

ALASKA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE FILES 2019020072  
1647 SJ NOTICE OF MEETINGS - BALANCED BUDGET

1981-1982

FINAL

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

LIST OF FILES (PAGE 1)

---

NOTICE OF MEETINGS

BALANCED BUDGET

BRISTOL BAY AFFAIRS

BRISTOL BAY HEARINGS

SB 3

SB 5

SB 6

SB 7

SB 11

SB 29

SB 41

SB 43

SB 44

SB 49

SB 51

SB 57

SB 65

SB 69

SB 77

SB 78 (file 1)

SB 78 (file 2)

SB 79

SB 80

SB 83

SB 90

SB 99

SB 100

1981-1982

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

LIST OF FILES (PAGE 2)

---

SB 101

SB 102

SB 108

SB 115

SB 116

SB 117

SB 130

SB 132

SB 142

SB 149

SB 165

SB 167

SB 171

SB 175

SB 177

SB 181

SB 183

SB 193

SB 237

SB 266

SB 283

SB 285

SB 287

SB 289

SB 299

SB 303

SB 327

1981-1982

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

LIST OF FILES (PAGE 3)

---

SB 331

SB 366

SB 391

SB 392

SB 421

SB 423

SB 437

SB 473

SB 485

SB 512

SB 535

SB 537

SB 545

SB 547

SB 592

SB 594

SB 603

SB 610

SB 611

SB 620

Sb 626

SB 632

SB 633

SB 635

SB 654

SB 686

SB 687

1981-1982

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

LIST OF FILES (PAGE 4)

---

SB 688

SB 692

SB 714

SB 723

SB 741

SB 765

SB 774

SB 811

SB 821

SB 845

SB 855

SB 861

SB 863

SB 864

SCR 1

SCR 9

SCR 20

SCR 37

SJR 2

SJR 4

SJR 5

SJR 6

SJR 9

SJR 10

SJR 13

SJR 20

SJR 25

1981-1982

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

LIST OF FILES (PAGE 5)

---

SJR 30

SJR 39

SJR 54

SJR 55

SJR 61

SJR 68

SR 15

HB 2

HB 34

HB 36

HB 47

HB 53

HB 63

HB 74

HB 89

HB 112

HB 154

HB 155

HB 156

HB 158

HD 184

HB 194

HB 206

HB 210

HB 214

HB 252

HB 254

1981-1982

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

LIST OF FILES (PAGE 6)

---

HB 287

HB 328

HB 332

HB 339

HB 356

HB 377

HB 406

HB 409

HB 473

HB 485

HB 504

HB 548

HB 573

HB 575

HB 577

HB 591

HB 621

HB 627

HB 633

HB 637

HB 640

HB 640 - Correspondence

HB 668

HB 678

HB 726

HB 848

HB 849

1981-1982

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

LIST OF FILES (PAGE 7)

---

HCR 36

HJR 32

HJR 41

HJR 50

HJR 77

NOTICE  
OF  
MEETINGS



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 1, 1982

TO: Senator Anderson  
Senator Bennett  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's Office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Judiciary Committee will be hearing the following legislation the week of April 5 - 9:

#### Monday, April 5

- SB 327 - "An Act relating to parole of offenders; continuing the existence of the Board of Parole; and providing for an effective date."
- HB 377 - "An Act relating to factors in aggravation for purposes of imposing presumptive terms of imprisonment for felonies."
- SB 636 - "An Act relating to the return of property recovered or seized by law enforcement agencies or acquired as evidence in a criminal proceeding."
- SB 864 - "An Act continuing the existence of the Alaska Code Revision Commission and amending the statutes relating to its responsibilities."

#### Wednesday, April 7

- HB 194 - "An Act relating to prisoner employment and correctional industries; and providing for an effective date."
- SB 863 - "An Act providing for the award of costs and attorney fees incurred by defendants acquitted of offenses and by individuals who prevail in certain state administrative proceedings; changing Rules 79 and

effective date."

Friday, April 9

There will not be a meeting

SENATOR  
PATRICK M. RODEY  
3271 MONTCLAIRE COURT  
ANCHORAGE, AK 99503



SENATE MAJORITY LEADER  
CHAIRMAN  
SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE  
CHAIRMAN  
SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE  
ON BANKING

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
POUCH V  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811  
(907) 465-3717

MEMORANDUM

*on calendar*

DATE: March 30, 1982  
TO: Senator Anderson  
Senator Bennett  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's office  
FROM: Senator Rodey *P.M.R.*  
RE: Schedule Change

The Judiciary Committee will be hearing SB 686 on Monday, April 5, rather than Wednesday, March 31 as previously scheduled. The Committee will also not be hearing SB 632 on Friday, April 2.

*Tim 4/13*



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 17, 1982

TO: Senator Anderson  
Senator Bennett  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Judiciary Committee will be hearing the following legislation the week of March 22 - 26:

#### Monday, March 22

- SB 845 - "An Act to provide for reinstatement of certain dissolved Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act village corporations to corporate status."
- SB 592 - "An Act providing that the parents of delinquent minors and children in need of aid have the right to counsel in certain proceedings under AS 47.10."
- SB 473 - "An Act relating to urban renewal and development projects of municipalities; and providing for an effective date."

#### Wednesday, March 24

- SB 327 - "An Act relating to parole of offenders; continuing the existence of the Board of Parole; and providing for an effective date."
- SB 633 - "An Act relating to work programs for prisoners in state institutions."

#### Friday, March 26

- SB 654 - "An Act relating to alcoholic beverage licenses; and providing for an effective date."
- SB 774 - "An Act reducing the fee for a club license to sell alcoholic beverages."
- SB 855 - "An Act repealing the requirement that an applicant for a beverage dispensary license file a bond."



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: March 25

TO: Senator Anderson  
Senator Bennett  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Judiciary Committee will be hearing the following legislation the week of March 29 - April 2:

#### Monday, March 29

SB 327 - "An Act relating to parole of offenders; continuing the existence of the Board of Parole; and providing for an effective date."

HB 350 - "An Act relating to unlawful practices in the sale or rental of real property."

#### Wednesday, March 31

SB 686 - "An Act relating to the return of property recovered or seized by law enforcement agencies or acquired as evidence in a criminal proceeding."

SB 193 - "An Act amending state personnel laws; and providing for an effective date."

#### Friday, April 2

SB 632 - "An Act relating to games of chance and contests of skill; and providing for an effective date."

SB 864 - "An Act continuing the existence of the Alaska Code Revision Commission and amending the statutes relating to its responsibilities."

HB 194 - "An Act relating to prisoner employment and correctional industries; and providing for an effective date."



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

Senate

Committee on Judiciary

*On Calendar*

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 17, 1982

TO: Senator Anderson  
Senator Bennett  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Judiciary Committee will be hearing the following legislation the week of March 22 - 26:

### Monday, March 22

- SB 845 - "An Act to provide for reinstatement of certain dissolved Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act village corporations to corporate status."
- SB 592 - "An Act providing that the parents of delinquent minors and children in need of aid have the right to counsel in certain proceedings under AS 47.10."
- SB 473 - "An Act relating to urban renewal and development projects of municipalities; and providing for an effective date."

### Wednesday, March 24

- SB 327 - "An Act relating to parole of offenders; continuing the existence of the Board of Parole; and providing for an effective date."
- SB 633 - "An Act relating to work programs for prisoners in state institutions."

### Friday, March 26

- SB 654 - "An Act relating to alcoholic beverage licenses; and providing for an effective date."
- SB 774 - "An Act reducing the fee for a club license to sell alcoholic beverages."

SB 855 - "An Act repealing the requirement that an applicant  
for a beverage dispensary license file a bond."



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

Senate

Committee on Judiciary

*Dr. Calundann*  
Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 11

TO: Senator Anderson  
Senator Bennett  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Senate Judiciary Committee will be hearing the following legislation the week of March 15-19:

Monday, March 15 ✓

SB 535 - "An Act relating to the criminal laws of the state."

HB 573 - "An Act relating to the crime of tampering with a witness."

Wednesday, March 17 ✓

SB 473 - "An Act relating to urban renewal and development projects of municipalities; and providing for an effective date."

SB 633 - "An Act relating to work programs for prisoners in state institutions."

Friday, March 19 ✓

SB 78 - "An Act relating to filing and recording and to recordable documents; and providing for an effective date."



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Judiciary Committee

Touch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 4, 1982

TO: Senator Anderson  
Senator Bennett  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Judiciary Committee will be hearing the following legislation the week of March 8 - 12:

Monday, March 8

SB 78 - "An Act relating to filing and recording and to recordable documents; and providing for an effective date."

Wednesday, March 10

SB 535 - "An Act relating to criminal laws of the state."

SB 635 - "An Act relating to liability of public officers and employees for an injury resulting from a determination relating to probation or parole."

SB 714 - "An Act relating to sexual assault."

Friday, March 12

SB 741 - "An Act relating to child support enforcement."

SB 603 - "An Act relating to regional resource centers."



ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
SENATE BANKING COMMITTEE  
POUCH V, JUNEAU 99811

March 2, 1982

*an  
closed*

TO : Members of the Senate Special Committee on Banking  
Senator Mulcahy  
Senator Stimson  
Senator Sturgulewski  
Members of the House Committee on Loans  
Representative Meekins  
Representative Bettisworth  
Representative Buchholdt  
Representative Halford  
Representative Miller

FROM: Senator Pat Rodey, <sup>Chairman</sup> ~~Chairman~~  
Senate Special Committee on Banking

RE : Joint Committee meeting on Saturday, March 13th from 10:00-Noon  
in Anchorage

There will be a joint committee meeting of the Senate Special Committee on Banking and the House Committee on Loans on Saturday, March 13th, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 Noon in the Anchorage Legislative Information Office, 2nd Floor Conference Room. Please use the 1016 W. 6th Avenue entrance as the Offices will be closed.

The purpose of the meeting will be to discuss the following:

- \* Multi-family housing
- \* Interstate banking

cc. ~~Senate Secretary's Office for publication~~  
Chief Clerk's Office for publication



ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
SENATE BANKING COMMITTEE  
POUCH V, JUNEAU 99811

March 2, 1982

TO : Members of the Senate Special Committee on Banking  
Senator Mulcahy  
Senator Stimson  
Senator Sturgulewski  
Members of the House Committee on Loans  
Representative Meekins  
Representative Bettisworth  
Representative Buchholdt  
Representative Halford  
Representative Miller

FROM: Senator Pat Rodey, <sup>MR</sup>Chairman  
Senate Special Committee on Banking

RE : Joint Committee meeting on Saturday, March 13th from 10:00-Noon  
in Anchorage

There will be a joint committee meeting of the Senate Special Committee on Banking and the House Committee on Loans on Saturday, March 13th, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 Noon in the Anchorage Legislative Information Office, 2nd Floor Conference Room. Please use the 1016 W. 6th Avenue entrance as the Offices will be closed.

