2540 BATCHELDER ST. APT. GT BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11235 FEBRUDRY 19, 1990

HON. CHARLES SCHUMER HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515

DEAR SIR;

- france

- CA

I WAS SHOCKED AND APPALLED OVER THE REPORT BY CINININEWS THAT OUR SECRETARY OF OBFENSE, RICHARD CHENEY, WAS "SNUBBED" BY PRESIDENT AQUINO DURING HIS VISIT IN THE PHILLIPINES, I FEEL THAT CONGRESS MUST RESPOND TO THIS AFFRONT BY SENDING A MESSAGE TO PRESIDENT ARUIND TELLING HER IN NO UNCERTAIN TEAMS THAT HER BEHAVIOR WAS RUDE AND UNNARRANTED AND INCONSISTENT WITH THE SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP SHE HAS WIDH THE UNITED STATES, OBVIOUSLY PRESIDENT ARUNO NBEDS TO BE REMINDED OF THE EXTREMB SACRIFICES MADE BY OUR SERVICEMEN IN THE DEFENSE OF THE PHILLIPINES DURING NORM WAR TWO, PARTICULARLY THE HERDIC EFFORTS OF OUR SOLDIBRS AND SAILORS AT BATRAN, CORREGIDOR AND CETTE GULF, INDEED, PRESIDENT ARUNO SHOULD BE GRATEFUL FOR THE SUPPORT SHE HAS RECEIVED FROM THE UNITED STATES, AND IF SHE HAS ANY

GRIPES CONCERNING THE TREATMENT OF HER COUNTRY, SHE SHOULD DISCUSS THEM WITH THE TAPANESE WHO FORCIBLY OCCUPIED HER COUNTRY FOR FOUR YEARS, SINCERELY

8100 Park Plaza Apt. 211 Stanton, Ca. 90680 March 11, 1982

Hon. Alan Cranston
U. S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

Sir:

I strongly feel that there should be a constitutional amendment to guarantee that Social Security retirement benefits will be paid out to all persons who have "contributed" into the system but have not yet reached retirement age. This amendment should also prohibit Congress from enacting legislation that would reduce or eliminate these benefits.

I also feel that at the earliest possible date, in lieu of the above constitutional guarantee, legislation should be proposed to limit the scope of the Social Security Act and make "contributions" into the system voluntary. This legislation should also include provisions that would allow persons to recover at least a part of the money that the Federal Government, through compulsory legislation, had taken out of their paychecks.

I am 32 years old and have "contributed" into the Social Security system for well over forty quarters. I want some guarantee that if I live long enough I will be able to collect some of that money.

I believe that Social Security witholding is the most regressive and oppressive tax in the United States and supports a system that is an economic disaster and is grossly unfair to people who are compelled to pay into it. The magnetic people who are compelled to pay

I am perfectly capable of planning for my own future and I do not need the Federal Government to guarantee an annuity for me. But since the Federal Government took the money out of my paycheck I hope to see some of that money if I live long enough to retire.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip Weiss

8100 Park Plaza Apt. 211 Stanton, Ca. 90680 March 15, 1982

Hon. Alan Cranston U. S. Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Sir:

On page C6 of the 3/12/82 edition of the Orange County Register there is an article entitled "These bureaucrats don't fit the mold; they are dedicated and conscientious." In the article it is stated that forty-nine career Federal managers received the rank of Distinguished Executive and \$20,000 and another 206 were named Meritorious Executives with cash awards of \$10,000 for saving the taxpayer \$131 million.

If this article is correct then the process for issuing cash awards to Federal managers - who already are very well paid - has to be scrutinized. How can these cash awards be justified when people are being laid off and services are being cut supposedly because there is no more money?

What extraordinary feats of service did these Federal managers perform to merit these incredible cash awards and who are these Federal managers and where do they work? And who authorized these awards?

Instead of paying \$10,000 and \$20,000 cash awards to well paid Federal bureaucrats this money should be used to maintain jobs and services.

