

Whereas, this legislation violates the theory of states' rights established under the 10th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, through which the states retain the right to regulate those matters that the federal government had not regulated; and

Whereas, specific provisions of the Police Officers' Bill of Rights will deprive police administrators of vital and necessary powers to conduct both informal and internal investigations to resolve employee grievances, and to maintain a civil service system free of politics;

Now therefore be it resolved that the Vermont Association of Chiefs of Police hereby affirms its opposition to H.R. 2946, H.R. 2537 and all bills and amendments of a similar nature that would establish a federal Police Officers' Bill of Rights.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be delivered to Vermont's Congressional Delegation along with a request that the resolution be entered into the Congressional Record.

Passed this 31st day of May, 1996 in Vergennes, Vermont.

GARY WATSON,
President.●

TRIBUTE TO J. MARK TIPPS

● Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute today to a member of my staff who has served me and the State of Tennessee with dedication and excellence for the past 2 years. When I came to the U.S. Senate, I had no previous political experience. That meant that I had no staff waiting for their next assignment, no idea how to set up an office, and no time to learn. Luckily, I did have Mark Tipps.

To my great benefit, Mark Tipps agreed to take a leave of absence from his law partnership at Bass, Berry, and Sims in Nashville and bring his wife Joi and two beautiful daughters, Annie and Grace, to Washington to serve as my Chief of Staff.

I first came to know Mark when he volunteered to help me clarify and articulate my position on various issues during my campaign. Although he also had no direct previous political experience, I was instantly impressed by his ability to bring complicated state and national issues into focus and his level-headed, common-sense approach. Throughout his tenure in Washington, he has used these qualities to help me put together and maintain a first-rate staff; keep a strong presence in Tennessee, even when the Senate schedule keeps me in Washington; develop a successful, focused legislative agenda; and make the right decisions for Tennesseans on tough issues.

Most importantly, Mark has played a major role for me and my entire staff in making sure these past 2 years were not only challenging, but also enjoyable. I remember the first trip I made to Washington with Mark after my election. We were late to a meeting because we were wandering around the Capitol looking for the Russell Building. We eventually found it, but it has been the source of many jokes over the past 2 years as we recount just how far we've come. Mark is known among my staff and throughout the office for his

open-door policy and good judgment. Staff members know that if they have a problem or need advice, personal or professional, all they have to do is knock. With his easygoing, affable personality, Mark is more than just a boss to my staff—he is a friend. Mark has also become far more than just a staff member to me and my wife, Karyn. He is a personal friend and we look forward to staying in touch with his family during our frequent visits to Nashville.

The one request that Mark made of me when he came to Capitol Hill was that I not make him stay more than 2 years. I am begrudgingly and with much hesitation keeping that promise, and I wish Mark the very best of luck as he returns to his home in Nashville to resume his law practice. If Mark takes nothing else back home with him after his 2-year "baptism by fire" here, he is at least taking a fifth family member and his first son. John Alfred Tipps was born on May 29 and may not remember much of his stay here, but can hopefully read this tribute and know how much his Dad contributed to this country. The whole Frist office will miss Mark, but we all send him off with our very fond memories, sincere gratitude and best wishes.●

SAVINGS BANK LIFE INSURANCE INDUSTRY

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, although I do not serve on the Finance Committee, I was pleased to work closely with that committee during this Congress on a number of issues which have a special impact on the people of Massachusetts. For example, in the Small Business Job Protection Act, we were able to provide tax relief for fishing families in New Bedford, MA, as well as extend the research and development tax credit and employer-provided education tax deduction. In addition, in that legislation, we raised the minimum wage by 90 cents an hour—the first installment of that raise just went into effect this week, and the benefit is being felt by families all across Massachusetts.

Mr. President, while we can take pride in this work, there were several miscellaneous tax provisions that the committee, without making any judgment about their merit, found unable to give proper review or consideration. One of these technical amendments would clarify the tax treatment of the State-mandated consolidation of savings banks life insurance departments. Specifically, the amendment would address the potential unfair consequences for the savings bank life insurance [SBLI] industry which is unique to New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts.

While the Finance Committee did not act on this issue in the current Congress, it is my hope and expectation that the Senate will be able to make the necessary technical clarifications in the law early next year.

I should point out that all six Senators from affected States wrote to the

chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Delaware, requesting committee consideration of the measure. That letter, which I ask to be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks, was signed by Senators KENNEDY, MOYNIHAN, D'AMATO, DODD, LIEBERMAN and me. Mr. President, in addition to the clear, bipartisan support for this technical amendment, the Treasury Department has indicated the Clinton administration has no objection to this proposal.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this issue in the 105th Congress. I yield the floor.

The letter follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, December 12, 1995.
Hon. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During upcoming negotiations on the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, we would ask that you support a technical amendment to address potential unfair tax consequences for the savings bank life insurance (SBLI) organizations in New York, Connecticut and Massachusetts. SBLI is an industry unique to our three States. The provision would clarify the tax treatment of the state-mandated consolidation of mutual savings bank's life insurance departments.

More specifically, the provision would clarify how the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 should treat certain additional policyholders dividends mandated by the Massachusetts State Legislature in 1990. As explained further in the attached paper, the legislation consolidated the state's savings banks' life insurance departments into a new non-public stock company, while still providing for the sale of its products through these state banking institutions. Because of the IRS' expansive interpretation of current law, it is essential that Congress clarify that the 12-year dividend payout associated with this consolidation should be treated as a deductible policyholder dividend rather than a non-deductible redemption of equity. The IRS has indicated that if the tax clarification of this issue is not made this year, SBLI and its policyholders will be subjected to this tax inequity which will be regrettably and unfairly passed on to the consumer.

Only the Savings Bank Life Insurance Company of Massachusetts is immediately affected by the IRS' interpretation of the Code. However, the sister industries in both New York and Connecticut may be adversely affected if the Tax Code is not properly clarified because they may follow the consolidation approach taken by Massachusetts. Revenue estimates by the Joint Committee on Taxation project that the cost of this clarification to the Tax Code would not exceed \$25 million over the next five years, and the Administration has testified that it does not oppose providing legislative relief to SBLI.

Mr. Chairman, for the aforementioned reasons, we would appreciate your cooperation in clarifying the Tax Code as it relates to this timely issue.

Sincerely,

ALFONSE M. D'AMATO,
U.S. Senator.
EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD,
DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senator.
JOHN F. KERRY,
JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN.●