The purpose of the meeting will be to discuss the following:

- \* Multi-family housing
- \* Interstate banking

cc. Senate Secretary's Office for publication  
Chief Clerk's Office for publication



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 25, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Ray  
Senator Parr  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Judiciary Committee will hear the following legislation the week of March 1 - March 5:

#### Monday, March 1

CSSB 167(Rules)am - "An Act relating to election campaigns and to the composition and responsibilities of the Alaska Public Offices Commission; and providing for an effective date."

SCR 37 - Relating to the use of computers and telecommunications systems.

SJR 13 - Relating to the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States defining Congressional representation and voting rights for residents of the District of Columbia.

#### Wednesday, March 3

SB 811 - "An Act relating to compilation of the jury list."

SB 626 - "An Act relating to smoking in public places."

SB 741 - "An Act relating to child support enforcement."

#### Friday, March 5

SB 175 - "An Act adopting a code of ethics for state officials and state employees; establishing a State Ethics Commission; repealing AS 39.50; and providing for an effective date."



# Alaska State Legislature

Official Business

Senate

Judiciary Committee

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 1, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Ray  
Senator Parr  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: SCHEDULE CHANGE FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 5

The Judiciary Committee will be hearing HB 640 on Friday, March 5, in addition to the already scheduled bills.

Thank you.



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

Senate

Judiciary Committee

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 4, 1982

TO: Senator Anderson  
Senator Bennett  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Judiciary Committee will be hearing the following legislation the week of March 8 - 12:

### Monday, March 8

SB 78 - "An Act relating to filing and recording and to recordable documents; and providing for an effective date."

### Wednesday, March 10

SB 535 - "An Act relating to criminal laws of the state."

SB 635 - "An Act relating to liability of public officers and employees for an injury resulting from a determination relating to probation or parole."

SB 714 - "An Act relating to sexual assault."

### Friday, March 12

SB 741 - "An Act relating to child support enforcement."

SB 603 - "An Act relating to regional resource centers."



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 25, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Ray  
Senator Parr  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Judiciary Committee will hear the following legislation the week of March 1 - March 5:

#### Monday, March 1

CSSB 167(Rules)am - "An Act relating to election campaigns and to the composition and responsibilities of the Alaska Public Offices Commission; and providing for an effective date."

SCR 37 - Relating to the use of computers and telecommunications systems.

SJR 13 - Relating to the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States defining Congressional representation and voting rights for residents of the District of Columbia.

#### Wednesday, March 3

SB 811 - "An Act relating to compilation of the jury list."

SB 626 - "An Act relating to smoking in public places."

SB 741 - "An Act relating to child support enforcement."

#### Friday, March 5

SB 175 - "An Act adopting a code of ethics for state officials and state employees; establishing a State Ethics Commission; repealing AS 39.50; and providing for an effective date."



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

Senate

Judiciary Committee

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 1, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Ray  
Senator Parr  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: SCHEDULE CHANGE FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 5

The Judiciary Committee will be hearing HB 640 on Friday, March 5, in addition to the already scheduled bills.

Thank you.



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Judiciary Committee

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 25, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Ray  
Senator Parr  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule Change

This is to notify you that the Judiciary Committee will be hearing SJR 6, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Alaska relating to sessions of the legislature, in addition to the bills already scheduled for Monday, March 1.

Thank you.



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 25, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Ray  
Senator Parr  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Judiciary Committee will hear the following legislation the week of March 1 - March 5:

Monday, March 1 ✓

CSSB 167(Rules)am - "An Act relating to election campaigns and to the composition and responsibilities of the Alaska Public Offices Commission; and providing for an effective date."

SCR 37 - Relating to the use of computers and telecommunications systems.

SJR 13 - Relating to the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States defining Congressional representation and voting rights for residents of the District of Columbia.

Wednesday, March 3 ✓

SB 811 - "An Act relating to compilation of the jury list."

SB 626 - "An Act relating to smoking in public places."

SB 741 - "An Act relating to child support enforcement."

Friday, March 5

SB 175 - "An Act adopting a code of ethics for state officials and state employees; establishing a State Ethics Commission; repealing AS 39.50; and providing for an effective date."

*on calendar*



# Alaska State Legislature

Official Business

Senate

Judiciary Committee

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

MEMORANDUM

March 1, 1982

To: Senate Judiciary Members

From: Senator Rodey *D.M.R.*

Re: Wednesday Schedule

The Committee will take up SJR 6 in addition to the other items on the calender.

*SENATE SECRETARY*



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 22, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Ray  
Senator Parr  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey *pmk*

RE: February 26th Meeting

*on calendar*

The Committee will not hear SB 686 as scheduled but will take up HB 640.



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

Senate

Committee on Judiciary

Ponch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

M E M O R A N D U M

*on calendar*

DATE: February 25, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Ray  
Senator Parr  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule Change

This is to notify you that the Judiciary Committee will be hearing SJH 6, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Alaska relating to sessions of the legislature, in addition to the bills already scheduled.

*March 1st*

Thank you.



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 18, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Ray  
Senator Parr  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

Monday, February 22, (this meeting will be at 1:00 P.M.)

SB 610 - "An Act relating to certificates of birth."

SB 765 - "An Act exempting importation of alcoholic beverages for religious purposes."

SB 692 - "An Act relating to the duties of coroners and the coroner's inquest."

Wednesday, February 24

SB 193 - "An Act amending state personnel laws; and providing for an effective date."

SB 620 - "An Act repealing the limitations on awarding compensation to victims of violent crime if the victim is a relative or member of the household of the offender."

SB 611 - "An Act revising the criminal penalties for unlawful operation of an aircraft."

Friday, February 26

SB 535 - "An Act relating to the criminal laws of the state."

SB 686 - "An Act relating to the return of property recovered or seized by law enforcement agencies or acquired as evidence in a criminal proceeding."



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

Senate

Committee on Judiciary

*a calendar*

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 3, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Senate Judiciary Committee will be hearing the following legislation during the week of February 8 - 12:

Monday, February 8, 1982

No meeting

Wednesday, February 10, 1982

HB 406 - "An Act relating to sales of alcoholic beverages to and by licensed wholesalers."

SB 626 - "An Act relating to smoking in public places."

SB 610 - "An Act relating to certificates of birth."

Friday, February 12, 1982

No meeting

SEN. PATRICK K. RODEY

CHAIRMAN

3071 465-3717



SEN. BOB MULCAHY  
SEN. JALMAR KERTTULA

MEMBERS

*on calendar*

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
SENATE BANKING COMMITTEE  
PO BOX V, JUNEAU 99811

January 28, 1982

*✓ Senate Secretary*

TO : Senator Mulcahy  
Senator Stimson  
Senator Sturgulewski

Representative Meekins  
Representative Bettisworth  
Representative Buchholdt  
Representative Halford  
Representative Miller

FRC. Senator Patrick M. Rodey

RE : Joint Meeting of the House and Senate Banking Committees

The House and Senate Banking Committees will hold a joint meeting on Thursday, February 4, at 3:30 pm in the House Finance Committee Room.

The purpose of the meeting will be to receive testimony from the housing industry and to receive an overview of AHFC.



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

Senate

Committee on Judiciary

*on calendar*

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 28, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Senate Judiciary Committee will be hearing the following legislation the week of February 1:

Monday, February 1

SB 289 - "An Act increasing the number of superior court judges."

SJR 6 - Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Alaska relating to sessions of the legislature.

Wednesday, February 3

SB 688 - "An Act making special appropriation to the Department of Public Safety for a computerized fingerprint system; and providing for an effective date "

SB 687 - "An Act relating to the issuance of search warrants; and changing Rule 37, Rules of Criminal Procedure."

SB 299 - "An Act relating to elections."

Friday, February 5

SB 193 - "An Act amending state personnel laws; and providing for an effective date."

SEN. PATRICK RODEY

CHAIRMAN

907 465-3717



SEN. BOB MULCAHY  
SEN. JALMAR KERTTULA

MEMBERS

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

SENATE BANKING COMMITTEE

P.O. BOX V, JUNEAU 99811

January 28, 1982

*Senate Secretary*

TO : Senator Mulcahy  
Senator Stimson  
Senator Sturgulewski

Representative Meekins  
Representative Bettisworth  
Representative Buchholdt  
Representative Halford  
Representative Miller

FROM: Senator Patrick M. Rodey

RE : Joint Meeting of the House and Senate Banking Committees

The House and Senate Banking Committees will hold a joint meeting on Thursday, February 4, at 3:30 pm in the House Finance Committee Room.

The purpose of the meeting will be to receive testimony from the housing industry and to receive an overview of AHFC.

*in calendar*



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

*on calendar*

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 28, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Senate Judiciary Committee will be hearing the following legislation the week of February 1:

#### Monday, February 1

SB 289 - "An Act increasing the number of superior court judges."

SJR 6 - Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Alaska relating to sessions of the legislature.

#### Wednesday, February 3

SB 688 - "An Act making special appropriation to the Department of Public Safety for a computerized fingerprint system; and providing for an effective date."

SB 687 - "An Act relating to the issuance of search warrants; and changing Rule 37, Rules of Criminal Procedure."

SB 299 - "An Act relating to elections."

#### Friday, February 5

SB 193 - "An Act amending state personnel laws; and providing for an effective date."



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 22, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's Office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

This is to notify you that the Senate Judiciary Committee will not be hearing SB 289 on Monday, January 25, as scheduled. It will be rescheduled for Monday, February 1.

*on calendar*



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

Senate

Committee on Judiciary

*on calendar*  
*1/25/82*  
Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 21, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Senate Judiciary Committee will be conducting a work session on the following legislation on Friday, January 29, in the House Resource Room at 1:30 P.M.:

SB 535 - "An Act relating to the criminal laws of the state."

SB 485 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."

SB 547 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of, or the exclusion of the public during, testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

Senate

Committee on Judiciary

*on calendar*  
*1/25/82*

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 21, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Senate Judiciary Committee will be conducting a work session on the following legislation on Friday, January 29, in the House Resource Room at 1:30 P.M.:

SB 535 - "An Act relating to the criminal laws of the state."

SB 485 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."

SB 547 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of, or the exclusion of the public during, testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 22, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's Office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

This is to notify you that the Senate Judiciary Committee will not be hearing SB 289 on Monday, January 25, as scheduled. It will be rescheduled for Monday, February 1.



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

Senate

Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 21, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Senate Judiciary Committee will be conducting a work session on the following legislation on Friday, January 29, in the Butrovich Room at 1:30 P.M.:

SB 535 - "An Act relating to the criminal laws of the state."

SB 485 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."

SB 547 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of, or the exclusion of the public during, testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 21, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

The Senate Judiciary Committee will hear the following bills during the week of January 25th.

Monday, January 25th

SB 108 - "An Act raising the limits of compensation which may be awarded by the Violent Crimes Compensation Board."