Please look into this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Phothed Mer an

Phillip Weiss

cc: Chairman, Appropriations Committee House of Representatives

8100 Park Plaza Apt. 211 Stanton, Ca. 90680 March 19, 1982

Hon. Alan Cranston U. S. Senate Washington, D.C. 20515

Sir:

As a follow-up to my 3/15/82 letter I have enclosed a copy of an article entitled "USPS Execs Get Bonuses" that appeared in the 3/22/82 edition of the Federal Times.

This article raises several questions: What is Jim Finch's base salary? How did Jim Finch get his job? What exactly did Jim Finch do to merit a \$10,000 bonus? What are the names of the other 17 officials who received performance award bonuses? How can the USPS Board of Governors approve 100 percent payment of health insurance premiums for top executives when very few workers in the United States are entitled to this benefit? Is it a usual practice to grant incredibly large bonuses and expensive fringe benefits to highly paid government bureaucrats? Shouldn't the money for these bonuses be used to maintain jobs and services?

I hope to receive answers to these questions.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip Weiss

cc: Jamie Whitten, Chairman Appropriations Committee House of Representatives

> William Ford, Chairman Committee on Post Office and Civil Service House of Representatives

Rep. Jerry Patterson House of Representatives

8100 Park Plaza Apt. 211 Stanton, Ca. 90680 March 19, 1982

Hon. Alan Cranston U. S. Senate Washington, D.C. 20515

Sir:

As a follow-up to my 3/15/82 letter I have enclosed a copy of an article entitled "USPS Execs Get Bonuses" that appeared in the 3/22/82 edition of the Federal Times.

This article raises several questions: What is Jim Finch's base salary? How did Jim Finch get his job? What exactly did Jim Finch do to merit a \$10,000 bonus? What are the names of the other 17 officials who received performance award bonuses? How can the USPS Board of Governors approve 100 percent payment of health insurance premiums for top executives when very few workers in the United States are entitled to this benefit? Is it a usual practice to grant incredibly large bonuses and expensive fringe benefits to highly paid government bureaucrats? Shouldn't the money for these bonuses be used to maintain jobs and services?

I hope to receive answers to these questions.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip Weiss

cc: Jamie Whitten, Chairman Appropriations Committee House of Representatives

> William Ford, Chairman Committee on Post Office and Civil Service House of Representatives

Rep. Jerry Patterson House of Representatives

8100 Park Plaza Apt. 211 Stanton, Ca. 90680 March 22, 1982

Hon. Robert Dole, Chairman Finance Committee U. S. Senate Washington, D.C. 20515

Sir:

I strongly feel that there should be a Constitutional amendment to guarantee that Social Security retirement benefits will be paid to all persons who have "contributed" into the program but have not yet reached retirement age. The interest of those citizens who under present law will be eligible to collect retirement benefits in the future must be protected. This can be done only by making it unconstitutional to terminate the program or enact legislation that would make retirement benefits more difficult to collect, especially by raising the so-called retirement age.

In lieu of a Constitutional guarantee, legislation should be proposed to limit the scope of the Social Security Act and make "contributions" into the program voluntary at some point. This legislation should also include provisions that would permit persons to recover a portion of the money that the Federal Government, through compulsory legislation, had taken from their earnings.

I believe that Social Security witholding is the most regressive and oppressive tax in the United States and finances a system that is an economic disaster and is grossly unfair to people who are compelled to pay into it.

I am perfectly capable of planning for my own future and do not need the Federal Government to assist me in this matter. But since the Federal Government has seen fit to take money out of my paycheck for many years I want some guarantee that if I live long enough I will be able to collect some of that money.

I hope you understand my point of view.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip Weiss

cc: Hon. Dan Rostenkowski, Chairman Ways and Means Committee House of Representatives

8100 Park Plaza Apt. 211 Stanton, California 90680 May 9, 1982

Lawrence F. O'Brien Commissioner National Basketball Association 645 5th Ave. New York, N.Y. 10022

Dear Mr. O'Brien:

As you are very well aware, on Sunday, May 9, 1982, the Los Angeles - San Antonio basketball game was "blacked out" in the Los Angeles area. I called KNXT, Channel 2, Los Angeles, and was told that the NRA would not permit the game to be televised because the Forum was not sold out.

