

May 11, 1977

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 7391

on fighting the Mob. According to a study by G. Robert Blakely, director of the Cornell Institute on Organized Crime, all levels of government employ only 400 lawyers who specialize in organized crime. Says he: "The Mafia now has more lawyers than we have."

Permitting easier bugging and wiretapping of known members of organized crime. The courts now require investigators to demonstrate that a specific crime has probably been committed. If the eavesdropping does not turn up enough evidence and the suspects are not promptly indicted, they must be informed about the bugs or taps.

Enacting stronger legislation. The Carter Administrator last week moved in this direction by proposing laws that would prohibit the laundering of Mob money, tighten loan-sharking statutes and provide stiff prison sentences for operating racketeering syndicates. The proposals, however, do not solve the central problem: the very difficulty of proving charges of money-washing, loan-sharking and running illegal rackets.

Giving convicted racketeers longer prison sentences. The GAO study found that over a four-year period, 52% of the sentences imposed on organized criminals by federal courts involved fines but no imprisonment and only 20% were for jail terms of two years or more. One reason: many judges feel that the mobsters' crimes, except the killings of each other, are nonviolent and thus less serious than, say, mugging. When jailed, mobsters are generally model prisoners and, with their high-priced legal help, win paroles more easily than the average convict.

Above all, there must be an end to Americans' tolerance for any kind of organized crime. Romantic notion about the dons and winking acceptance of their goods and services create an atmosphere that helps the Mob to flourish. Without a profound shift in public attitudes, even the most aggressive law enforcement drive against the Mafia and organized crime has scant chance of permanently cutting into their activities, let alone putting them out of business.

THE GODMOTHERS

They live quietly in the exclusive suburbs of River Forest and the Hamptons. There may be a ranch house in Palm Springs or a Miami condominium as well. They can afford the best of everything, but they have almost nowhere to go, few pleasant ways to pass the time. Their husbands are often away on business, or in jail, or calling on their mistresses. The wives are isolated not only by bodyguards but also by ignorance of the details of their husbands' business activities. The men's workday deeds are not discussed at dinner.

Today most Mafia wives are native Americans, but their marriages reflect the old-country values of silence and obedience. Family bonds have weakened, but neither the generation gap nor the suburban Diaspora has dissolved them. Fathers may bankroll their sons in a legitimate business or pay their way through medical school. "But if the sons don't have the brains," says an investigator, "they are given work in the Mob. The sons don't become plumbers or factory workers. That wouldn't look right." Many of the daughters go to college, but only a few seek careers, most marry early.

The Mafia's code limits social activities. "Made' guys [Mafiosi] don't like their wives to mingle with the wives of other 'made' guys," says a former Mob lieutenant, "because they might reveal something about each other. The only thing wives go to is wakes, weddings and funerals."

Detroit News Reporter Shelley Eichenhorn interviewed for Time the wives of three middle- to high-level Mafiosi. Her report:

These women live suspended in contradictions, tree-lined Grosse Pointe streets and prison cells, handmade lace and machine guns, family portraits and FBI mug shots.

They disbelieve the ugly headlines about their men, and they bristle at the stereotype of themselves as provincial peasant wives who never leave the nursery or their knees.

"They're not vulgar or bold-acting," says one Grosse Pointe. "They are mother and grandmother types—and good ones. Take Mrs. Anthony Giacalone [wife of a top Mafia figure in Detroit's ruling family], she's a quiet, lovely lady. Why, she even contributed \$20 to the March of Dimes."

Mafia wives rarely unburden themselves to friends, and sometimes not even to their parish priests. Says a Grosse Pointe priest: "One woman's husband is in prison. She doesn't want to be asked how he is. The subject is never introduced. Her man is away; she misses the father of her children."

When Mass is over, one top-ranking Mafia wife returns home where a plaque proclaims her Madonna of the Kitchen. A housekeeper is here today only because the wife is ill. She makes a point of saying that she cares for her own house. It is a matter of pride. "We live a quiet life. It is not our intention to be noticed," she says. "I'm happiest sometimes when they leave my name of the list of charity contributors."

Sundays, her family gathers in the living room. There are shelves of family pictures, and a wall plaque reads: God Bless Our Family. Five children and three grandchildren say grace. The head chair is for their father; he is in prison.