SB 620 - "An Act repealing the limitations on awarding compensation to victims of violent crime if the victim is a relative or member of the household of the offender."

SB 289 - "An Act increasing the number of superior court judges."

Wednesday, January 27th

SJR 6 - "Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Alaska relating to sessions of the legislature."

SB 193 - "An Act amending the State Personnel Act (AS 39.25); and providing for an effective date."

Friday, January 29th

To be announced Friday, January 22.



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

1-20-82  
on calendar

DATE: January 14, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Schedule

Monday, January 18, 1982, 1:30 P.M., Butrovich Room

- CSSB 399 - "An Act relating to adoption; and providing for an effective date."
- SB 535 - "An Act relating to the criminal laws of the state."
- SB 545 - "An Act relating to release after conviction of an offense."

Tuesday, January 20, 1982, 1:30 P.M., Butrovich Room

- SB 485 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."
- SB 547 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of, or the exclusion of the public during, testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."

Friday, January 22, 1982, 1:30 P.M., Butrovich Room

- SSSJR 10 - Proposing amendments to the Constitution of the State of Alaska relating to agricultural rights in state lands.

- SJR 54 - Proposing amendments to the Constitution of the State of Alaska relating to the confirmation of appointments by the governor.
- SCR 19 - Proposing an amendment to the uniform rules relating to an earlier organization of the legislature.



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

Senate

Committee on Judiciary

*1-20-82  
on calendar*

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Parr  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's Office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Friday, January 22 Committee Meeting

We will not take up SCR19 as originally scheduled. The remainder of the committee calender is unchanged.



# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

Official Business

### Labor & Commerce Committee

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

15 January, 1982

TO: Senator Hohman, Vice Chairman  
Senator Fahrenkamp  
Senator Rodey  
Senator Ziegler

FROM: Senator Bob Mulcahy, Chairman  
Senate Labor and Commerce

The Senate Labor and Commerce Committee announces a joint House and Senate Labor and Commerce meeting to be held on Wednesday, 27 January, 1982, at 1:30pm, in the first floor conference room at the Behrends Building.

The meeting will be a presentation on the results of the Vocational Rehabilitation Study, and the preliminary findings of national consultant John Lewis, who is conducting a comprehensive Workers Compensation Study for the Department of Labor.



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 14, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Schedule

Monday, January 18, 1982, 1:30 P.M., Butrovich Room

CSSB 399 - "An Act relating to adoption; and providing for an effective date."

SB 535 - "An Act relating to the criminal laws of the state."

SE 545 - "An Act relating to release after conviction of an offense."

Wednesday, January 20, 1982, 1:30 P.M., Butrovich Room

SB 485 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."

SB 547 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of, or the exclusion of the public during, testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."

Friday, January 22, 1982, 1:30 P.M., Butrovich Room

SSSJR 10 - Proposing amendments to the Constitution of the State of Alaska relating to agricultural rights in state lands.

- SJR 54 - Proposing amendments to the Constitution of the State of Alaska relating to the confirmation of appointments by the governor.
- SCR 19 - Proposing an amendment to the uniform rules relating to an earlier organization of the legislature.



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Parr  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's Office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Friday, January 22 Committee Meeting

We will not take up SCR19 as originally scheduled. The remainder of the committee calender is unchanged.

*Jim & Ed*



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 14, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hobman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Schedule

This is to notify you of cancellation of the Senate Judiciary Committee meeting scheduled for Friday, January 15 due to the joint session to be held at 2:00 on that date.



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 14, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Schedule

Monday, January 18, 1982, 1:30 P.M., Butrovich Room

CSSB 399 - "An Act relating to adoption; and providing for an effective date."

SB 535 - "An Act relating to the criminal laws of the state."

SB 545 - "An Act relating to release after conviction of an offense."

Wednesday, January 20, 1982, 1:30 P.M., Butrovich Room

SB 485 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."

SB 547 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of, or the exclusion of the public during, testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."

Friday, January 22, 1982, 1:30 P.M., Butrovich Room

SSSJE 10 - Proposing amendments to the Constitution of the State of Alaska relating to agricultural rights in state parks.

- SJR 54 - Proposing amendments to the Constitution of the State of Alaska relating to the confirmation of appointments by the governor.
- SCR 19 - Proposing an amendment to the uniform rules relating to an earlier organization of the legislature.



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 19, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Committee Schedule

This is to notify you that the Senate Judiciary Committee will hear SB 545, "An Act relating to release after conviction of an offense.", on Wednesday, January 20 at 1:30 P.M. in the Butrovich Room. SB 547 and SB 485 will still be heard as scheduled.



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Parr  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary's Office

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Friday, January 22 Committee Meeting

We will not take up SCR19 as originally scheduled. The remainder of the committee calendar is unchanged.



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 14, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Schedule

Monday, January 18, 1982, 1:30 P.M., Butrovich Room *on calendar*

CSSB 399 - "An Act relating to adoption; and providing for an effective date."

SB 535 - "An Act relating to the criminal laws of the state."

SB 545 - "An Act relating to release after conviction of an offense."

Wednesday, January 20, 1982, 1:30 P.M., Butrovich Room *on calendar*

SB 485 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."

SB 547 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of, or the exclusion of the public during, testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."

Friday, January 22, 1982, 1:30 P.M., Butrovich Room *on calendar*

SSSJR 10 - Proposing amendments to the Constitution of the State of Alaska relating to agricultural rights in state lands.

- SJR 54 - Proposing amendments to the Constitution of the State of Alaska relating to the confirmation of appointments by the governor.
- SCR 19 - Proposing an amendment to the uniform rules relating to an earlier organization of the legislature.



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 15, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Schedule

Friday, January 15, 1982, 1:30 P.M., Eutrovich Room

- CSSB 399 - "An Act relating to adoption; and providing for an effective date."
  - SB 485 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."
  - SB 547 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of, or the exclusion of the public during, testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."
- on calendar*  
*on calendar*  
*on calendar*



Official Business

# Alaska State Legislature

## Senate

### Committee on Judiciary

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

#### M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: January 11, 1982

TO: Senator Bennett  
Senator Hohman  
Senator Parr  
Senator Ray  
Senate Secretary

FROM: Senator Rodey

RE: Senate Judiciary Schedule

Wednesday, January 13, 1982, 1:30 P.M. Butrovich Room

HB 156 - "An Act relating to Legislative contracts."

SB 399 - "An Act relating to adoption; and providing for an effective date."

Friday, January 15, 1982, 1:30 P.M. Butrovich Room

SB 485 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."

SB 547 - "An Act permitting the videotaping of, or the exclusion of the public during, testimony of young victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse of a minor; and changing Rule 804, Alaska Rules of Evidence relating to exceptions to the hearsay rule."

BALANCED  
BUDGET



SENATE OF MARYLAND

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

November 7, 1979

The Honorable Robert H. Ziegler  
Box 7500  
Ketchikan, Alaska 99901

Dear Bob:

Under separate cover, we are sending you a considerable amount of material on the pros and cons of the Balanced Budget Amendment.

My personal view is that the present system has not worked. In fact, we can't even keep to the schedule which is set by statute for passing the budget resolutions. Experience has shown us that the states have benefited greatly by the constitutional provision which requires a balanced budget. Most all of the states are in good financial shape; whereas, the Federal government is tottering on the brink of disaster.

I think the central point is that without constitutional discipline, a representative democracy will always err on the side of excesses. Representatives will always try to give their constituents everything they desire even if it is unaffordable. I call this the disease of representative democracy.

I hope this will be helpful to you, and if there is anything else you would like to have, please let me know. If you can secure the passage of this resolution at the next session you will have made a great contribution towards maintaining our freedoms and liberties in this country.

Sincerely,

James Clark, Jr.

P-I 2/29/80

# Top Banker Warns Of National Bankruptcy

NEW YORK (AP) — Felix Rohatyn, the banker who played a leading role in saving New York City from fiscal collapse, said yesterday that the United States is "headed for a national bankruptcy."

He called for a freeze on wages and prices coupled with federal budget cuts and a large gasoline tax.

"What is happening to the United States in 1980 is similar to what happened to New York City in 1975, namely a slide towards bankruptcy," said Rohatyn, a partner of Lazard Freres & Co. who served as chairman of the Municipal Assistance Corp., set up by the state.

In a speech prepared for delivery to the Conference Board, a business-financed research organization, Rohatyn said New York's political leaders "did not wake up to reality until the credit markets closed on the city," stopping it from borrowing.

"The present near-collapse of the credit markets is finally focusing attention of the government and the public on what has been the inescapable reality for some time, namely that we are headed for a national bankruptcy, in this case called runaway inflation," he said.

The federal government has been forced to pay record interest rates to borrow this year as investors have sought high rates to protect them against inflation. The rates have been rising rapidly in recent weeks, forcing some companies and municipalities to avoid borrowing money through the bond markets.

Rohatyn called for a "temporary 12-month wage-price freeze, together with extreme budgetary restraint. This should include a cut of at least \$20 billion in current outlays to break inflationary expectations."

# The Anchorage Times

ROBERT B. ATWOOD  
Editor and Publisher

WILLIAM J. TOBIN  
Associate Editor  
And General Manager

FRED DICKEY  
Executive Editor

Page A-6

Wednesday, March 19, 1976

## Carter's cutbacks

**HARD TIMES ARE** coming, and apparently more rapidly than any politician really wants to admit. But the signs are there, and those who will be affected the most are wage earners and their families. The recurring theme of the warnings now being heard from economists and certain officials in the public and private sector is that everybody's standard of living is about to take a substantial and frightening drop.

President Jimmy Carter laid some of the groundwork last week in an address to the nation, advising us of what he said would be severe steps taken by the administration to bring inflation and escalating living costs under control. The short-range effect of Mr. Carter's plan apparently will be beneficial, but from all sides now are being heard predictions that what the president is doing is far off target and won't achieve any long-range solutions.

We're not surprised.

Mr. Carter clearly hasn't come to grips with the issue, and the magnitude of his continued refusal to take proper positive steps is nowhere more apparent than it is in Alaska. All Alaskans aren't necessarily economics wizards, but most of them can see that Mr. Carter's policy is haywire when it comes to energy.

**DESPITE THE GRAVITY** of a situation which even he acknowledges, Mr. Carter still stubbornly sticks to the blind unreasonableness of Interior Secretary Cecil Andrus. In return for election year support from the environmental zealots, the president persists in his backing of Mr. Andrus' determination to lock up millions of acres of Alaska natural resource land in untouchable wilderness regions.

The truth is that the nation

will never solve inflation, will never righten its listing economy and will never control soaring living costs until it makes a priority commitment of the need to produce new domestic oil and gas supplies — and reduce dependency on foreign petroleum imports.

At a time when the national budget is over the \$600 billion mark, Mr. Carter's brave determination to cut federal expenditures by \$13 billion is a drop in the bucket. It will not stave off the threat of economic disaster or depressionary peril.