Apparently you think that by "blacking out" an area more people will buy tickets to see an event. But you are wrong. Even though the Los Angeles area was "blacked out" the Forum still was not sold out and I doubt a "black out" is going to effect future ticket sales one way or another. I object to the use of the "black out" as a means to coerce people into buying more tickets.

I believe that the use of the "black out" is motivated by greed. How much more money does the NBA need? It is obvious by the enormous and highly publicized salaries paid to the players that the NBA is making a lot of money. None of the franchises are going out of business and the league has no competition. So what does the NBA want? To "black out" the entire country? To televise all the games over cable T.V.(for a price)? To make tickets so expensive that only big corporations and rich people will be able to attend a game? If this is what the NBA wants, then it's going to lose most of its fans. It will simply become too expensive for most people to follow the sport. And when it becomes too expensive, people will soon lose interest.

As for me, I like following basketball but I can also live without it.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip Waisa

cc: Neil Tilson, President



UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE 475 L'Enfant Plaza, SW Washington, DC 20260

May 14, 1982

Honorable Alan Cranston United States Senate Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Cranston:

This is in response to your letter of April 22 on behalf of Mr. Phillip Weiss of Stanton. Mr. Weiss expressed concern over the recent actions of the Board of Governors of the Postal Service granting performance awards to certain postal executives and approving full payment of all of the health insurance premiums for the officers of the Postal Service.

Addressing Mr. Weiss' questions in the order in which they appear, Mr. Jim Finch, Senior Assistant Postmaster General, Finance Group, receives a base salary of \$59,500.00 He was appointed to his present position in 1979 by virtue of consistent superior performance as Associate General Counsel, Office of Rates and Classification Law and as Assistant Postmaster General, Government Relations Department. The Board of Governors recently chose to recognize Mr. Finch's meritorious performance in his current duties by granting bim a performance award. Mr. Finch is responsible for managing and coordinating the activities of the Finance Department, which forecasts and meets, if necessary, the Postal Service's long- and shortterm borrowing needs, invests postal funds not required to meet current obligations, governs cash management, prepares the Postal Service's budget, and maintains the service-wide accounting system, and the Rates and Classification Department. The latter department is responsible for preparing and justifying before the Postal Rate Commission all rate and classification proposals, for implementing recommended rate and classification decisions approved by the Governors of the Postal Service, and for ruling on requests for authority to mail under a certain status or at a particular rate. In short, he is the chief financial officer of an enterprise with a more than \$23 billion budget. I have included as an enclosure to this letter, a list of the other management employees who were given performance awards by the Board of Governors.

Title 39, United States Code, section 1003(a) permits the Postal Service to fix the compensation and benefits of its officers and employees and mandates that such compensation and benefits be comparable to those paid to managers and line employees in the private sector of the economy. By regulation, the Board of Governors has assumed the duty of fixing the levels of compensation and benefits for the officers of the Postal Service. As you well know, the officers of the Postal Service have significant management responsibilities. The salary structure, even with the most recent adjustment, does not provide for compensation commensurate with those responsibilities. This situation is aggravated by the fact that inflationary pressures have forced the salary levels for all positions upward while, at the same time, a salary ceiling has remained in effect for postal executives' salaries. This situation has slowly eroded the limited, though essential, differential between middle management and officer-level positions.

Due to the salary compression problem and the fact that the compensation of postal executives is far below that of top executives in the private sector, the system of performance awards mentioned above was instituted as part of the Postal Career Executive Service Program. This Program is quite similar to the Senior Executive Service, established by the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, which also provides for the payment of performance bonuses to government executives. In addition to the performance award system, the Board of Governors of the Postal Service, after careful consideration of several alternative proposals, decided to pay one hundred percent of the health benefits for the thirty-seven top postal executives. Assuming that all executives are enrolled in a family plan, the maximum annual additional cost to provide this benefit is \$16,008.00. This additional cost is minimal when compared to the total health benefit costs for all postal employees, which amounted to \$580,015,499.00 in 1981.

While I share Mr. Weiss' concern over service levels, I believe that the additional costs of these modest benefits, which incidently are both quite common in the private sector of the economy, will have no effect on services available to the public and postal employment. It is essential that executive compensation be such as will enable the Postal Service to attract and retain highly qualified individuals who will provide the necessary leadership and meet the challenges facing the Postal Service.