Across the city in a gracious colonial home, another Mafia wife speaks with pride of her husband, a graduate of a prestigious university who served honorably in the Army. A recent family portrait hangs above the fireplace. Her husband is not in the picture; he is serving a five-year term.

"The worst thing I had to face was the day my husband went to prison," says the wife, a pleasant, stylish blonde. "For him, the worst day came when his kids were kicked out of a private Grosse Pointe club."

"I'm so sick of the Italian image of the uneducated housewife. The women I know give their time to charities and hospitals. They don't get in the papers. They don't do it for that. I feel for the Watergate wives. I admire them for standing by their husbands. I uphold that."

"They have taken my husband out of my home for no reason. Others are murderers, and they walk the streets."

Most of the wives are totally untouched by the violence that pervades their husbands' lives. Not Jeanne Randazzo. Her husband Frank and two other men were shot to death last summer in the basement of the Randazzos' modest home on the east side of Detroit. The gunman, a government informer named Ernie Kanakis, was acquitted on the ground of self-defense; he told a jury that the others had tried to kill him with ice picks.

"Life is nothing," says Jeannie. "Life is a vaporous smoke. On the night Frank was killed, he said, 'Don't cook, we'll go out to dinner.' He took a shower like he always did, and we went to dinner with my son and daughter. After dinner, about 8:45 p.m., Frank said he had to see someone who was buying our '74 Cadillac. He said to wait for him at the Golden Coach Restaurant. When he didn't come back by 10 p.m., my son said, 'If I know Dad, he fell asleep in front of the TV set.'"

"So we went home. I couldn't get in my own house because of the police and the neighbors. The bodies were still in the basement. I had to move in with my mother for three days while the police cleaned up."

In the Randazzo parlor, red and white checkered bows brighten dried-flower arrangements left over from Frank Randazzo's funeral. "We were married 37 years," says Mrs. Randazzo, wiping tears from behind black-rimmed glasses. "Before you know it, it's goodbye."

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1488. A bill to provide for monitoring of soil moisture in drought-prone areas, to provide information thereon and accelerate financial and technical assistance to lessen impact of drought on farming and ranching operations; and

S. 1489. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to prevent soil erosion during a drought emergency; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am introducing today two bills which will both help to prevent the worst consequences of drought in the United States and remedy those which cannot be planned for or prevented.

It is essential that the Department of Agriculture be able to better predict drought occurrence and warn farmers and ranchers of its imminence. Although the rudimentary machinery is in place within USDA, the program does not work satisfactorily, as we can all attest from our recent experience in the West.

My bill would correct this deficiency by directing the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Soil Conservation Service, to monitor soil moisture, rural water supplies, and other drought-related indices in drought-prone areas to provide information for making decisions about early actions which can be taken by both Government and landowners to minimize the adverse effects of drought.

This bill would also accelerate the soil conservation program by helping farmers to implement those measures which lessen the potential and the impact of drought. Without such measures, we are in jeopardy in this country of losing our present ability to feed and clothe the Nation.

The second bill, Mr. President, would authorize assistance on a matching basis for weather modification measures, when these remedial efforts are needed and desired by local conservation districts. The bill does not authorize the Federal Government to undertake such weather modification work on its own or without the request of local soil conservation districts. The power to plan or implement these efforts to modify weather patterns and precipitation will remain at the local level.

Mr. President, I think this last provision is very important. Weather modification to relieve drought areas remains a controversial alternative. It is still as much an art as it is a science, and the decision to implement such procedures is one which is appropriately a local initiative.

It is also important, however, that the Department of Agriculture expend appropriate efforts to assist those farmers and ranchers in an area to take these steps, should they be deemed desirable. My bill, if enacted, would provide up to 80 percent of the cost of weather modification work, with the remaining share paid by the conservation district or combination of districts that request assistance.

The cost of both bills is relatively low. In the case of the weather modification assistance bill, \$5 million is authorized for each fiscal year through September 30, 1980.