Greater expenses by far are being run up by the Department of Energy, whose annual budget is said to outstrip the profits of all the oil companies combined. On top of that now comes the cost of a new Department of Education, which surely eventually will be as large.

**EVEN IN ALASKA**, Mr. Carter is proposing — through Secretary Andrus — to spend millions in policing the wilderness largely frozen in place by the shortsighted policies of this floundering administration.

Can anyone really believe that President Carter is doing anything more than political posturing when on the one hand he tones the need to reduce federal spending while on the other he authorizes the National Park Service to seek \$3.5 million for the construction of 11 one-bedroom houses for park rangers who are supposed to oversee the new monuments created by the infamous Andrus edict?

That's \$318,000 per house for this environmentalist playground created by Mr. Carter's Interior secretary.

Heaven help you family budget. It's for sure Jimmy Carter won't.

# Carter's Policy Leaning Toward Balanced Budget

WASHINGTON (UPI) — The administration's emerging new anti-inflation policy yesterday focused heavily on balancing the federal budget for the first time in a decade.

A number of other possible anti-inflation steps have all but been ruled out in the administration's policy review, sources said. These include credit controls involving automobile purchases and housing, gasoline rationing and a stiff gasoline tax.

Carter still might propose using the Credit Control Act of 1969 to tighten the Federal Reserve's control over credit issued by banks, possibly by extending its authority to banks that are not members of the Fed.

Mandatory wage-price controls were ruled out earlier in the government's review. Instead, the administration plans to step up monitoring of prices under its voluntary wage-price guidelines program and seeks other ways to make that program more effective.

The Council on Wage and Price Stability, with only about 60 professional price monitors, may borrow more from other government agencies.

Administration officials do not regard a balanced budget as an "overnight panacea" for inflation. Some studies show that, by itself, it would affect inflation by only a few tenths of a percent.

But they hope such a move would effectively convince Americans Carter intends to bring inflation under control — and thereby puncture the buy-it-now psychology officials believe is fueling inflation.

The administration studied proposals to cut government spending by possibly \$4 billion during the remainder of this fiscal year.

In addition, government agencies have come up with possible spending cuts to trim about \$10 billion from the \$15.8 billion deficit President Carter had projected for fiscal year 1981, which begins Oct. 1.

Program re-estimates based on more current information and possible delay of some new programs might take care of the remaining 1981 deficit, administration sources said.

If so, it would be the first time since 1969 the federal budget came out of the red.

**Editorial Opinion and Comment of**

**FAIRBANKS**

# **Daily News - Miner**

*"Independent in All Things... Neutral in None"*

Other opinions expressed on this page do not necessarily reflect those of the Daily News-Miner.

## **Too little, too late**

Time is running out for President Carter's promises to balance the federal budget and control inflation. As our nation's economy moves faster toward the recession that's somehow been put off since last year, he has announced a program designed more toward the prospects of his next election than the promises of the last one.

About the only good thing one can say about the Carter plan is that it does not adopt wage and price controls. This could be a rare bit of good sense in the Carter administration, or it could be nothing more than the fact that wage and price controls are a program identified with the president's Democratic primary election opponent, Sen. Edward Kennedy.

But whatever the motive, President Carter's program is too little, too late. Rather than cure inflation, it's more likely to cause an increased call for Kennedy-like solutions in three or four months when it becomes obvious that both the Carter plan and the Kennedy campaign have failed.

The president plans to at last balance the budget. This is to be done by both cutting the budget and raising more revenue through new federal oil taxes. Yet the budget for the current fiscal year is to be cut by only \$2 billion. Next year, we're promised, the budget will be cut by another \$13 billion. We won't be told where these cuts are to be made until after the next few primary elections.

About \$10 billion of the new oil revenue will come from an import fee on foreign crude oil. The administration that has been unfairly blaming all our inflation problems on expensive foreign oil is now raising the price of foreign oil to fight inflation.

There's no big delay in the higher oil prices Americans will have to pay. They went into effect at midnight Friday night.

At least we should be happy that the president has rededicated himself to balancing the budget, by whatever means. The federal budget deficit has been the leading actor in the inflation tragedy since the Johnson administration, while oil prices have only played a supporting role for the past six years.

In the simplest terms, the Carter plan calls for the public to pay now while he promises to cut the federal budget after the election.

That's not good enough, given the record of Jimmy Carter's promises and the failure of his previous three inflation fighting plans.

## **What now?**

So what do we do, now that the nation's inflation rate is booming along at an annual rate of 18 per cent and the only thing that will stop it is a recession? What do we do, now that the bumbling in Washington D.C. is making that recession look more like an old-fashioned depression all the time?

The prescription has been given many times before. It's not bitter medicine, except for the politicians and bureaucrats. What makes it hard is that in this case the politicians run the drug store.

We need big cuts where the federal budget has grown the most in useless bureaucratic fat. One good area is the Department of Energy, which spends billions to tie up our nation's domestic oil and coal production. Another place to cut is the new Department of Education. Since both of these are pets of the Carter administration, we'll need a new president too.

We also need cuts in federal income taxes. That will increase the take-home pay of every American, thus pumping billions of dollars into the economy to strengthen businesses, create new jobs and in turn increase other federal revenues. Tax cuts can fight unemployment and ease the effects of the recession better than any federal government "assistance" program.

We also need a state income tax cut right here in Alaska. The reasons for that are the same as those for a federal tax cut, but in Alaska's case the arguments are even stronger because of the budget surplus our state will soon be enjoying. A tax cut is not the only way the state's oil resource wealth can be shared with the people here, but it's the fastest, easiest and simplest act open to us now.

After all, we're not in the penny pinch or the election year straitjacket that grips the federal government.

Development Planning and Research Associates, Inc.  
200 Research Drive, Manhattan, Kansas 66502

BRISTOL BAY RED SALMON  
PROJECTED  
1981 MARKET CONDITIONS

To

State of Alaska  
Office of the Governor

P. 407

May, 1981

# BALANCE THE BUDGET AMENDMENT COMMITTEE

## Why A Balanced Federal Budget Amendment Is Needed

A constitutional amendment is needed to curb federal spending, reduce inflation, and balance the federal budget on a regular basis. It is a needed check against the strong bias in our political system for higher spending. Many of our economic problems - inflation, unemployment, low productivity - can be traced to excessive spending by the Federal government.

The key factor in this bias for excessive spending is pressure group politics. Well organized special interest groups make strong demands for programs that benefit them greatly, but these demands are weakly opposed because costs are thinly spread over all taxpayers, each of whom stand to lose comparatively little. Deficit spending helps hide these costs in the form of borrowing, inflation, and reduced economic growth.

Because of these factors, the budget has been balanced just once in the last 20 years. Successive Congresses and Presidents have proven themselves unable to resist pressures to spend. Conventional legislative remedies and new approaches to budgeting have failed. Only a constitutional amendment will be strong enough to provide the necessary fiscal discipline.

### Benefits of a Balanced Budget

A balanced budget will help reduce interest rates. When the government borrows money, it soaks up available capital, raising interest rates. Businessmen can't get needed funds for investment and consumers must pay high interest rates to finance the family home or car.

A balanced budget will reduce inflation. Deficits are financed by the hidden tax of inflation. When the government increases the money supply to pay for the deficit, each dollar becomes worth less. From 1950 to 1965 the average annual federal deficit was \$2.6 billion and the average inflation rate was under 2%. From 1965 to 1978 the average deficit was \$25.8 billion, and the average inflation rate was about 5.5%. With deficits averaging over \$50 billion in the last 3 years, the current inflation rate is over 10%. Chronic deficits also feed an inflationary psychology. In the long run, a balanced budget will reduce the rate of inflation substantially.

A balanced budget will help reduce unemployment. Deficits are being financed out of private savings, with the result that less money is available to finance private investment. This shift of resources causes a lower growth rate and an increase in unemployment.

A balanced budget will reduce wasteful spending. The costs of spending programs are not fully considered, since they are partly hidden by deficit financing. Without a check on federal spending, Congress has little incentive to stop waste.

A balanced budget will slow the growth of federal spending. Since all new programs will have to be paid for with new taxes, Congress would be far more reluctant to enact new programs, without cutting out old and unnecessary ones.

A balanced budget will increase government accountability. Chronic deficit spending is fundamentally dishonest. It's an attempt to treat spending programs as if they have no tax cost.

Public support for a balanced budget amendment is overwhelming. Gallup polls consistently find that about 75 percent of those polled favor an amendment. A 1979 Roper poll found a three to one margin in favor of a convention "called to consider an amendment to limit federal spending."

### The Necessity For State Action

Congress is very reluctant to propose such an amendment which would restrain itself. Every proposed constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget has died in committee. Article V of the Constitution enables the states to amend the Constitution when Congress fails to do so. To date, 30 of the required 34 states have passed resolutions asking for a limited convention on a balanced budget amendment if Congress does not act.

As the drive for a convention nears success, Congress will probably propose the amendment on its own, and no convention would be necessary. This has happened before. Congress proposed an amendment to provide for the direct election of U.S. Senators in 1912 but only after enough states had called for a convention. Congress will not propose a balanced budget amendment unless the states again call for a limited convention. Mere memorial resolutions cannot force Congressional action.

A convention would have one purpose only - to draft a balanced budget amendment. It would not have any other powers which Congress has. This convention can only propose an amendment which would become law only after it is ratified by 38 states.

The resolutions before the state legislatures plainly state that the resolution is void if a convention is not limited to this one exclusive purpose. There is strong legal authority that the States and Congress have the power to limit a convention to one subject. This is the official position of the American Bar Association. This is also the conclusion of former U.S. Attorney General Griffin B. Bell, former U.S. Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr. the Deans of Harvard and University of Chicago Law Schools, and many others.

Besides the moral and legal safeguards which would assure a limited convention, there are three additional "checks" to limit a convention.

The mode of ratification of amendments (by either legislatures or conventions in three-fourths of the states) must be selected by Congress. By refusing to make the selection, Congress can block ratification of an amendment that went beyond the convention call. An extraneous amendment could also be subject to disapproval by the Federal Courts. Finally, any proposed amendment must be ratified by at least three-fourths (38) of the states.



OFFICE OF  
**The Secretary of State**  
STATE HOUSE  
Phoenix, Arizona

ROSE MOFFORD  
SECRETARY OF STATE

April 9, 1980


Senator Clem V. Tillion  
President of the Senate  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear President Tillion:

The Arizona State Legislature, Second Regular Session, 1980, passed Senate Concurrent Memorial 1004, urging the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit federal expenditures to a percentage of the gross national product.

The members of the Legislature have asked me to transmit the enclosed copy to you, with the hopes and request that your legislative body will swiftly adopt a similar Memorial.