Sincerely,

M. Bruce Downey Senior Representative Government Relations Department

OFFICERS OF THE POSTAL SERVICE GIVEN PERFORMANCE AWARDS

Carl C. Ulsaker, Senior Assistant Postmaster General

Joseph P. Morris, Senior Assistant Postmaster General

Louis A. Cox, General Counsel

Emmett E. Cooper, Regional Postmaster General

John G. Mulligan, Regional Postmaster General

Anthony P. Cavallo, Assistant Postmaster General

Roger P. Craig, Assistant Postmaster General

Walter E. Duka, Assistant Postmaster General

Ralph M. Feemster, Assistant Postmaster General

Nancy L. George, Assistant Postmaster General

James C. Gildea, Assistant Postmaster General

Eugene C. Hagburg, Assistant Postmaster General

Edward E. Horgan, Jr., Assistant Postmaster General

Edward J. McCaffrey, Assistant Postmaster General

Gordon C. Morison, Assistant Postmaster General

John L. Gentile, Executive Assistant to the Deputy Postmaster General

Charles K. Kernan, Executive Assistant for Information Resource Management



United States Office of Personnel Management Washington, D.C. 20415

In Reply Refer To:

Your Reference:

MAY 2 4 1982

Honorable Alan Cranston United States Senate Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Cranston:

Your constituent, Phillip Weiss, is referring in his letter to you of March 15, 1982 to recipients of Presidential Rank Awards established by the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 (loc. cit. 5 USC 4507). These awards were first given at the end of FY 80, and the number of awards he cites is the number granted that year. The ranks of Distinguished Executive and Meritorious Executive were granted to 25 and 93 recipients, respectively, in FY 81 even though by statute as many as 65 Distinguished and 325 Meritorious ranks could have been awarded and almost that many candidates were nominated.

The Orange County Register article cited by Mr. Weiss implied that 49 recipients of the Distinguished Executive rank award had collectively saved the Federal Government \$131 million. In fact, leadership of these outstanding Federal managers has resulted in substantially larger savings than that. One Distinguished Executive has developed a financial management system that will save his agency an estimated \$235 million in accounting, billing, and contracting costs over the next 5 years. Another, in charge of a major research facility, reduced overhead costs for his organization by \$6 million. Still another conducted negotiations with foreign firms that may have saved as much as \$100 million in weapons systems costs. By restructuring professional work so that it could be performed by less skilled, lower graded employees another Distinguished Executive saved his agency more than \$3 million in a single year. One attorney who was granted the award negotiated regulatory reforms last year which saved industry and consumers over one billion dollars.

While the monetary savings achieved by the efforts of the Presidential rank award winners are impressive, money is not the only measure of their contributions. One has developed the most comprehensive and effective fire research program in the world; he also authored the fundamental handbook on fire retardation. Another directed the effort that eliminated smallpox in Southeast Asia. One laboratory chief who won the award has conducted vital, productive research into enzymes controlling metabolism. Still another recipient developed a criminal investigation program that has produced outstanding

results in the identification and prosecution of large scale illegal drug dealers. Over the past 19 years, a recipient has directed programs of unmanned satellite space exploration including the spectacular Viking missions to Mars. Such efforts directly or indirectly enrich the lives of us all.

In short, these recipients are the very best of the Federal Government's management team. They are the people who designed and launched the space shuttle Columbia, who develop the technology that keeps our defense capability viable, who conduct vital medical research, who keep multi-million dollar programs on target. We all benefit from their efforts even though their names may be known to only a few in their professional fields.

At the time these awards were granted, top career Federal Executives had received only one 5.5% pay increase since 1977. Meanwhile, during the period 1977 through 1981 the Consumer Price Index rose 57%, Federal retirement annuities increased 55%, and executive salaries in the private sector were up about 49%. None of the recipients will be eligible to receive the same award again for at least five years. All will pay income tax on the full amount they receive, but because salaries for all 6,500 SES members (and about 39,500 other executive branch employees down to some at GS-14) were capped at \$50,112.50 and the law prohibits payment of salary and rank award money in excess of the salary paid Executive Level I (currently \$69,630), none of the recipients of Distinguished ranks received the full \$20,000 stipend.