S 7392

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

May 11, 1977

Mr. President, drought is a long-term disaster, a gradual depletion of resources which saps the vigor of the Nation's agricultural sector. By helping to prevent, to plan for, or end drought-related disasters, we can in some measure insure continued vitality of the farm sector. I know each of my colleagues is concerned with that goal, and I would hope they would view these two bills as viable steps in that direction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two bills I have introduced today to alleviate drought disaster be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1488

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Drought Disaster Warning and Assistance Act of 1977".

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture, through the Soil Conservation Service, is directed under existing authorities to monitor soil moisture, rural water supplies, and other drought-related indicators in drought-prone areas in order to provide information for making decisions about early actions which can be taken by Federal, State, and local governments and landowners or land users to minimize the effects of drought.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is further directed to accelerate financial and technical assistance to farmers and ranchers and to develop and help implement those additional conservation techniques or measures that will lessen the impact of a drought on their operations, thus assuring a continued supply of food and fiber for the Nation.

SEC. 4. Such measures on irrigated lands shall include but not be limited to irrigation system change or reorganization, land leveling, ditch lining or piping, water flow control structures, and water re-use systems; provided that such measures are planned and implemented to provide improved water quality including salinity control; further technical assistance will include information on the capability of soils to produce food and fiber under drought conditions while maintaining a soil conservation program to reduce wind and water erosion; further assistance will be accelerated to local organizations in cooperation with states or other Federal agencies to develop water resources plans which would lessen the effects of recurring droughts.

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as are required to carry out the provisions of this Act.

S. 1489

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Drought Emergency Relief Act of 1977".

SEC. 2. The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended by including therein the following:

"(a) DEFINITIONS—As used in this amendment—

"(1) 'Drought' shall mean that which exists whenever the Secretary of Agriculture (hereafter referred to as the Secretary), pursuant to the request of the Governor of a State, declares that severe economic loss is imminent unless an adequate amount of precipitation occurs in the affected area in time to prevent or lessen said economic loss.

"(2) 'District' shall mean a conservation district as constituted under State law in accordance with the provisions of section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act having for its prime purposes the

conservation of soil, water, and related resources.

"(3) 'Weather modification' shall mean any activity performed with the intention of producing artificial changes in the composition, behavior, or dynamics of the atmosphere.

"(4) 'State' shall include the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and any territory or insular possession of the United States.

"(5) The term 'Governor' means the chief executive of any State.

"(b) (1) Pursuant to the request of a Governor, the Secretary is hereby authorized to declare a state of drought to exist in those areas designated by the Governor in the Governor's request to the Secretary.

"(2) Whenever a drought is declared as in section 2(b) (1) within a district or combination of districts, the officials of the district or combination of districts may make application to the Secretary for financial assistance for weather modification purposes.

"(3) Upon such a request from a district or combination of districts, as in section 2(b) (2) the Secretary, through the Soil Conservation Service, shall make financial assistance available to the district or combination of districts for the purpose of assisting and initiating weather modification measures recommended by the district designed to alleviate the drought condition. The total amount of such financial assistance provided by the Secretary to meet a drought shall equal 80 per centum of the total cost of the weather modification program during that period of implementing such drought alleviation or prevention program.

"(c) The remaining portion (20 per centum) of the cost of the weather modification described in section 2(b) (3), shall be borne by the district or combination of districts in which a drought has been declared, such money being raised by the district or combination of districts as the officials of the district or combination of districts may prescribe within the limits of the State laws which initiated the district.

"(d) Funds shall be made available by the Secretary to a district or combination of districts when the district or combination of districts are declared to be in a state of drought as defined in section 2(a) (1) and after the district or combination of districts have raised the required local funding as prescribed in section 2(c)."

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is hereby authorized to transfer and utilize for the purpose of section 2(b) (3) any funds included in the Agricultural and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1977. This transfer and utilization of funds shall not exceed \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, these funds to remain available until expended.

(b) The funds transferred and utilized in section 3(a) may be replaced at the request of the Secretary in a future supplemental appropriation.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this amendment, not to exceed \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, and \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, all funds to remain available until expended.

By Mr. CHILES (for himself, Mr. PERCY, and Mr. HEINZ):

S. 1490. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into multiyear leases through use of the automatic data processing fund without obligating the total anticipated payments to be made under such leases; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, today I join with Senator PERCY and Senator HEINZ in introducing a bill to save up to \$150 million a year in Federal leasing of automatic data processing equipment.

