

Another is the new faster depreciation write-off for big corporations.

But many of the biggest "loopholes" in the tax code aren't slipped in by lobbyists or corporations. They are there by popular demand. An example is the deduction for home mortgage interest. Ask President Carter: Try to end the break and you bring on an uproar.

Now momentum is building to add still another big tax break, and the support is so widespread that it may be impossible to stop it. The proposal is for a tax credit for parents to offset burgeoning college tuition expenses. Some say it's only a matter of time before it becomes law.

The major proposal in the area has been a bill by Sen. William V. Roth (R-Dele.). The measure would enable parents to reduce their taxes by up to \$250 of the amount they spend on each child's college tuition and books. The maximum would be raised to \$500 after four years.

And recently Sens. Daniel P. Moynihan (D-N.Y.) and Bob Packwood (R-Ore.) have gone Roth a step further, proposing to extend the writeoff to cover elementary and secondary schools as well. Their bill also would provide a cash payment for families too poor to take a credit.

At first blush, the move seems a natural. As many parents can testify, college costs are soaring dramatically. Everyone agrees that education is a worthy social goal. What nobler cause than to send your son or daughter to college? It's as American as gooseberry pie.

But the issue becomes more mottled when the bill is examined closely. For one thing, it's exceptionally expensive: The Roth bill alone would cost \$1 billion next year, with the revenue loss leaping to \$2.3 billion by 1981. The Moynihan-Packwood plan would cost a whopping \$4.7 billion.

(For comparison, the deduction for home mortgage interest will cost \$4.6 billion this year, rising to an estimated \$5 billion in 1978. And all government spending for student grant programs now totals only \$3 billion.)

More important, however, the breaks would go mainly to the well-to-do. A study by the Congressional Budget Office shows 60 per cent of the credit's benefits would go to families earning \$25,000 a year or more—a group that amounts only to about 12 per cent of the taxpaying population.

Although parents complain a lot, there's no evidence the extra aid actually is needed. While college costs have jumped 65 per cent between 1967 and 1975, the median income of families in the \$25,000-and-over bracket has soared by 80 per cent—more than enough to make up the difference.

Moreover, critics question how much a \$250 tax break means to a high-income family in a day when college costs are running \$4,700 a year or more. Sure, opponents concede, when you're sending a kid to college every little bit helps. But is a little bit really worth \$4.7 billion a year?

As a result, some tax experts charge the tuition credit proposal amounts to little more than an income-transfer program, such as Social Security or veterans' payments—only this time a costly one aimed mainly at the rich. Taxation With Representation, a liberal group, brands it "a disaster."

Finally, some critics fear that the Moynihan-Packwood version, which would extend the credit to elementary and secondary schools, would revive another thorny issue—whether it's legal to provide federal aid to parochial schools. A court ruling a few years ago barred most forms of aid.

To be sure, there are some compromises. A bill by Rep. Abner J. Mikva (D-Ill.) would replace the credit with a provision allowing parents to defer payment of taxes equal to their children's college costs—effectively converting the credit into a long-term government loan.

But tax experts warn the Mikva plan would be difficult to administer (the Internal Revenue Service would have to keep tabs on the deferred portion of a parent's taxes for up to 10 years). And the "loan" still would be channeled through the tax system—a round-about way of subsidizing anything.

Because of these problems, tax planners consistently have tried to thwart the tuition credit. Both the Treasury and key congressional staffers flatly oppose it. And the House Ways and Means Committee has avoided even considering the measure, for fear a vote would mean sure passage.

But the bill has garnered increasing majorities in the Senate in recent years—most conspicuously in last year's so-called Tax Reform Act, where it was included with a spate of other giveaways before being dropped in a House-Senate conference committee.

And congressional strategists say it's almost certain the measure will become law sometime in the next few years. Besides enjoying broad support from middle-income taxpayers, the bill is being pushed by the well-heeled education lobbies, which view it as a new avenue for increased aid.