In addition, it is important to note that agency nominations for these awards were reviewed by an ad hoc board of distinguished private citizens to provide a measure of external control over the rank award process. The final selections were based upon guidance from the private sector review board and the recommendation of OPM Director Donald J. Devine, but they were made by the President.

I hope this explanation of the substantial contributions made by these Presidential rank award recipients, the difficult salary situation tolerated by all Federal executives, and the carefully structured selection process rank award nominees had to pass through will serve to ease the concerns of Mr. Weiss.

Sincerely yours,

George Nesterczuk
Associate Director for Administration

8100 Park Plaza Apt. 211 Stanton, Ca. 90680 July 6, 1982

Hon. Alan Cranston U. S. Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Sir:

Thank you for acting on my letters of March 15 and March 19, 1982 concerning the granting of large bonuses to government managers. However I find the responses you received from the OPM and Postal Service completely unsatisfactory. According to the letters from Mr. Nesterczuk and Mr. Downey bonuses are tools used by government agencies to provide financial incentives for government managers to remain with the government. The clear implication is that government managers are underpaid. But if that is the case then why don't they leave government service and get higher paying jobs in the private sector? Actually these government managers ought to be grateful they have jobs and I seriously doubt that they need bonuses to intice them to stay with the government. entire matter smells of cronyism and backslapping and is an affront to those government workers who have lost their jobs or have been furloughed in the name of fiscal austerity. The policy of granting large bonuses to well paid government managers needs to be re-evaluated.

One other point: in the next to last paragraph of Mr. Nesterczuk's letter it says that "...agency nominations for these awards were reviewed by an ad hoc board of distinguished private citizens ... " Who are these "distinguished private citizens" and on what authority do they make recommendations on matters concerning the expenditure of public funds? I don't understand how "distinguished private citizens" can be involved in internal government matters, such as the decision to grant large bonuses to well paid government managers. "Distinguished private citizens" do not represent constituents and are not government officials who can be held accountable for their actions. So what is their relationship to the OPM? In what other areas of policy formulation and implementation do they play a role? I believe these questions need to be explored.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

8100 Park Plaza Apt. 211 Stanton, Ca. 90680 July 9, 1982

Hon. Alan Cranston U. S. Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Sir:

As a follow up to my letter of July 6, 1982 I have enclosed the following items:

- 1. A letter from Mr. Fred Nicholson of Brooklyn, New York in which he expresses his views on big bonuses for well-paid government executives.
- 2. A copy of an article that appeared in the January 21, 1982 edition of the L.A. Times telling of 48 employees at a Federal office in Chicago who received \$25,000 in bonuses, including \$2,500 to a \$50,120 per year bureaucrat, while agency services were being trimmed. What is remarkable about this story is that one of the bureaucrats actually REFUSED to accept his \$1,000 bonus on moral grounds.

The point I am trying to make is that the whole procedure for granting bonuses to government employees, and especially to highly paid government employees, seems rotten to the core and needs to be investigated. For highly paid government managers to justify their bonuses on the grounds that they are underpaid is absurd. What right do they have to circumvent the pay schedule enacted by Congress? If these government managers are dissatisfied with their salaries then they should either petition Congress to increase the pay schedule or leave government service. But they should not be permitted to manipulate the system for their own personal gain.

I question the integrity of a system that provides substantial gratuities for its managerial personnel while services are being cut and people are losing their jobs and their homes. This is like corporate executives getting bonuses while the company is going out of business. What is your opinion on this matter?

Respectfully yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

8100 Park Plaza Apt. 211 Stanton, Ca. 90680 August 2, 1982

Hon. Alan Cranston U. S. Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Sir:

Enclosed is a copy of an article that appeared in the July 28, 1982 edition of the Los Angeles Times. The article states that "several Reagan Administration officials, including Michael K. Deaver, the President's deputy chief of staff, have cited inadequate salary as a major reason they cannot afford to continue in government service. Deaver has said he plans to resign at the end of the year because he cannot make ends meet on his \$60,662-

a-year salary."