Sincerely,

  
Rose Mofford  
Secretary of State

RM/bp



## SENATE OF MARYLAND

ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

JAMES CLARK, JR.  
PRESIDENT

242 WILDE LAKE VILLAGE  
COLUMBIA MARYLAND 21044  
PHONE: 397-3572

December 31, 1980

The Hon. Robert H. Ziegler, Sr.  
307 Bawden Street  
Ketchikan, AK 99901

Dear Bob:

It was good talking to you the other day, and as agreed, I have written to Patrick Rodey asking him to consider helping with the passage of the resolution. I sent him a copy of the model and I am also enclosing another one for you.

Hopefully 1981 will be the year we are successful in this endeavor. Please let me know if there is anything further that I might do.

Sincerely,



Jim Clark

JC/m



## SENATE OF MARYLAND

ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

JAMES CLARK, JR.  
PRESIDENT

542 WILDE LAKE VILLAGE  
COLUMBIA, MARYLAND 21044  
PHONE 997-2572

December 31, 1980

The Honorable Patrick Rodey  
601 W. 5th Ave., Suite 320  
Anchorage, AK 99501

Dear Senator:

Please allow me to introduce myself. I am James Clark, Jr., and have been a member of the Maryland General Assembly for 22 years. Since 1974 I have given a great deal of effort and time to promoting an amendment to the Constitution for a balanced federal budget. At this point we have had 30 states adopt a balanced budget resolution, which calls upon the Congress to give us such an amendment, or in the event that the Congress does not choose to act, calls upon them to convene a constitutional convention for the specific and exclusive purpose of taking up such an amendment.

I would hope that Alaska would be willing to join the 30 states that have already taken this action. It seems to me that 30 years of fiscal irresponsibility by the Congress is about enough. We cannot continue to deficit spend without dire consequences for our great Country. Further, I would hope that you could see fit to help in the passage of such a resolution at your coming legislative session. I am enclosing a "model" resolution which has been used in most of the states.

Wishing you a happy and successful new year.

Sincerely,

Jim Clark

JC/m  
Enc.

Budget of the United States

FOR the purpose of requesting appropriate action by the Congress, either acting by consent of two-thirds of both Houses or, upon the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several states, calling a constitutional convention to propose an amendment to the Federal Constitution to require, with certain exceptions, that the total of all Federal appropriations may not exceed the total of all estimated Federal revenues in any fiscal year.

WHEREAS, With each passing year this Nation becomes more deeply in debt as its expenditures grossly and repeatedly exceed available revenues, so that the public debt now exceeds hundreds of billions of dollars.

The annual Federal budget continually demonstrates an unwillingness or inability of both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal government to curtail spending to conform to available revenues.

Unified budgets do not reflect actual spending because of the exclusion of special outlays which are not included in the budget nor subject to the legal public debt limit.

Knowledgeable planning, fiscal prudence, and plain good sense require that the budget reflect all Federal spending and be in balance.

Believing that fiscal irresponsibility at the Federal level, with the inflation which results from this policy, is the greatest threat which faces our Nation, we firmly believe that constitutional restraint is necessary to bring the fiscal discipline needed to restore financial responsibility.

Under Article V of the Constitution of the United States, amendments to the Federal Constitution may be proposed by the Congress whenever two-thirds of both Houses deem it necessary, or on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several states the Congress shall call a constitutional convention for the purpose of proposing amendments. We believe such action vital; now, therefore, be it

Congress of the United States that procedures be instituted in the Congress to add a new Article to the Constitution of the United States, and that the \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ requests the Congress to prepare and submit to the several states an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, requiring in the absence of a national emergency that the total of all Federal appropriations made by the Congress for any fiscal year may not exceed the total of all estimated Federal revenues for that fiscal year; and be it further

RESOLVED, That, alternatively, this Body makes application and requests that the Congress of the United States call a constitutional convention for the specific and exclusive purpose of proposing an amendment to the Federal Constitution requiring in the absence of a national emergency that the total of all Federal appropriations made by the Congress for any fiscal year may not exceed the total of all estimated Federal revenues for that fiscal year; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this application by this Body constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until at least two-thirds of the legislatures of the several states have made similar applications pursuant to Article V, but if Congress proposes an amendment to the Constitution identical in subject matter to that contained in this Joint Resolution then this petition for a Constitutional Convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this Body also proposes that the legislatures of each of the several states comprising the United States apply to the Congress requesting the enactment of an appropriate amendment to the Federal Constitution; or requiring the Congress to call a constitutional convention for proposing such an amendment to the Federal Constitution; and be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of this Resolution be sent by the Secretary of State to (our members of Congress); and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Secretary of State of this State is directed to send copies of this Joint Resolution to the Secretary of State and presiding officers of both Houses of the Legislature of each of the other States in the Union, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. and the Secretary of the United States Senate,

# Learned Anything?



Cicero, that great Roman statesman made these suggestions for good government:

- The budget should be balanced.
- The treasury should be refilled.
- Public debt should be reduced.
- The arrogance of officials should be tempered and controlled, and assistance to foreign lands should be curtailed lest we become bankrupt.
- The people should be forced to work and not depend on the government for subsistence.

Keep in mind of course that Cicero lived about two thousand years ago.

Have we learned anything?

April 18, 1980

Ms. Rose Mofford,  
Secretary of the State  
Arizona House of Representatives  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Secretary Mofford:

We appreciate receiving a copy of your Senate Concurrent Memorial 1004.

Alaska is taking similar steps, both at the federal and state level, as you can see by the enclosures.

You might tell your Arizona troops that we sure as hell see eye to eye with them.

Please remember me to President Corbet, Peter Kay and other members of your legislature whom I've met over the course of years at Western Conference of the Council of State Government meetings.

Regards,

Robert H. Ziegler, Sr.

RHZ:lk

Enclosures

bcc: Senator Tillion

**Former Treasury Secretary Michael Blumenthal**—"The current Congressional budget process provides a fully adequate formal mechanism for controlling spending and the deficit. The real task before us is not to write new statutes and Constitutional amendments, but to use the existing legal machinery to achieve balance in fact. The test of fiscal restraint is not what we say, but what we do."

**Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr. (R-Tenn.) Jr.**—"I have come to the conclusion that a constitutional mandate for a balanced federal budget, except in case of clear national emergency, is necessary and proper."

"I have co-sponsored a Constitutional amendment, proposed by Senator Richard Lugar (R) of Indiana, which states that the federal budget, as set in the Congress' Concurrent Budget Resolution, shall be balanced unless two-thirds of both the House and the Senate vote otherwise."

"While I do not fear another Constitutional convention, I believe the more sensible and expeditious approach would be for the Congress itself to recognize its own failing and take the strong but necessary measures to put its financial house in order."

**Senator Edmund S. Muskie (D-ME)**—"I believe a fundamental danger exists in any plan to call a new Constitutional convention."

"In the two hundred years since 1776, we have had only one Constitutional convention. That was the one in which James Madison, Benjamin Franklin and their colleagues shaped the system of government we know in America today. I am not eager to expose their work to the prospect of massive revision. No one knows for sure that a new convention would limit itself to the balanced budget issue."

"Constitutional scholars are not at all sure that a convention could be forced to limit its agenda. What would be the outcome? Would the delegates ban abortion or give abortion a specific guarantee? Would they outlaw guns or outlaw gun control? Would they stop forced busing or give forced busing an explicit Constitutional blessing?"

"We have no business taking such chances with the fundamental law of the land. Through wars, depression, impeachment proceedings and an amazing array of changes, this nation has never found it necessary to call a new Constitutional convention. It is not necessary now."

"No Constitutional amendment and no legislative act can be drafted so carefully that it is not susceptible to evasion and circumvention. One option, for example, would simply be to balance the federal budget by separating operating costs from capital investments and counting only the former as subject to a yearly balance. That is what the states do, and if we were to do it in Washington, the budget would be close to balance now. But that kind of budgeting is inappropriate for Washington."

**Senator Henry Bellmon (R-OK)**—Ranking minority member of the Senate Budget Committee has been outspoken in his call for a balanced budget.

"The federal government has become accustomed to spending in the red. We've had only eight balanced budgets since 1934 and only one since 1980. The deficit for this year alone will be over \$30 billion and our total national debt will be about \$800 billion, equal to \$3,000 for every man, woman and child in this country."

"What's really frustrating is that the government, which causes inflation, benefits most from inflation. Because of the progressive tax system, federal revenues increase 1½ percent when inflation goes up 1 percent. When you receive additional income and move into a higher tax bracket, the government takes a higher percentage and the end result is that your income won't buy as much."

**Congressman James R. Jones (D-OK)**—Is very much in favor of a balanced federal budget, and proposes that the federal budget be limited to 10 percent of the nation's gross national product. Jones is a key member of the powerful House Budget Committee and his bill H.R. 4646 concerning capital cost recovery reflects concern for federal budgeting and tax reform.

**Senators H. John Heinz III (R-Pa.) and Richard Stone (D-Fla.)** have joined in introducing a constitutional amendment to limit federal spending. Simply, this amendment would limit the increase in federal spending to a percentage equal to the percentage increase in the gross national product. If the inflation rate exceeds 3 percent, however, the amendment would apply additional limits on the overall growth of federal outlays.

Stone. "I joined in introducing this amendment because I believed it would put our economy back on the road to prosperity by keeping more money in the hands of those who earn it. This amendment limits the growth of federal spending by setting a ceiling on how much more the federal government will be allowed to spend every year. The formula says that next year's government spending can't grow faster than this year's production, as measured by the gross national product."

## BENEFITS OF A BALANCED BUDGET

Reducing federal spending would not solve inflation per se. It would, however, dampen inflationary expectations on the part of business and consumers. At the consumer level, this would result in reduced spending in anticipation of inflation. At the corporate level it would be reflected in smaller salary increases, wage settlements and price increases. These phenomena together would mean moderate growth at best, and slightly higher unemployment.

But more than psychological benefits would result from a reduced federal spending. For example:

**Lower Interest Rates**—with the government diverting less money from public and private sources, more money will be available for borrowing at lower rates.

**Federal Government Under Control**—legislation creating new programs and extending current ones could not be enacted without

raising taxes or abolishing other programs.

**Business Investment Stimulated**—Wall Street and Main Street will be able to attract more "small" and "large" investors because people will be looking for long-term gains. Today people must spend their money to avoid losing purchasing power.

## IS A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT THE WAY TO LIMIT SPENDING ?

How can Federal spending be limited? One way that is getting more and more attention in Congress and in State Houses across the country is a constitutional amendment to require a balanced federal budget.

Critics of a balanced budget amendment—and they represent the conservative and liberal ends of the political spectrum—cite two principal reasons for their position. First, they contend such an amendment would not be realistic, that it could not take into account the volatile nature of the national—and international—

economy. Besides, asks Congressman John J. Rhodes, (R-AZ) "What would you do if the budget weren't balanced? Send everybody in the legislative and executive branches of government to jail?" Second, amendment critics are fearful of a Constitutional convention that would not limit itself to the consideration of the federal budget. They point out that such a convention could recommend sweeping changes in the Constitution, prompting other countries to question the stability of the United States government.