As an amendment to section 111 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 759), this new subsection (H) authorizes the Administrator of General Services to enter into multiyear leases through the use of the automatic data processing fund without obligating the total anticipated payments to be made under such leases.

In each of the last two Congresses, the Senate passed bills identical to this one, but in each instance, Congress adjourned before the House could take action. This time around, both Senator PERCY and I are looking forward to working with Senator HEINZ to enact this legislation into law.

In this period of economic stress, it is our obligation to initiate and encourage efficient and conscientious spending in our Federal agencies. Wasteful spending practices are today outrageous. This bill is one part of a broad campaign to overhaul the Government's antiquated system for spending \$70 billion a year in the purchase of goods and services.

This legislation was recommended by the Commission on Government Procurement and supported by the General Accounting Office in a report entitled "Multiyear Leasing and Governmentwide Purchase of Automatic Data Processing Equipment and Results in Significant Savings"—B-115369—of May 7, 1974. As GAO concluded in that report:

Almost all of the \$390 million that the government spent to rent ADP equipment in fiscal year 1969 was for short-term rentals . . . generally the most costly acquisition method.

Furthermore, GAO discovered:

Since many agencies do not seek competition before renewing leases under schedule contracts, there is no assurance that the Government is leasing a major part of its ADP equipment at the lowest possible cost.

Most manufacturers and suppliers offer discounts under multiyear leases. Since most Government leased ADP equipment is for 3 or more years, GAO concluded that the rental of the equipment under multiyear leasing would be the most efficient use of the limited funds available for such equipment.

It is essential that competitive proposals be solicited for initial lease, purchase, or renewal of ADP equipment as well as software, maintenance, related equipment, supplies and services. Competition should not be limited to manufacturers, but should include the proposals of third-party sources and nonmanufacturing businesses.

Presently, GSA has authority to enter into multiyear leases, payment of which comes from a revolving fund established by section 111(c) of the Property Act. But under 31 U.S.C. 665(a):

No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure—in excess of the amount available therein.

Accordingly, the amount payable for the entire period of the multiyear lease must not be obligated from the fund at the time of contracting. However, as GAO recommended, this legislation would authorize GSA to enter into lease agreements without immediately obligating the total anticipated

May 11, 1977

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 7393

payment, but rather than cash balances of the ADP fund be maintained in such amounts as is necessary for cash disbursements of payments.

In an August 20, 1973, letter to the President of the Senate, Arthur Sampson, Administrator of GSA, stated:

A GAO comparison of multiyear versus short-term rental rate for 1,066 systems in the government's inventory of June 1969 indicated possible savings of \$70 million under 3-year leases and \$155 million under 5-year leases.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and some pertinent descriptive material be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill and material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1490

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 111 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 759) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator is authorized to enter into multiyear contracts under this section financed through the fund and may incur or authorize obligations in excess of the amount available in the fund, except that (1) the amount of unfunded obligations incurred during any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount specified in an appropriation Act for that fiscal year, (2) the cash balances of the fund shall be maintained in such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made from the fund, and (3) the term for the performance of any such contract shall not exceed ten years.

"(i) As used in this section, automatic data processing equipment also includes, but is not limited to, hardware, software, maintenance, related equipment and supplies, and related services."

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT

PURPOSE

This bill amends section 111 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 79 Stat. 1127, as amended (40 U.S.C. 759) by adding two new subsections (h) and (i). These subsections would permit the Administrator of the General Services Administration (GSA) to enter into multiyear leases (not to exceed ten years) of automatic data processing (ADP) equipment at amounts in excess of what is available in the fund, provided the amount of unfunded obligations authorized is not needed and the balances of the fund are maintained in such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made therefrom. Thus, the United States Government, the world's largest user of ADP equipment, would be able to take advantage of multiyear lease savings that are available to any private business. The bill also clarifies that the authority to enter into multiyear leases of automatic data processing equipment extends to collateral maintenance, software and other kinds of supplies and services that normally flow with ADP equipment acquisition.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

The Government is expending \$35 to \$75 million more for installed computer equipment under short-term leases than it would under firm-term multiyear leases. Millions of dollars of additional savings are possible

through the use of multiyear contracting for new equipment and maintenance services associated with long-term leases. S. 2785 would permit the Government to obtain better terms, more effective competition and, in short, operate in the marketplace in a manner comparable to commercial lessees of automatic data processing equipment.