Instead of waiting for Deaver to resign at the end of the year, he should be encouraged to resign immediately so that his position can be filled by someone who is more dedicated to serving the people and less interested in personal gain. I am amazed that a \$60,662-a-year bureaucrat can complain about his salary while he is part of a team that is pressing for massive cuts in jobs and services under the banner of fiscal restraint. As Mr. James states in the article, Deaver knew what his salary would be when he accepted the job, so he cannot complain.

What I want to know is if Deaver's appointment was subject to Senate confirmation, and if so, was the question of salary discussed? I also want to know if Deaver has been awarded any cash bonuses during his tenure, and if so, what specific services did he render to merit these

bonuses?

Thank you for looking into this matter.

Respectfully yours,

Philip W. Weiss

cc: Michael K. Deaver

Hon. Jerry Patterson House of Representatives

8100 Park Plaza Apt. 211 Stanton, Ca. 90680 August 2, 1982

Hon. Alan Cranston U. S. Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Sir:

Enclosed is a copy of an article that appeared in the July 28, 1982 edition of the Los Angeles Times. The article states that "several Reagan Administration officials, including Michael K. Deaver, the President's deputy chief of staff, have cited inadequate salary as a major reason they cannot afford to continue in government service. Deaver has said he plans to resign at the end of the year because he cannot make ends meet on his \$60,662-

a-year salary."

Instead of waiting for Deaver to resign at the end of the year, he should be encouraged to resign immediately so that his position can be filled by someone who is more dedicated to serving the people and less interested in personal gain. I am amazed that a \$60,662-a-year bureaucrat can complain about his salary while he is part of a team that is pressing for massive cuts in jobs and services under the banner of fiscal restraint. As Mr. James states in the article, Deaver knew what his salary would be when he accepted the job. so he cannot complain.

What I want to know is if Deaver's appointment was subject to Senate confirmation, and if so, was the question of salary discussed? I also want to know if Deaver has been awarded any cash bonuses during his tenure, and if so, what specific services did he render to merit these

bonuses?

Thank you for looking into this matter.

Respectfully yours,

Philip W. Weiss

cc: Michael K. Deaver

Hon. Jerry Patterson House of Representatives

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

August 16, 1982

Hon. Patricia Schroeder U. S. House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Madame:

According to an article that appeared in the August 2, 1982 edition of the Federal Times Gerald P. Carmen, chief of the GSA, was found to have acted in an "unfair, insensitive, wasteful and politically motivated" manner. His actions will result in "a 'serious short-term and, perhaps, long-term loss of productivity' and relocation costs that could reach several million dollars." Of course the taxpayer will be billed for the loss.

How did an incompetent and irresponsible bureaucrat like Carmen become chief of an agency? What steps are being taken to remove him from office?

I question the integrity of any bureaucrat who acts in a "politically motivated" manner. This insidious practice is a threat to honest, efficient government and must be stopped.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss President

enclosed: copy of article

cc: Gerald P. Carmen

ORGANIZATION For FISCAL

INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

August 16, 1982

Hon. William Ford, Chairman Civil Service Committee U. S. House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Sir:

According to an article that appeared in the August 16, 1982 edition of the Federal Times a bureaucrat named Milton Crenchaw "was removed" from his position as EEO chief at Ft. Rucker, Alabama, after an employee filed suit against the Army charging discrimination. The "white female Army employee" won the case and "has been awarded more than \$100,000 and the job she had sought." I assume the award will have to be paid by the taxpayer.

It appears that Crenchaw was given a job for which he was not qualified. How did he get the job in the first place and who decided to remove him?

If the Crenchaw case is typical, then there is something wrong with the way managerial positions are filled in the Federal Government.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss President

enclosed: copy of article

cc: William M. Bell, Chairman Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

August 26, 1982

Hon. Alan Cranston U. S. Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Re: letters dated 7/6/82 and 7/9/82

Sir:

Enclosed are copies of two letters I sent to you in early July. To date I have received no response. My organization believes that the issues raised in these letters warrant prompt consideration.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

ORGANIZATION For FISCAL

INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

September 1, 1982

Hon. Orrin G. Hatch U. S. Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Sir:

According to reports in the Federal Times, it appears that the replacement of Michael Connelly by Michael Martinez as EEOC general counsel was politically motivated.