Proponents of a balanced budget amendment scoff at these concerns for the most part. Responding to the first point, they argue balanced budgets could be waived by vote of Congress for specific periods of time. Also, budget deficits could be offset by applying budget surpluses from previous years. On the point of a sweeping Constitutional convention, supporters of an amendment say that the Constitution provides many safeguards to prevent a runaway convention from proposing fundamental changes in the law of the land.

## LEGISLATIVE REVIEW - What are Congressional and Government leaders saying about limiting spending ?

Twenty-nine states have already passed resolutions calling for a Balanced Budget Amendment.

Recent Congressional action in the House narrowly defeated budget resolution proposals by Rep. Holt (R-Md.) to reduce fiscal 1979 spending levels. Senate passed the so-called Nunn

amendment, which coupled spending ceilings with individual tax cuts through 1983. The house instructed its conferees on the tax bill to accept the same language, but after the Administration intervened, the amendment was watered down to non-binding "statement of intent." Roli-Kemp personal tax cuts, with-

out associated spending cuts, were defeated in both houses. A proposal by Senator Danforth (R-Mo.) requiring a surtax to finance "excess" spending growth was defeated in the Senate Finance Committee.



## Greater Ketchikan Chamber of Commerce

2415 Hemlock - 110 - Ketchikan, Alaska 99901

Telephone 507 225-3184

Representative Charles H. Parr  
Chairman, Judiciary Committee  
Alaska State Legislature  
Pouch V  
Juneau, AK 99811

April 2, 1980

Dear Representative Parr:

The Greater Ketchikan Chamber of Commerce is on record in support of the "Balance the Budget" amendment to the Constitution of the United States and Senator Ziegler's Senate Joint Resolution #16.

The Chamber of Commerce understands that S.JR #16 has passed unanimously in the Senate and is currently in the House Judiciary Committee for consideration. The Chamber requests that this resolution be brought to the floor of the House for ratification immediately.

Best regards,

*Sally Smith*

Sally Smith  
President  
Greater Ketchikan Chamber of Commerce

cc: Senator Robert H. Ziegler, Sr.  
Representative Oral Freeman  
Representative Terry Gardiner



KETCHIKAN RAINBIRD

Dear Editor:

The fact that some legal opinion could somehow make the words "shall call a convention" into a "run-away" nightmare is, I believe, illustrative of why people are so upset with government and the experts. It is this kind of ruling class elitism which fights so hard for the status-quo by trying to make every issue so complicated, that breeds and fosters the mistrust of government that is now so prevalent.

I, along with over 65 % of all Americans as shown by a recent Roper poll do not believe the sky is going to fall or civilization come to an end if a constitutional convention were to be held.

## A Conclusion

It should be remembered that even if a balanced budget amendment were passed, the federal government could also resort to a number of stratagems to get around any budget amendment. It could, for example:

\*Mandate that state and local governments finance programs now supported with federal dollars.

\*Use new regulations to shift the cost of certain programs on to the private sector, which already spends an estimated \$100 billion a year complying with various government edicts.

\*Exclude capital expenditures from the budget.

\*Pass on new program costs to future budgets.

\*Use tax incentives, loan guarantees, tariff protection or antitrust waivers—instead of direct on-budget expenditures—to accomplish certain economic objectives.

One excellent way to avoid all this is for the White House and Congress to live up to their promises about a lean and austere budget—which, according to the Administration, means a \$28.4 billion deficit in fiscal year 1980 and a \$300 million surplus in fiscal 1981.

## WHAT DOES GFWC SAY ABOUT LIMITING FEDERAL SPENDING?

By resolution at national convention, GFWC has long been on record as being in favor of bringing federal spending more in line with income, as the following resolutions indicate:

1974—**RESOLVED**, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges Congress to:

1. Adopt enforceable spending limits;
2. Adopt the recommendations of the Joint Study Committee on

Budget Control to bring about effective Congressional control over spending;

3. Reject bills which require spending beyond the proposed spending limitations.

1978—**RESOLVED**, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs supports an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would require a balanced Federal budget.

1979—**RESOLVED**, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the Government of the United States to pursue a program of realistic economic stabilization including reduced consumption where necessary, with a pay-as-you-go plan of taxation; sound monetary controls; an end to the vicious spiral resulting from the contest between rising wages and rising prices; and the utmost economy in administration.

## WHAT CAN YOU DO?

**Become a Lobbyist Yourself—**Write your Representatives and Senators. Tell them your personal view of the issue; keep it simple; handwritten letters have the greatest impact; state how the issue affects you, your family and your community; avoid form letters; be specific; be constructive; and, ask for a reply.

**Duplicate This Report—**This ACTION REPORT is placed in the CLUBWOMAN centerfold so it can be removed easily. Duplicate it on a photocopy machine. Distribute it to all your club members. Ask them to study it, and to take ACTION.

**Ask Your Local Media To Help—**Check with your local newspaper, public and commercial television stations and see if they have taken a stand on the issue of Federal Spending. If not, encourage them to use their voice to inform the public.

**Ask Your GFWC Members To Take ACTION Now—**The more than 600,000 GFWC club members of the largest organization of women volunteers in the world can have a tremendous impact on the formation of legislative policy concerning Federal Spending, but ONLY if your club studies the issues

**GFWC Headquarters Wants To Know—**How do the members of your club feel about the issue of Limiting Federal Spending and what action will your members take? Write to the FREE PROGRAM and let us have a brief report and your ideas on how GFWC members everywhere can help to support the FREE Program by taking ACTION on the issues covered in the CLUBWOMAN.

Write to: Mrs. Bill G. Williams  
GFWC FREE Chairman  
P.O. Box 118  
Newport, Tenn. 37821

Watch for the next FREE Program ACTION REPORT

## BENEFITS OF A BALANCED BUDGET

Reducing federal spending would not solve inflation per se. It would, however, dampen inflationary expectations on the part of business and consumers. At the consumer level, this would result in reduced spending in anticipation of inflation. At the corporate level it would be reflected in smaller salary increases, wage settlements and price increases. These phenomena together would mean moderate growth at best, and slightly higher unemployment.

But more than psychological benefits would result from a reduced federal spending. For example:

**Lower Interest Rates**—with the government diverting less money from public and private sources, more money will be available for borrowing at lower rates.

**Federal Government Under Control**—legislation creating new programs and extending current ones could not be enacted without

raising taxes or abolishing other programs.

**Business Investment Stimulated**—Wall Street and Main Street will be able to attract more "small" and "large" investors because people will be looking for long-term gains. Today people must spend their money to avoid losing purchasing power.

## IS A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT THE WAY TO LIMIT SPENDING ?

How can Federal spending be limited? One way that is getting more and more attention in Congress and in State Houses across the country is a constitutional amendment to require a balanced federal budget.

Critics of a balanced budget amendment—and they represent the conservative and liberal ends of the political spectrum—cite two principal reasons for their position. First, they contend such an amendment would not be realistic, that it could not take into account the volatile nature of the national—and international—

economy. Besides, asks Congressman John J. Rhodes, (R-AZ) "What would you do if the budget weren't balanced? Send everybody in the legislative and executive branches of government to jail?" Second, amendment critics are fearful of a Constitutional convention that would not limit itself to the consideration of the federal budget. They point out that such a convention could recommend sweeping changes in the Constitution, prompting other countries to question the stability of the United States government.

Proponents of a balanced budget amendment scoff at these concerns for the most part. Responding to the first point, they argue balanced budgets could be waived by vote of Congress for specific periods of time. Also, budget deficits could be offset by applying budget surpluses from previous years. On the point of a sweeping Constitutional convention, supporters of an amendment say that the Constitution provides many safeguards to prevent a runaway convention from proposing fundamental changes in the law of the land.

## LEGISLATIVE REVIEW - What are Congressional and Government leaders saying about limiting spending ?

Twenty-nine states have already passed resolutions calling for a Balanced Budget Amendment.

Recent Congressional action in the House narrowly defeated budget resolution proposals by Rep. Holt (R-Md.) to reduce fiscal 1979 spending levels. Senate passed the so-called Nunn

amendment, which coupled spending ceilings with individual tax cuts through 1983. The house instructed its conferees on the tax bill to accept the same language, but after the Administration intervened, the amendment was watered down to non-binding "statement of intent." Roth-Kemp personal tax cuts, with-

out associated spending cuts, were defeated in both houses. A proposal by Senator Danforth (R-Mo.) requiring a surtax to finance "excess" spending growth was defeated in the Senate Finance Committee.

community, and we mentioned what was uppermost on our minds, the death of Maurice Cohen. Almost at once, this usually imperturbable gentleman choked up, and his eyes filled with tears, a spontaneous tribute to one of the dearest, most lovable of God's children.

Maurice would have been embarrassed by any show of special recognition, although I think he would have deeply appreciated it. Maurice was accustomed to give rather than receive, and his special pleasure was in helping and seeing others enjoy fame or acclaim, fellowship and good conversation, the opportunity for following their individual interests, and food and drink. He took such joy in urging and serving heaping portions of succulent beef, Mexican tastes, a variety of vegetables, and unimaginably spicy condiments to the table of select friends, acquaintances, and friends of friends who met any day of the week for lunch with and by Maurice as his guests.

Maurice pressed food on people, to his and their delight. Yet he never pressed his opinions or persuasions. He practiced and encouraged freedom—to be what one chooses, to think and say what one believes—or believes at the moment. God, it is said, looks more carefully at the heart of a person than at any other aspect of being. This was true of Maurice as well. He understood people—their occasional weaknesses, but primarily their over-riding nobility and strengths. So his list of select friends was long and enduring. It included the elite of officialdom, presidents, governors, Congressmen, judges, mayors, district attorneys, postmasters, the whole roster of officers and workers in government at all levels. It included outstanding members of the community in many fields of endeavor, as well as individuals little known.

He saw through the gobbledygook and meaninglessness of party differences, of status and income differences, of vocational or interest differences, of ethnic and religious differences; and his heart was generous enough, and his intellect discerning enough, to embrace them all, like a proud mother all her children, encouraging them the while to "Eat, eat!" and "Live, live!"

The one word that might be picked to describe Maurice Cohen would be "character"—he was a character, and he had character.

Maurice was different. He followed his own star—whether in manner, speech, dress, habits, crotchets, hobbies, interests, or business practices. Yet he never said or did or wore anything unseemly or wrong. That would have been out of character. For his whole life—his upbringing, the teachings of his parents, the traditions of his grandparents and forebears, the counsel and example of his cherished wife and helpmate in all things, Edith, his own strict code of ethics and standards, marked his every action and reaction.