Presently, GSA has multiyear leasing authority for acquisition of automatic data processing equipment through the ADP Fund. However, since, under 31 U.S.C. 665(a), "No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure—in excess of the amount available therein;" the amount payable for the entire period of the multiyear lease must be obligated from the fund at the time of contracting. This provision severely limits the use of the ADP Fund for multiyear leasing; therefore, GSA and other Federal agencies are generally forced to enter into short-term leases, or long-term leases with termination rights. Both of these types of leases are considerably more expensive than firm-term multiyear leases.

* * * * *
ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

The bill amends section 111 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 by adding two subsections.

Subsection (h) would enable GSA to enter into multiyear leases at amounts in excess of what is available in the ADP Fund. Restrictions are placed on this authority to enable Congress to maintain visibility and control over the Fund. An additional provision limits the terms for performance of multiyear leases placed under the authority of this subsection to ten years.

Following is a further elaboration on each of the above three elements of subsection (h):

Firm-term multiyear leases

GSA's authority to execute firm-term multiyear leases for automatic data processing equipment is severely restricted because governing laws require obligation of the total cost for the entire period of the lease at the time of contracting. These laws provide, in part, that:

"No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or found in excess of the amount available therein; nor shall any such officer or employee involve the Government in any contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such purpose unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law. (31 U.S.C. 665(a)).

"No contract or purchase on behalf of the United States shall be made, unless the same is authorized by law or is under an appropriation adequate to its fulfillment," . . . (41 U.S.C. 11)

Subsection (h) would remove this restriction, thereby permitting GSA to use firm-term multiyear leases rather than short-term rentals of one year or less.

During the hearings on S. 2785 the Computer and Business Equipment Manufacturers Association (CBEMA) representative cautioned that if the Government applies the authority of this bill in such a manner as to conflict with normal commercial operations, then countercosts would arise which would offset the advantages of true multiyear leasing. He pointed out that in return for payment of a lesser sum over a specific number of years, the ADP vendor expects a long-term commitment of cash flow which

can be discounted by a bank or used as collateral for a loan. The Committee took the position that the objective of the bill is to gain for the Government the same benefits that are available to the private sector from multiyear contracts. Accordingly, the Committee desires the Government's use of multiyear contracting to be consistent with normal commercial practice. The Committee expects GSA to use a multiyear contract that is, in fact, a marketplace mechanism.

Another point that arose during the hearings was whether the multiyear contracting authority should be extended to user agencies. CBEMA suggested that S. 2785 is unnecessarily restrictive in limiting multiyear leasing to GSA's ADP Fund. After a thorough evaluation of this suggestion, the Committee determined that the CBEMA objective of maximizing use of the multiyear authority could best be accomplished within the framework of Public Law 89-306 that established GSA as the focal point for ADP management within the executive branch.

The approach adopted in S. 2785 of establishing the ADP Fund as the single source of funding for multiyear ADP contracts has a number of advantages:

GSA can consider the useful life of ADP equipment to the Government as a whole. Individual agencies, either from annual appropriations or from revolving funds, would only be able to commit funds for their individual needs.

The provision in the bill that, "the amount of unfunded obligations incurred during any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount specified in an appropriation Act for that fiscal year," assures congressional control over these expenditures. Broadening the bill to authorize other agencies, through annual appropriations or revolving funds, to contract on a multiyear basis would diffuse accountability to such a point that Congress could lose a great measure of fiscal control.

By funding all firm-term multiyear contracts through the ADP Fund (including those procurements delegated to other agencies), single payment discounts from vendors of 2 to 4 percent annually are expected.

One source of ADP funding to interface with the market and its supporting financial institutions would enhance the Government's bargaining position for the acquisition of ADP equipment.

The concept in S. 2785 of the ADP Fund serving as the single source of funding for multiyear ADP contracts is entirely consistent with the responsibilities assigned to GSA by Public Law 89-306. Senate Report 89-938, pertaining to this law, discussed the need for the Fund and GSA's operation of the Fund in these terms:

The Fund would afford an effective means of attaining economic acquisition of Government ADP equipment.