The Organization for Fiscal Integrity strongly believes this is wrong. Appointments should be made based upon a person's qualifications, not his political affiliation.

What was wrong with Michael Connelly's performance that caused you to press for his removal and how is Michael Martinez - "said to be Sen. Orrin G. Hatch's man for the office" - better qualified to perform the duties of general counsel for the EEOC?

A prompt response is expected.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss President

enclosed: copies of articles that appeared in the 9/6/82 edition of the Federal Times.

ORGANIZATION FOR FISCAL

INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

September 22, 1982

Hon. Alan Cranston U. S. Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Sir:

According to an article that appeared in the 9/27/82 edition of the Federal Times, the GSA performed or authorized \$68.033.51 of work between January,1981 and May, 1982, to alter and improve Presidential appointees offices.

This is another outrageous, yet strangely pathetic, example of bureaucracy placing its needs before the needs of the people. Due to this kind of gross mismanagement, the deficit continues to grow and new ways have to be found to tax the people.

How in good conscience can this expenditure be justified? My organization strongly objects to well paid political appointees pampering themselves at the taxpayers expense while services continue to be cut and people continue to lose their jobs.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss President

enclosed: copy of article

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

October 12, 1982

Hon. William Ford, Chairman Civil Service Committee U. S. House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Sir:

According to two articles that appeared in the October 11, 1982 edition of the Federal Times, well-paid bureaucrats, both civilian and military, are piling up millions of dollars in unnecessary travel expenses while the Federal government pleads poverty and devises new ways to tax the people. This is another example of the irresponsibility, selfishness and insensitivity that many well-paid bureaucrats all too frequently demonstrate.

My organization is especially interested in the activities of bureaucrat J. Lynn Helms, chief of the F.A.A., who, according to the G.A.O., could have saved the government \$404,000 if he had not abused his travel privileges. This abuse of authority is inexcusable and cannot be ignored. What does your committee plan to do about this situation?

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

President

cc: Hon. Patricia Schroeder Mr. J. Lynn Helms

enclosed: copies of articles

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

October 15, 1982

Mr. Gerald P. Carmen Administrator General Services Administration 18th and 'F' Sts., NW Washington, D.C. 20405 Dear Mr. Carmen:

I read the House Civil Service Subcommittee report concerning the reassignment of G.S.A. senior executives and, frankly, I was shocked and appalled. Either you failed to anticipate the problems that would be created by deciding to arbitrarily transfer these senior executives or chose to ignore the implications of your decision. Whatever the case, the results were dismal. The integrity of your office was tarnished and your plan was discredited. Hopefully you have learned something from this experience and will exercise better judgement in the future.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

President

cc: Hon. Patricia Schroeder

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

November 6, 1982

Hon. Jack Brooks, Chairman Committee on Government Operations House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Sir:

According to an article in the November 8, 1982 edition of the Federal Times, bureaucrat A. Diane Graham, assistant O.P.M. director for affirmative employment programs, was found to have discriminated against a female candidate for promotion because of her sex. Due to Graham's incompetency, the government (meaning, of course, the taxpayer) will have to pay about \$12,250 in legal fees and costs.

My organization strongly urges that this matter be investigated to determine whether Graham should be removed from her job and if the O.P.M. procedure for recruiting and selecting personnel for managerial positions should be changed.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss President

cc: A. Diane Graham

enclosed: copy of article.

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

November 8, 1982

Hon. Patricia Schroeder House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Madame:

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I received from Gerald Carmen's office concerning the reassignment of senior executives at the G.S.A.

It appears from this letter that Mr. Carmen completely disregarded your committee's recommendations concerning this matter. This is another example of the arrogance that bureaucrats like Mr. Carmen all too often demonstrate and the contempt they have for the people and their elected representatives.

The apparent failure of your committee to effectively check the activities of a bureaucrat who has clearly abused his authority leads my organization to question Congress' ability to redress grievances and right wrongs.

Respectfully yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

November 8, 1982

Hon. Patricia Schroeder House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Madame:

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I received from Gerald Carmen's office concerning the reassignment of senior executives at the G.S.A.

