Credit Bureau Reporting Shows Promise," on June 3, 1994. Generally, the GAO found that my proposal can increase child support collections, that it is administratively feasible, and, most importantly, it can be implemented with little cost to either State or Federal governments. In short, over time, my bill will help save money and increase court-ordered child support collections.

Mr. Speaker, we have done nearly all we can in the way of Federal statute; we already mandate tax-refund intercepts, the withholding of court-ordered support from wages, liens on property, and so on. But government cannot do this alone. The private sector must also reinforce the principle of parental responsibility. My bill will provide private-sector banks, credit card agencies, merchants, and businesses the information they should weigh when making loan decisions. Private sector lenders should attach at least as much importance to a parent's track record for paying court-ordered child support as they do to credit card balances and loan payments. And failure to pay court-ordered child support should carry grave consequences.

Mr. Speaker, if we support family values, then surely this is a sensible and necessary step. Those in the private sector—banks, credit card agencies, and businesses—should put court-ordered child support on the scale when weighing the decision to make a loan. We must send the message that both parents are responsible for supporting their children and that child support is a debt parents cannot afford to ignore.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that a copy of the bill be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

ALAN EMORY ASSUMES GRIDIRON PRESIDENCY

HON. JOHN M. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the achievements of a distinguished journalist who has been covering Washington since the days of President Truman. This week, as we seek a new direction for Congress and the country, so too will a new voice guide the well known Gridiron Club. Alan S. Emory, Washington correspondent for the Watertown (New York) Daily Times, assumed the presidency of the Club January 1. He has been that newspaper's Washington correspondent since 1951.

Gridiron is an organization of 60 journalists covering the Nation's Capital. They are well recognized for their annual gala dinner and

musical spoof of politics, over which Mr. Emory will preside on March 25.

Mr. Speaker, Alan Emory has crossed many notable milestones in his career—recipient of the Thomas L. Stokes prize for conservation reporting, election to the Society of Professional Journalists, President of its Washington Professional Chapter and member of the Chapter's Hall of Fame—but he is probably most gratified at his elevation to the presidency of Gridiron. He has twice been music chairman of their spring show, a producer ten times and always one of the Club's most prolific writer of lyrics. As a member since 1976 and most recently its vice president, he will be a most capable leader.

Covering Washington politics for more than four decades, Mr. Emory is known as a journalist with the highest of standards. He can be tough on newsmakers but is as fair as they come. What public official could ask for more? And who better to be chief lampooner at the Gridiron?

Mr. Speaker, I join his fourth estate colleagues, his family, particularly his beloved wife, Nancy, and his Capitol Hill friends in congratulating Mr. Emory on his assumption of the Gridiron Club presidency and look forward to his continuing successes through the new year.

CENTRALIZED AUTOMOBILE EMISSIONS INSPECTION

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today legislation to bring a commonsense approach to implementation of the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments. My legislation is designed to accomplish three goals: First, to delay for 2 years the implementation of the enhanced vehicle inspection and maintenance program; second, to require the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] to reissue regulations for this program; and third, to provide for the redesignation of marginal and moderate ozone nonattainment areas.

This legislation is in response to a consistent trend by the EPA of regulating first and asking questions later. As far back as April 2, 1993, I contracted EPA Administrator Carol M. Browner with regard to a requirement that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania implement a centralized vehicle inspection program. While I have many concerns with the EPA's Centralized Vehicle Emissions Inspection Program as a means of actually improving air quality, my main concern is over the Agency's Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards Report which found 41 of the 98 previously designated nonattainment regions registering ozone attainment for the years 1991 through 1993. Additionally, according to available ozone air studies these regions will again reach attainment in 1994. Had it not been for the inclusion of 1988, a climatological anomaly, in the EPA's 3-year average of ozone nonattainment, regions such as Harrisburg and Lancaster, PA, would never have been caught in this bureaucratic web of regulations. In my opinion, the EPA is looking for a problem to regulate which does not exist.