

already has a conceptual design for such a facility which they could site on Federal Government property in Nevada.

I realize that the schedule proposed in this bill is ambitious, but we must consider the necessary adjustments to this program now so that the Federal Government can meet its obligations to electricity customers nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, time is running out for the Federal Government to fulfill its duty to consumers and the capacity to store spent nuclear fuel at nuclear power plants is quickly diminishing. Electricity customers will soon be confronted with spending millions of dollars in addition to their monthly payments to the Federal Nuclear Waste Fund.

We have received a number of comments on this legislation from Governors, State attorneys general, State public service commissioners as well as others, and we have attempted to incorporate these comments into H.R. 1020 in order to develop an integrated plan that will get this program on track.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell you that there is widespread support for this legislation. I would like to particularly site the efforts of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners [NARUC], which has spent the last few years examining this nuclear waste problem. I commend their efforts in sponsoring dialogue with affected parties to unearth and examine the different options. There have been a series of resolutions past by NARUC in the past few years which underscore the need for the four essential components of the integrated spent fuel management system.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must chart a new course for the Nation's spent fuel management program. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Integrated Spent Nuclear Fuel Management Act of 1995.

CRIME PREVENTION THAT WORKS

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 24, 1995

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Act of 1995, section 101, authorized the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance [BJA] to make grants directly to units of local government for reducing crime and improving public safety. These funds can be used for hiring or training personnel, equipping law enforcement officers, enhancing school safety, or establishing crime prevention programs. The local jurisdictions have great flexibility as to how they used these funds.

An article by Chris Gersten, president of the Anti-Crime Alliance, in the November 28, 1994 issue of the Washington Times describes one new technology that has the potential to take a big bite out of crime. Mr. Gersten outlines how the use of video monitoring in Great Britain in the Washington, DC subway system has led to dramatic decreases in crime. Video monitoring is now employed in over 300 cities in Great Britain with virtually no complaints about civil liberties. The Prince George's County public school system in Maryland has recently pioneered in the use of video monitoring in some high schools.

I request that Mr. Gersten's article be placed in the RECORD and that jurisdiction around the country explore the potential uses of closed circuit video monitoring in their efforts to reduce crime.

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 28, 1994]

CRIME PREVENTION THAT WORKS

(By Chris Gersten)

Despite having a violent crime rate still a fraction of our own, British lawmakers have taken dramatic steps to reduce crime.

American observers were surprised to read of England's new Criminal Justice and Public Order Act which became law two weeks ago. The most controversial aspect of the new law is the modification of the right to silence. Now, anyone who remains silent after being arrested, can have his silence used against him in court. The new statement by police reads: "You do not have to say anything. But if you do not mention now something which you later use in your defense, the court may decide that your failure to mention it now strengthens the case against you."

The law also contains new powers for police to stop and search vehicles and pedestrians, to arrest squatters and trespassers, and to prevent or break up raves—drug-laden parties sweeping the country.

In addition to the new restriction on the right to silence and the increase in police powers, the British have employed new technology to curtail what they see as a dramatic increase in crime. At least 300 towns across great Britain have installed or are planning to install video surveillance of public spaces to catch and deter criminals, according to PhotoScan Ltd., a leading British video system installer. The pioneering British city, King's Lynn, and other towns have installed monitoring cameras in city centers, parking lots, streets, high-crime housing projects, industrial parks, sports complexes, churches and alleyways. Officials report a high rate of arrest and conviction since installation of the monitoring systems.

The British Home Office, which oversees the police, is promoting video monitoring as "one of the most exciting and constructive applications of new technology in the fight against crime, according to Junior Home Minister David Maclean. A clear majority of citizens express support for the use of video cameras to stop crime.

Video monitoring has been utilized successfully in the United States for some time. The Washington D.C. Metro subway system has had a closed-circuit monitoring system since it opened in 1976. The system has a total of 1,200 cameras and an equal number of monitors with 10 to 30 cameras in each station, depending on station size. The entire system cost approximately \$3 million to install with the cameras costing \$2,000 to \$2,500 each and the monitors \$200 each. It costs roughly \$250,000 per year to maintain the system.

The monitors for all the cameras in each station are housed in one enclosed booth where an official watches the screens. This creates a strong deterrent effect as potential criminals are aware that every movement in the station is being monitored. If a crime is committed, the station guards can usually reach the suspect within seconds.

The use of the camera system has made the Washington subway system the safest in the country, according to Patricia Lambe, spokesman for the Washington Metro Area Transit Authority. In 1993, only 33 violent crimes occurred in the system. From 1990 through 1993, only one murder. All the other violent crimes were classified as aggravated assaults. Many of these crimes were commit-

ted in parking lots and garages not covered by video cameras. This is an amazing record for a metropolitan area subway system serving over 4 million people.