He could precisely be called a man of character—a title of rare distinction—for it should cover many aspects of goodness, consistently and without deviation. He was honest in all matters; his word was his bond, whatever the cost. He took advantage of no one, regardless of their status. He was unfailingly kind, gentle, generous and compassionate, and would go to great lengths to make others happy or comfortable. He was a truly humble person, without pretense or ostentation. He greatly appreciated any kindness to him, to any member of his family or his friends. I never heard him condemn anyone.

Maurice had real courage and venture-someness. In his business undertakings, he assumed great risks as a matter of course. His decisions, however, were not thoughtless gambles. They were based on specialized knowledge, on a keen eye and a quick mind, with far-ranging considerations of many factors and possibilities.

In his earlier years, he was recognized as one of the most expert cattlemen in the country, who for decades bought, raised and sold vast numbers of livestock. He continued in this business and in allied enterprises until his fatal stroke last week.

He had, of course, many associates in this work. It is another test of his character that they remained good friends so many years, and he never forgot their helpfulness to him in tough times. Thus he was closely attached to the late Mr. Jesse Oppenheimer and to his lifelong colleagues and comrades, Dan Oppenheimer and Joe Straus, Sr., to name only a few.

Maurice had this curious contradiction in makeup. In the depths of his being, he was a single individual, almost a loner, if not lonely. On the other hand, he craved to have people around him, as often as possible. He was strengthened by their presence, and was even dependent on that presence. Among the friends who have been stalwarts are Julio Vasquez, Rosita Jimenez, and Robert Garcia.

Maurice did not come often to synagogue, but I know he was profoundly a person of faith. Prayer, offered on behalf of others, for his wife, Edie, for his late brother Bill, and for himself were not just words and phrases. They were ladders to heaven, a way of communicating with the Divine. He prayed as well, particularly for his dear departed—and of course, he thereby acknowledged that life continues beyond life. How else could it be when quality was his mark! He was devoted to the persistence of quality, in all things, in thought, in action, in human relationships, in life here and forever. Amen: so may it be. ●

### THE DANGEROUS FALLACIES OF A BALANCED BUDGET CONVENTION

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, several misconceptions are being used in support of the call among some of the States for a constitutional convention to mandate a balanced Federal budget.

In view of the potential consequences of such a constitutional convention, it would serve us all well to examine the arguments for such a convention carefully before the Nation is led into a potentially disastrous undertaking.

In the April 1979 issue of the AFL-CIO American Federationist, there is a thoughtful discussion of "the dangerous fallacies" involved in such a convention, written by Gus Tyler, assistant president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, author of several books, and a columnist.

I insert a condensed version of his article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the AFL-CIO American Federationist, April 1979]

#### THE DANGEROUS FALLACIES OF A BALANCED-BUDGET CONVENTION

(By Gus Tyler)

The present push for a constitutional convention to balance the federal budget raises two questions: the desirability of constitutionally mandating a balanced budget and the desirability of convening a convention to enact such an amendment.

The mood of the country on reducing or holding down taxes is understandable. People who work for wages feel over-taxed—and they are. The who live on "earned" in-

come report virtually all of their earnings and pay on what they report because they don't have any loopholes. People who live on "unearned" income—stocks, bonds, properties—report about half their income and pay on only part of what they report because they enjoy many loopholes.

The problem is not that taxes are too high, but that they are too high for some because they are too low for others. A proper cure for this disorder would be tax reform that lifts some of the burden from America's middle class of wage and salaried people and imposes more of the burden on the rich who live on "unearned" income.

Fearing precisely such an eventuality, the wealthy have mounted a campaign to convince the nation that taxes in general are too high for everyone. This myth was the basis for Proposition 13 in California and is the basis for the present proposal to have a constitutional convention for a balanced budget.

Although the emotional urge for a balanced budget is the desire to keep taxes down, the constitutional amendment will not guarantee that taxes will be reduced or kept at present levels. Indeed, the mandated balance may actually increase taxes.

A budget can be balanced in one of two ways: either by reduced spending or by increased taxes. If at some future time, the President and Congress are not allowed to borrow they will have to raise taxes to make ends meet. Hence, a balanced budget can mean higher as well as lower taxes.

Although some favor the idea on the mistaken notion that it will automatically hold down taxes, others favor it as a way to check inflation. The logic is embedded in the argument that government deficits lead, in one way or another, to more dollars chasing too few goods, and thereby forcing up prices.

For such monetary theorists, the expanded money supply is offered as the sole reason for inflation. They do not blame high interest rates; they do not blame monopolies and oligopolies; they do not blame government fixing of prices, as in the case of numerous agricultural products; they don't even blame high wages. They are single-minded: the culprit is the government that tries to pay for deficits by "printing money."

Their statistical evidence is that in years when the federal deficit is high, inflation runs high. Actually, this seemingly irrefutable proof is no proof at all, because a tracing of U.S. budget deficits shows they are more likely the result of wars and recessions. Inflation may cause a deficit, but not vice versa. In a period of inflation, the government must pay more for many things. Hence, a so-called balanced budget, drawn at the beginning of the year, may well end up as a deficit at the end of a year when prices rise either because of crop failures, an act of OPEC, monopoly action, or a jump in interest rates imposed by the Federal Reserve Board.

#### THE REALITIES OF DEBT

Most monetarists reveal their anti-government bias when they blame out federal budget deficits as the sole or the primary source of an expanded money supply. There are many, many other factors at work expanding the money supply, traditionally defined as the total of all currency plus all demand deposits. Effective money supply is determined by at least two other factors: the amount of credit and the velocity with which money circulates. At present the "supply" of money generated by credit is staggering, with multi-billion dollars outstanding on any one day on credit cards alone—just to cite one small instance. Likewise, the velocity with which money moves is decisive: one dollar spent 10 times in one day has the same impact as 10 dollars spent once. And neither the amount of credit outstanding nor the velocity with which money moves can be

... solely or mainly to government def-

In sum, although the monetarist theories about how deficits make for inflation are couched in seemingly sophisticated research and reason, the arguments are shockingly unsophisticated.

Equally fallacious is the argument that the national debt is growing at a dangerous rate and that, unless we stop this piling of debt on debt, the unbearable burden will break the government's back.

In 1966, when the Gross National Product (the sum of all goods and services produced here in one year) was \$753 billion, the debt was 43.6 percent of the GNP. But in 1976, when the GNP was at \$1,706 billion (rushing toward the \$2 trillion mark) the debt had fallen to 37 percent of the GNP. In 10 years our debt shrank as a portion of our total output.

This "shrinking" of the national debt is not some freakish occurrence peculiar to the years from 1966 to 1976. There has been a downward trend ever since the end of World War II; in 1946, the debt was 132.6 percent of GNP; by 1962, it was 55 percent; by 1965, 48 percent; by 1976, it was down to 37 percent; and by 1979, the debt is a mere 28.4 percent of GNP. Judged by ability to carry the burden, the debt is getting steadily lighter.

An irksome irony about the call for budget balancing is that those who cry loudest and longest about debt are the worst offenders: the states, the corporations and the individual consumers. They are all in debt and more deeply in debt than the government that, at the end of 1978, was only responsible for 19 percent of total indebtedness in America. From 1940 to 1976, the federal debt grew at a slower pace than all other kinds of debt, state and local, corporate, and private consumer debt grew far more rapidly.

In 1940, the federal debt was \$44.4 billion; by 1976, it stood at \$515 billion—a twelvefold increase in 36 years. State and local debt for the same years rose from \$16 billion to \$236 billion—a fifteen-fold increase.

Corporate debt rose (same years) from \$75 billion to \$1,414 billion—a nineteenth-fold increase.

The biggest sinners of all—if debt is considered a sin—are Richard Roe and Jane Doe. The debt incurred by consumers rose (same years) from \$8 billion to \$217 billion—a twenty-sevenfold increase.

The truth of the matter is that debt is a way of life not only in America but in every free enterprise (capitalist) country in the world. The reasons are pragmatically obvious and theoretically understandable.

Most homeowners in America would own no home if they had to pay in cash for the purchase. A mortgage is a loan that incurs a debt. Mortgage indebtedness rose (same years) 24 times over, which is about twice as fast as the federal debt.

It would be useless to put money in a bank unless it is done purely for safekeeping. The bank could pay no interest—unless there were borrowers, ready to incur debt, who would pay interest to the bank so the bank could pay interest to the depositor.

No corporation of any size could operate without going deeply into debt—as they do. They float bonds and borrow directly and invent a variety of debt instruments to finance their undertakings. Debt is the lubricant for the business machine without which the machine would grind to a halt.

You add to the debt when you take out a small loan, when you buy something on the installment plan, when you make a purchase on a credit card, when you ask your local retail store to charge it, when you borrow against your insurance policy, when you work out a financing arrangement for your car. In the one month of

January 1979, installment indebtedness rose by more than \$1.5 billion.

Viewed in an overall theoretical way, debt is the foundation of a "free enterprise," modern capitalist society.

KEYNESIAN ECONOMICS

For those who think that deficit financing began with President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Senator Edward S. Muskie (D-Maine) advises in a recent speech that the "distinction belongs to General Washington—first in war, first in peace, and first in federal deficit." Actually, Washington was following a pattern set on Dec. 15, 1692, in the British House of Commons, when the Committee on Ways and Means proposed to raise \$1 million by way of a loan, at the rate of 10 percent up to year 1700 and 7 percent thereafter.

From that point on, the debt began to grow. "At every state in the growth," records Thomas Macauley in *The History of England*, it has been seriously asserted by wise men that bankruptcy and ruin were at hand. Yet still the debt went on growing; and still bankruptcy was as remote as ever."

For centuries nations had been using debt as a way to pay the way for governments. It was not until the first quarter of the present century, however, that government indebtedness was seen not simply as a way for the state to meet its bills but as a way to guide the total economy. This concept—the use of public debt to regulate economic growth—was the brain child of John Maynard Keynes and, unbeknownst to most Americans, became the theoretical base for the anti-recession policies of the New Deal and of every Administration that followed.

As a practical man, FDR had to resolve a practical yet seemingly nonsensical puzzle: why, at the American economy running during the 1930s when all the factors for a viable economy were present—in superabundance? There was plenty of capital, labor, raw material and entrepreneurial know-how. But they were all idle, rotting, festering. Why?

What was lacking in our market economy was the market which, in plain language, is buying power. Buying power was lacking because the big buyers—working people—were out of work. So long as they did not earn, the market would sag and sag.

The private economy would not put these people to work because it could not. No business pays people to make things for which there is no market. So, to prime the pump, the government had to put people to work, so they would have buying power to put others to work.

The government could get the necessary funds to do so either by taxation or by borrowing. Taxation would not have yielded much in those depressed days; moreover, whatever taxation would yield had to come out of consumers or investors, thereby undercutting the primary purpose of increasing employment. So, the government borrowed.