Were all ADP purchase and lease money in "one pocket," the Government would be in a stronger bargaining position in dealing with the manufacturers.

But the most compelling need for the revolving fund is in establishing the single purchaser concept in Government ADP acquisition.

Essentially, all Federal agencies would lease equipment from the GSA revolving fund.

By proper use of the authority conveyed in the Brooks bill, as amended by S. 2785, all of the above advantages can be realized, while maximizing use of the multiyear contracting authority. It will also be possible to use selectively, the capabilities for ADP procurement that exist within the user agencies. The procedure to be employed by GSA

in implementing S. 2785, is explained in the Agency's letter of April 5, 1974. It should be noted that in recent years GSA has delegated approximately 81 percent of the ADP procurements to user agencies (in terms of dollar value).

Under the GSA procedure, when a procurement delegation is made to an agency to enter into a firm-term multiyear lease without full obligation of funds, the authority to cite and obligate the ADP Fund will also be delegated. The Fund then would underwrite the contract and make payments to the vendor, and the user agency would reimburse the Fund from annual appropriations.

To insure that there is no legal impediment to GSA delegating an agency authority to cite and obligate the Fund, the General Accounting Office was asked for an opinion. GAO confirmed that there is no prohibition against this practice, as long as GSA maintains adequate overall supervision of Federal agencies procurement of ADP equipment and provided the amount of unfunded obligations authorized is not exceeded and that there is sufficient balance in the ADP Fund to make required cash disbursements.

ADP fund

Use of the Fund, as prescribed by S. 2785, is consistent with the principles of congressional visibility and control as set forth in the Senate's budget reform legislation (S. 1541, as amended). The provisions in the bill that (1) the amount of unfunded obligations incurred during any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount specified in an appropriation Act for that fiscal year, and (2) the cash balances of the Fund shall be maintained in such amounts as are necessary at any time nor cash disbursements to be made from the Fund, will enable Congress to exercise control over the amounts that may be obligated for ADP leasing. These restrictions conform to the requirements established in Public Law 89-306 for operation of the ADP Fund.

Contract term

The limitation of ten years on the term for the performance of a multiyear lease provides an essential control but permits flexibility in the negotiation of multiyear leases. One reason for selecting ten years is that the current life of ADP systems is eight to ten years. Another reason is that it corresponds to GSA's contracting authority in the telecommunications area. The fact that multiyear contracts may cover up to ten years does not alter the requirement that multiyear leases are to be justified on a case-by-case basis as the most cost-effective method of acquiring needed ADP equipment.

Subsection (i) was included in the bill to make it clear that the authority in subsection (h) applies to more than leases for hardware. Software development, related equipment, maintenance, supplies, and services may also be procured by firm-term multiyear contracts. The description of automatic data processing equipment in subsection (i) is compatible with the General Accounting Office interpretation of automatic data processing equipment as it is used in the Brooks bill.

Mr. PERCY, Mr. President, along with Mr. CHILES and Mr. HEINZ I am introducing legislation to amend section 111 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 79 Stat. 1127, as amended (40 U.S.C. 759). This legislation would permit the Administrator of the General Services Administration to enter into multiyear leases of automatic data processing equipment through the use of the automatic data

processing fund, provided cash balances of the fund are maintained in such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made therefrom.

This bill was originally recommended by the General Accounting Office in a report to the Congress entitled "Multiyear Leasing and Government-Wide Purchasing of Automatic Data Processing Equipment Should Result in Significant Savings." In this report, released April 30, 1971, GAO states that—

The rental of equipment under multiyear leases, as an alternative to short-term rentals, has become essential if the Government is to make maximum use of its limited funds for acquiring ADP equipment.

As a result of this report and my own study of the subject, I introduced S. 2785 on December 6, 1973. This bill passed the Senate on September 19, 1974, but no action was taken in the House.

The bill which Senators CHILES and HEINZ are introducing with me today is identical to that bill, and to S. 1260, which Senator CHILES introduced during the 94th Congress. S. 1260 also passed the Senate, but never reached a vote in the House.

