

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

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

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

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

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

Even that wasn't the last word.

Two days later, Daley telephoned Simon.

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

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

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

A CIVIC LANDMARK

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"I have been very fortunate," he says.

And that is Chicago's own good fortune.

THE IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1995

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AGRICULTURAL LANDS PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

HON. JOHN N. HOSTETTLER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1995

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

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

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

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