Closed circuit camera technology has increased dramatically since the Washington subway camera system was installed. Cameras can be installed which rotate and tilt to cover a wide area and can zoom in on an individual up to a mile away. Cameras can be programmed to turn to any area where there is movement or noise. A camera covering a huge parking lot can detect someone breaking into a car or committing an assault and zoom in on the crime.

Police watching closed circuit monitors are alerted that a crime is being committed and move in on the suspects immediately. One person can watch up to 10 television monitors at a time. Police substations should be located within a short drive to the scene of any crime located by the monitoring system.

Closed circuit systems should be tested in high-crime inner-city areas such as public housing facilities, playgrounds, parking garages and lots, open air drug markets, and schools. The cameras should be mounted on inaccessible rooftops or street lights.

A pilot project in 10 cities, funded with federal dollars, could produce dramatic results for under \$50 million. Each city could install 1,000 cameras in high-crime areas for a cost of \$3 million each or \$30 million for 10 cities. Upkeep and replacement costs would be approximately \$250,000 a year per city or \$2.5 million per year for the 10 cities. The city or state government would be expected to pick up the cost of the personnel to watch the monitors. The total cost of maintenance would be \$12.5 million for five years for a total cost of \$42 million.

This is less than the cost of midnight basketball, self esteem-building classes or a handful of other very dubious programs just passed in the federal crime bill. It is the cheapest way to reduce crime in our cities and make our urban residents feel free to go outside again.

While civil libertarians will complain about invasion of privacy, we are being monitored by video cameras already in a host of private establishments including banks, supermarkets, department stores, airports and subway systems. Such monitoring doesn't make most of us feel like big brother is watching. It makes us feel safer. If closed circuit monitoring works in Great Britain, in the Washington Metro subway and in a variety of private businesses, isn't it time to try this approach in our crime ridden inner-cities?

Get-tough legal changes are being enacted by the federal and state governments and through the voter initiative process. Many of these reforms, such as life sentences for third felony convictions (three strikes you're out), eliminating parole and longer sentences for violent offenders are important steps in reducing crime.

These get-tough laws will keep prisoners incarcerated for much longer periods, resulting in reduced crime rates in the years to come.

But installation of closed circuit video cameras and monitors will have an immediate and dramatic impact on the crime rate and on the lives of America's beleaguered inner city residents.

As the new GOP leadership in Congress contemplates serious changes in the recently passed Crime Bill, taking resources from the social programs and earmarking them for closed circuit cameras and monitors would be a good investment with an immediate payoff.

TRIBUTE TO LEON WINSTON AND
RAY DEFRESS

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 24, 1995

Mr. DAVIS, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the winners of this year's Fairfax County Don Smith Employees Advisory Council [EAC] Award. The winners are Leon Winston and Ray DeFress. These two men are being honored for consistently going the extra mile for those around them. These two fine men will be honored on Monday, February 27, 1995, at ceremonies at the Fairfax County Government Center.

The Don Smith Award was established by the Fairfax County EAC in 1991 to honor Donald D. Smith, who retired in 1990 after devoting 16 years to the EAC. The award honors employees who have contributed to the well-being of their fellow employees. Recipients receive \$1,000 and a plaque.

Ray DeFress, an employee in the real estate assessments office, is being honored for his timeless generosity. Employees know that they can turn to Ray DeFress for a lift or help with a move. He can be found on his lunch hour taking someone to the service station or fixing their car. He is always available to help employees moving from one place or another. He has also raised money for people in need and spent hundreds of dollars of his own money to help people in their darkest hour. He has been a county employee for 26 years, with an exemplary record.

Leon Winston, a custodian at Navy Elementary School in Fairfax, is being commended for his commitment, leadership, hard work, and contribution to a positive work environment, and concern for others. When another custodian became ill, Winston offered to share work hours. He is a favorite with the students at the school, who not only see him as a supervisor but, a friend. He is a man who can always be trusted to always have the school open, even during the strongest snow storms, and clean for the public.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in acknowledging and honoring these two fine men who exemplify all that is right with local government employees not only in Fairfax, but across the Nation. Their honor, voted by their peers, is one for which we can all be proud.

THE SAVINGS AND INVESTMENT
LIBERATION BILLS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 24, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a package of three bills designed to give Americans the freedom to invest and save, without interference from the IRS. Our current tax code acts as an obstacle for individuals to do what they have been counseled to do by their parents for generations—save and invest.

A study by the Tax Foundation revealed that effective tax rates on income from savings and investment are substantially higher than the effective tax rates on income from wages. As a result, the tax burden falls heaviest on those who earn a greater portion of their income

from savings and investments—namely entrepreneurs and senior citizens. As a consequence, these high tax rates actually discourage Americans from saving and investing.