In a pragmatic way, the United States had backed into its own brand of Keynesian economics. When the private economy failed to generate the necessary market—buying power to sustain the economy, the government stepped in by deficit financing, by— as the monetarists would have it—expanding the money supply. And the formula worked.

WHAT OF CRISES?

Since the New Deal, there have been recessions, but we have not had a single major depression in this country. Crises have been fended off with the weapon of deficit financing.

The big deficits of the Roosevelt period were not rolled up during the peacetime years but in wartime. In 1940, the deficit was only \$5 billion. In the war years of 1943-45, the deficits ran between \$17 and \$50 billion a year. But whether it was to combat recession

or to combat a foreign enemy, the money borrowed was used to serve national purposes and, in no case, did the deficit impoverish the people.

If a constitutional amendment had prohibited deficit spending in the Great Depression or during World War II, where would the money have come from? In 1933, Roosevelt would have had to raise taxes to get the funds to "prime the pump." Such taxation would have worsened the crisis by further depleting buying power and capital sources. Where would the government have gotten the funds to fight World War II? Between 1941 and 1942, federal expenditures doubled, from \$35 billion to \$70 billion. It would have been necessary to double taxes—an intolerable, undesirable and unnecessary move.

What happens in the future—assuming a budget-balancing amendment is on the books—if we are hit by some new crisis: another depression, another war, an internal insurrection, a massive earthquake from the Appalachians to the Rockies? Neither the President nor Congress could act swiftly because the funds would not be there and no new funds could be appropriated without going through the protracted process of once more amending the Constitution.

A mandated balance of the budget assumes that the budget makers know, at the beginning of the year, what their income and their expenditures will be. But they have no way of knowing; they can only guess.

They do not know what their expenditures are for three simple reasons: First, they do not know what crises will arise. Second, they do not know what inflation will do to their costs in the course of the 12 months. Third, they do not know what they will have to pay out under a variety of government "entitlement" programs. Under the last, for instance, the government has an obligation under law to someone who is disabled, or is the head of a family under aid for dependent children, or is newly retired, or is eligible for a veteran benefit. Whoever meets certain criteria set down by law is "entitled" to certain government funds—and there just is no way that the government can know to advance just how big these payments will be.

The government knows even less about what its income will be. How much comes in depends on how much people earn, how corporate profits run, how sales stack up. Income through taxes is a mathematical function of the Gross National Product whose size nobody knows when the year begins or even when the year has passed its halfway mark. For 1980, the President forecasts a growth rate in the GNP of 3.3 percent; the Congressional Budget Office sets it at a 3.9 percent; Wharton Econometrics sets it at a low 1.2 percent; and Chase Econometrics sets it at an optimistic 4.1 percent. The difference between the low and high estimate makes a difference of about \$10 billion in taxes to the government.

THE RISK TO STATES

Being less than omniscient then, Congress and the President would unwittingly and unwillingly find themselves in violation of the amendment. Who will prosecute, try and sentence them for their transgressions?

The easiest way to cut federal taxes would be to stop federal aid to the states, which currently runs about \$80 billion per year. If an Administration chose to cut grants to the states, you would hear a different tune from state politicians now so eagerly calling for a constitutional convention to balance the federal budget.

But this reduction in the federal budget would not necessarily mean a reduction in taxes for the taxpayer. Even if the government reduces taxes by virtue of the savings in grants to the states, and it is doubtful such a cut would be possible, the states

would have to increase their taxes to make up for the funds they no longer get from the federal government. The end result would be higher taxes for the taxpayer.

The other alternative for the federal government would be to raise taxes to cover present and future costs. And it would have to raise taxes beyond a reasonable level because it would have to allow for that margin of safety so as to live within the mandate of the amendment.

#### A RENAISSANCE BODY?

The Constitution provides two ways to amend the Constitution: the traditional way has been through congressional action requiring two-thirds of both houses and ratification by three-fourths of the states; the unused way is through a constitutional convention to be assembled on the call of the legislatures or two-thirds of the states with ratification requiring three-fourths of the states.

There is no precedent, since 1789, for initiation of an amendment through a convention.

Because there has been some fear in the Congress that a constitutional convention could turn into a runaway body, several efforts have been made in recent years to write legislation to define what a constitutional convention may or may not do and how it may do it. But no bill has yet passed both houses. So, if a convention is called, nobody really knows who shall convene the convention, what shall be the scope of its agenda (one issue or the whole works), how delegates shall be apportioned among the states, who would elect the delegates. Even if Congress should address itself to these questions, there is only questionable authority for the federal legislature to curb or control or control a convention that was convened precisely because Congress did not wish to initiate the disputed amendment.

The constitutional route to amendment has been proposed by both progressive and conservative forces. In more recent decades, however, the push has come from the right: to limit federal taxes, to undo one-man, one-vote, to set up a special court to overrule the Supreme Court, to prohibit "forced busing," to disallow abortions.

Should a constitutional convention be held it is likely that the several ideas held by conservatives will find expression at the gathering. The delegates may convene to discuss budgets but are likely to end by proposing a variety of pet proposals presently circulating among those who are unhappy with the behavior of Congress and who would like to bypass the legislature. In effect, the constitutional convention route would mean that the states with their state-minded concentration would replace the Congress of the United States with its prime focus on national goals.

The final irony of the balanced budget amendment is that its greatest support comes from those politicians who have, for the last couple of decades, been presenting themselves as the true defenders of the Constitution. Should they ever add their amendment to the Constitution, they will have violated the basic spirit of our supreme law.

The Founding Fathers had three great purposes in composing the Constitution. They wanted a government that was strong, flexible and respectful of the rights of the individual.

Because they wanted a state that was strong they set up a central government to replace the feeble Articles of Confederation. Because they wanted a flexible government they wrote a brief declaration that distributed powers without prescribing what those powers should do in dealing with the special and specific problems of the changing times. To show their regard for the individual, they added the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights—to the Constitution as an integral part of the document at the time of original ratification.

In the subsequent amendments of which there are 16, the prime purpose has been to expand the power of the individual citizen to influence public policy. In short, the thrust of the amendments has been to give the citizen a greater voice in government.

A balanced budget amendment would run contrary to this spirit of the Founding Fathers in all three respects. First, the amendment would narrow the scope of government, a purpose that is the underlying motive of most of the proponents. Second, the amendment would impose a straitjacket on government, turning firing flexibility into hostile rigidity. Third, the amendment would deprive the individual citizen of a regular say over government in the most decisive area of legislation; namely, the budget. ●

## DOING THE SALT SHUFFLE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979.

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, every day the media events in Vienna for the SALT II Treaty draws closer and every day a new barrage of "facts" comes out of the administration. The latest round of news releases and speeches shows that we are not seeing a SALT debate as much as a shuffle of whatever the President and the media think is going to co-opt or dupe enough people into ratifying the SALT II Treaty.

On May 31, the Washington Post reported that the estimates of the explosive power of the Soviet SS-18 ICBM have been drastically reduced. The reduction, from 1.2 megatons to 600 kilotons per warhead, was based on a guess drawn from the weight of the overall delivery vehicle. The Post went on to say that the new guess was based on "a review of past data rather than receipt of any new data from recent Soviet testing."

The first question that needs to be asked about this statement is why is one guess any better than another if the same information is used? The article goes on to quote one official as saying, "Understanding comes gradually, and uncertainties hang on for a long time." This is a pretty lame excuse for something as important as how many megatons of explosives are going to rain down on our missile silos.

Why must our intelligence experts rely on old data and "guesstimates" to figure out the potential threat of the new Soviet missiles?

The answer to why our experts are guessing instead of knowing comes from a Washington Post article on May 30. It seems that the Soviets are still testing the SS-18 but are encoding the radio signals from the missiles. The result is that we did not even know what was happening in those tests except that the tests were going on. This blind spot in our intelligence has not upset the Carter administration. In fact they are upset that knowledge of this blind spot was made public. The official word from the open White House was that reports of the encoding were "irresponsible leaking."

The administration then went on to state that the encoding of the SS18 data

was irrelevant because the SS18 was an "old system." The Soviets could test the SS18 with encoding for "the next 10 years" and the United States need not worry, said one official. The reason we should not worry is that the Soviets, under SALT, will tell us if they change anything on the SS18 or any other missile and that, if there is a change, they will not encode the data for that specific missile test. "The Russians accept our position on new and modified missiles" one official said, "That's what matters."

Into the SS18 debate comes Defense Secretary Brown. In an address before the graduating class of the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Secretary Brown warned that, since 1962 the Soviets have been embarked on "a policy of building forces for preemptive attack against U.S. intercontinental ballistic missiles." He went on to say that, by the early 1980's, two new missiles, the SS18 and the SS19, would give the Soviet Union the means of destroying, "with high assurance" most of the 1,000 American land-based Minuteman missiles.

Later in his speech he again referred to the SS18 as a new missile that, with 10 warheads, had the accuracy to destroy most of the American Minuteman missiles in their underground silos. He concluded on point by saying "the Soviets continue with a policy of building forces that could be used in a preemptive, counterforce mode."

What is going on here? The Brown speech was reported in the New York Times, but buried deep in the front section on May 31. The Washington Post did not cover the speech at all. There seems to be some problems with the Carter administration over whether or not the SS18 is an old system or a new system. I guess we should all be glad the Soviets agreed to a SALT Treaty because they can always be depended upon to sort out our dilemmas on new and old missiles.

If the next SS18 or SS19 that is launched has encoded radio signals then it must be an old missile with no modifications. If the missile signals are open and clear then we all will know there is something different about the missile and we should all sit up and take notice.

I am proud to know that our intelligence community and the military wizards in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency have come up with such a simple solution to our verification dilemma. The guessing game on megatonnage becomes superfluous. As one agency bureaucrat reported, "We have always said their advantage in megatonnage overall makes no difference." This is a shuffle of rhetoric that reminds me of a new dance . . . the hustle. ●

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. W. HENSON MOORE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent due to appointments in Louisiana yesterday and, in doing so, I missed two rollcall votes.

AMENDMENT #1

OFFERED IN THE SENATE:

By: Senate Finance

To: \_\_\_\_\_ SENATE BILL No. SJR 16

HOUSE BILL No. \_\_\_\_\_

PAGE: 2

LINE: \_\_\_\_\_

- { Page 2, Line 1 - change "five" to "four"
- { Page 2, Line 6 - after the word "alternatively" insert  
· "this body makes application and requests  
that"

March 7, 1980

Mr. and Mrs. Gilbert Moerlein  
P. O. Box 559  
Kenai, Alaska 99611

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Moerlein:

The enclosed resolution, if it passes our legislature, will do more for the taxpayers of this country, and the country itself, than the Liberty Amendment would ever do.

We are going to get substantial relief from taxation; we just haven't agreed as to the form of that relief yet.

Very truly yours,

Robert H. Ziegler, Sr.

RHZ:lk

Enclosure