I appeared as a witness last year in hearings on S. 1260, and I told the Subcommittee on Federal Spending Practices that "for us in Government to assume that we only live year to year and thereby cannot commit ourselves in such a way to take into account the economies that are available to us is perfectly ridiculous." The United States is the world's largest user of ADP equipment, yet it is currently unable to take advantage of multiyear lease savings that are available to any private user. Each year which passes without this bill becoming law costs the American taxpayer significant amounts of money which could be used for more constructive purposes.

The General Services Administration estimates that the passage of this legislation could result in savings of \$150 million over the next 5 years, and up to \$50 million annually thereafter. Over the past 2 years, Senator CHILES has led a commendable effort to increase efficiency in Government by overhauling antiquated Federal spending practices. I firmly believe that this legislation takes an important step in that direction.

Section 111 of the Federal Property Act, which this bill would amend, authorizes and directs the Administrator of GSA to:

Coordinate and provide for the economic and efficient purchase, leasing and maintenance of automatic data processing equipment by Federal agencies.

In my opinion, which is shared and substantiated by GAO and GSA, this bill truly does make such leasing of ADP equipment "economic and efficient." Accordingly, I urge its expeditious adoption.

By Mr. PERCY (for himself, Mr. CHILES, and Mr. HEINZ):

S. 1491. A bill to authorize procurement of janitorial, protective, trash removal, and similar services for periods not exceeding 4 years; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Mr. PERCY, Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation along with Mr. CHILES and Mr. HEINZ which would authorize procurement of janitorial, protective, trash removal, and similar services for periods not exceeding 5 years.

This legislation is similar to S. 3635, which was introduced last year by Senator CHILES, Senator WEICKER, and myself, and it is consistent with other legislation I have sponsored to allow for significant cost savings by providing for longer term contracting authority. By initiating such multiyear contracts, both administrative expenses and actual costs can be reduced.

Currently, GSA has 390 janitorial services contracts in 440 buildings. These 440 buildings represent 17 percent of the Government-owned and GSA-leased buildings. However, since these buildings average over 125,000 square feet of space, they represent over 34 percent of all GSA-managed space. Additionally, there are approximately 2,000 trash removal and similar contracts in an estimated 2,200 buildings, or 85 percent of the Government-owned and GSA-leased-operated buildings. All of these contracts are currently limited to a maximum length of 1 year, necessitating higher contract costs as well as yearly costs associated with annual bid invitations, advertising, bid evaluation, and contract awards.

GSA has submitted anticipated savings of \$1.5 million annually on 3-year contracts and \$1.63 million annually on 4-year contracts. Since this legislation authorizes contracts of up to 5 years, it is estimated that annual savings will be in excess of both these figures. Furthermore, successful experience resulting from this legislation can ultimately lead to further savings by extending contract authority in other areas.

I commend this legislation to the attention of my colleagues, and I hope that we will move quickly toward its adoption.

Mr. HEINZ, Mr. President, I am proud to join with Senators PERCY and CHILES in introducing two bills to make the procurement of services by the Federal Government more efficient and less costly.

The introduction of these two bills shows our continuing commitment to and interest in reforming Federal spending practices. Even though these two bills cover only narrow areas of Federal spending, I believe that they are important for two reasons. First, significant savings will accrue to the Government. And, second, these two bills will demonstrate the sizeable potential for cutting down on Federal spending.

Presently, there is a 1-year limitation on contracts for the procurement of janitorial, protective, trash removal, and similar services. One of our bills would authorize multiyear contracts for these services, so long as such con-

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		DATE 17 May 77
TO: DDA		
ROOM NO. 7 D 18	BUILDING HQS	<i>P [Signature]</i>
REMARKS: <i>D/O D P</i> <i>2 D 0000</i> <i>EO - 60</i> <i>C/MS 9B</i> <i>DC B+F/MS [Signature]</i> <i>C/P 4 B6 [Signature] copy please</i> <i>C/P 4 B6 [Signature] - copy please</i>		
FROM: OLC		
ROOM NO. 6 C 19	BUILDING HQS	EXTENSION 6604

FORM NO. 241
1 FEB 55

REPLACES FORM 36-8
WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)