Again according to the Tax Foundation, the current estate laws have similar negative effects in the market. Amazingly, the current Federal estate taxes have the same punishing effect on Americans as doubling income tax rates.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I am attempting to put some rationality back in the tax code, and as part of the effort to achieve fundamental reform of the code, I am introducing a package of three bills to do the following:

1. Eliminate dividend and interest taxes on individuals;
2. Repeal estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers; and
3. Repeal the capital gains tax on individuals.

It is high time we stopped punishing those who save and invest. A typical taxpayer who chooses to save is taxed several times on the same dollar of earned income under the present system. As a result, savings and investment rates in the United States are among the lowest of the world's major industrial powers. Under this legislative package, taxpayers will finally be set free from these redundant taxes.

I encourage my colleagues to support these bills for the benefit of their constituents.

THE PENSION REFORM ACT OF 1995

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 24, 1995

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Pension Reform Act of 1995.

There can be no doubt that the status of women in America has changed dramatically in this century with these changes having profound implications for the long-term economic security of women. Whereas, heretofore extended families cared for the aged, both male and female; women today are increasingly likely to be alone as they age due to the disappearance of the extended family, mortality rates, and the increased incidence of divorce and single parenthood. And when one considers the average woman earns 68 cents for every dollar earned by the average man, it is easy to understand why the poverty rate is so much higher among older women than older men, 15 percent versus 9 percent. Even more striking is that the median income of women aged 65 and older is \$6,425, 56 percent lower than the median income of older men—\$11,544.

The Retirement Equity Act of 1984 made an important start. It improves the chance of widows actually receiving a pension by offering survivors protection to employees as soon as they become vested and requiring a wife's notarized signature before her husband can sign away her right to receive a survivor's benefit. The law also makes it easier for a divorced wife to get a share of a court-awarded pension directly from a former spouse's pension plan; lowers the age at which plans begin counting service for vesting credit, and extends the amount of time women can take off for child-rearing without losing credit for prior service.

But the Retirement Equity Act didn't go far enough. Women divorced before its passage have no pension rights. That means that a 56-year-old woman divorced in 1980 is now 65 and has no pension rights. That means we could have a whole new class of poor elderly women. The Pension Reform Act of 1995 would allow pensions not divided at the time of divorce, to be divided now, pursuant to a court order thereby effectively making the Retirement Equity Act retroactive. The Pension Reform Act of 1995 would also require the division of pension assets prospectively unless a domestic relations order provides otherwise.

The Tax Reform Act of 1986 continued the trend of enhanced retirement security for women. It reduced the vesting period, the period of service which must be completed before an employee has a nonforfeitable right to a pension, to 5 years for single employer pensions. This means that employees must be 100 percent vested after 5 years of service or, using an alternative vesting schedule, 20 percent vested after 3 years and 20 percent for each year thereafter. In general, therefore, employees who have been covered by an eligible pension plan for 5 years and work at least 1 hour after January 1, 1989 are automatically vested. This change is particularly important for women as it is estimated that approximately 1.9 million additional workers are now entitled to pensions. Multiemployer pension plans however, are not covered by these new vesting rules. The Pension Reform Act of 1995, would extend the 5 year vesting period to these types of plans as well. This provision was contained in H.R. 4210 and H.R. 11 in the 102d Congress—both were vetoed by the President. It was also contained in H.R. 3419, which was passed by the House of Representatives, but ultimately never reached the President's desk for signature. It is my hope that we can at least enact this provision this year.

Faster vesting also leads the way to greater portability; the ability to carry one's credit for service in an employer-sponsored pension plan from job to job. This is of particular importance to women as they are much more likely to change jobs and interrupt their participation in the work force at one or more times in their lives.

The Tax Reform Act of 1986 also limited integration, a little known, but potentially devastating, mechanism whereby employers may reduce pension benefits by the amount of Social Security to which an employee is entitled. Although originally intended to offset the employer contribution to Social Security, integration has often had the effect of eliminating an employee's entire private pension. In 1986, after much struggle, it was determined that Social Security benefits do not adequately replace the preretirement earnings of low- and middle-income workers. Today, therefore, the law limits integration and assures that all eligible employees receive some minimum level of benefits. However, this protection only applies to benefits earned in plan years beginning after December 31, 1988. The Pension Reform Act of 1995 would extend this protection to all benefits earned since January 1, 1987 and eliminate integration entirely by January 1, 2000.

Under current law of the Railroad Retirement Act a divorced spouse may receive a divorced spouse annuity at age 62 if the employee has attained age 62 and is receiving an annuity. The Pension Reform Act of 1995 would amend the Railroad Retirement Act by