Ironically, many of the people behind the credit are the same ones who are calling for elimination of other "tax loopholes" that they complain benefit the rich and the big corporations. Which all goes to show that, as the tax planners put it, one man's loophole is another man's incentive. Or tuition credit.

COURAGE OF SADAT AND BEGIN

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 25, 1977

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, President Anwar Sadat of Egypt and Prime Minister Menachem Begin of Israel presented to the world an act of statesmanship and courage that is worthy of consideration for the Nobel Peace Prize.

Both men have a long history of involvement in the war and turmoil that has beset the Middle East. Mr. Begin was a freedom fighter in the early days of the Israeli state and Mr. Sadat guided Egypt through the 1973 war.

Both men have seen the tragedies that the Arab-Israeli war have inflicted on their countries and their people. Egypt's economy suffers and her people go hungry as staggering amounts of money are spent on arms. Israel has lost many sons and daughters in the fighting.

Both men are patriots and have great pride in their countries. Mr. Sadat has steered an independent course for Egypt, moving her away from the Soviet sphere and into an independent stature in the Arab world. Mr. Begin was elected in a campaign that focused on his devotion to the biblical origins of his Israel.

But, most importantly, both men are men of peace. It was their desire for peace that brought them together over the weekend. It was their desire for peace that so animated their public actions. It is their desire for peace that gives hope to all of us that the Middle East will soon see peace for the first time in a generation.

It would be fitting and proper that the Nobel Peace Prize for 1978 be awarded jointly to Anwar Sadat and Menachem Begin.

ARTHUR W. ARUNDEL

HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 25, 1977

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 15 years Arthur W. Arundel has been a leader in the provision of all-news broadcasting in the Washington metropolitan area and in the Nation.

Unfortunately for us all, he has decided to leave all-news broadcasting. I want to share with my colleagues his last editorial broadcast over WAVA. His commentary will be missed:

A VIEW OF NEWS BROADCASTING

(By Arthur W. Arundel)

To people in Washington over the years it has probably always seemed that their own times were the worst, the pressures on leadership and the burdens of power never greater. We journalists here, along with government leaders, have not always been immune from exaggerated notions of our self-importance to the national destiny.

But stone age man probably also thought that he bore in his hands the fate of all living things when he invented the hatchet, as did Martin Luther when in another time he declared that with gunpowder man had finally developed the ultimate weapon. And less than a century ago, leaders in Britain, then the world's leading power, were appalled at the burden of human survival they carried when Lord Kitchener first used the machine gun to mow down the Hordes of the Mad Madullah in the Sudan.

SINCE VIETNAM

It has been different in Washington since Vietnam, perhaps our last ground war, and Watergate. In the quieter, laid back early months of President Jimmy Carter visible and newsmaking military combat seems all the more on the way to being replaced by the weapons of nuclear warfare. In nuclear energy man is equally capable of either limitless good or of quickly flattening civilization to a pile of dust and rubble.

So perhaps people in Washington today are indeed not just another generation consumed with indulging their own self-importance. We all, politicians and journalists alike, possess human frailties. But our generation also possesses this capacity by the mere pressing of a button to change all of human destiny. There is something less in this than Armageddon, but there is also more than Chicken Little seeing the sky falling.

After some 20 years here with CBS news and all news broadcasting in Washington, I am now selling all news WAVA to move on into new fields of journalism and public affairs. But from the experience I have a few thoughts on the shape of broadcasting and broadcast journalism.

THE VAST WASTELAND

Many will remember FCC Chairman Newton Minow's much publicized reference to television 15 years ago as a "vast wasteland". He was right about that then and, while we can be proud of the occasional rays of brilliance in broadcast news and specials he would be right about that today. Television programming continues to sink toward the lower common denominators of the public taste.

And even as television has replaced radio as the nation's principal live entertainment medium, radio has made a shotgun marriage to become essentially the promotional loud-speaker of the record industry. Going across the radio dial today, from classical to rock music stations—modern radio can be measured as little better than a glorified jukebox, spitting out just so much news and public