It appears from this letter that Mr. Carmen completely disregarded your committee's recommendations concerning this matter. This is another example of the arrogance that bureaucrats like Mr. Carmen all too often demonstrate and the contempt they have for the people and their elected representatives.

The apparent failure of your committee to effectively check the activities of a bureaucrat who has clearly abused his authority leads my organization to question Congress' ability to redress grievances and right wrongs.

Respectfully yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

ORGANIZATION FOR FISCAL

INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

November 23, 1982

Hon. Robert Dole, Chairman Committee on Finance United States Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Sir:

In recent weeks several newspapers have reported that Congress may consider extending full Social Security coverage to Federal employees. My organization is categorically opposed to this plan. Federal employees already contribute into a Federal retirement system and do not need nor desire Social Security coverage. Moreover Federal employees do not want to be burdened by a Social Security tax that is without a doubt the most onerous, oppressive and regressive tax ever perpetrated against the taxpayers of the United States.

Extending full Social Security coverage to all Federal employees will prove to be nothing more than a "quick fix" that will fail to restore fiscal integrity to a very sick system and will only add more weight to the yoke of taxation that is slowly crushing the American taxpayer. Government should protect its people, not bleed them.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

ORGANIZATION For

FISCAL

INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

December 6, 1982

Hon. Jack Brooks, Chairman Committee on Government Operations House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Sir:

In the December 6, 1982 edition of the Federal Times there is an article entitled "Federal Execs Get \$2.4M In Rank Award Bonuses." The article states that 38 top-level executives were given \$20,000 bonuses and another 160 employees were given \$10,000 bonuses.

My organization believes that the granting of these extraordinarily large bonuses is ill-advised. How can these cash awards to well paid Federal bureaucrats be justified when people are losing their jobs and services are being cut supposedly because there is no more money?

Instead of paying \$10,000 and \$20,000 bonuses to well paid Federal bureaucrats, this money should be used to maintain jobs and services.

I question the integrity of a government that provides substantial gratuities for its managerial personnel while pleading poverty. Surely this is an inconsistency that needs to be addressed.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

President

cc: Mr. Donald J. Devine

enclosed: copy of article

ORGANIZATION For

INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

December 10, 1982

Hon. Strom Thurmond, Chairman Senate Judiciary Committee United States Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Sir:

On page one of the December 9, 1982 edition of the Los Angeles Times there is an article entitled "Japanese Experiments - Germ Tests: Manchurian Mask Lifted," by Michael Parks. This article describes in detail the activities of a special Japanese military unit that conducted so-called "medical experiments" on captive civilians and prisoners of war during World War Two.

According to the article, the commander of the unit, Lt. Gen. Shiro Ishii and other senior officers

...were granted immunity from prosecution by the United States in return for the records of their research which Washington wanted to keep from the Soviet Union.

This article also quotes two Defense Department officials as having written

"Since any war crimes trial would completely reveal such data to all nations, it is felt that such publicity must be avoided in the interests of defense and national security of the United States."

I think it is outrageous that the United States government granted these vicious murderers immunity from prosecution. Instead of protecting these criminals, the United States should have assumed the leadership in vigorously prosecuting and punishing them for their heinous crimes. It is incredible that American officials actually did business with terrorists who had conducted, among other things, experiments in ways to infest the United States with bubonic plague. There is simply no justification for the role played by the United States in this matter.

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

December 10. 1982

Hon. Strom Thurmond

Sir (continued):

This article leads me to ask the following questions:

- 1. Was Lt. Gen. Ishii ever permitted to enter the United States, and if so, when?
- 2. Is Lt. Gen. Ishii still alive, and if so, are there any plans to prosecute him?
- 3. How many Japanese officers assigned to Unit 731 were granted immunity from prosecution by the United States?
- 4. Who are the two Defense Department officials who wrote that this matter should be covered up?
- 5. Has China or Japan demanded the extradition of any suspected war criminals living in the United States, and if so, what has been the United States government's response?

I expect a prompt and candid reply to this letter.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

President

enclosed: copy of article.

cc: Mr. Fred Nicholson

ORGANIZATION For FISCAL

INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

December 16, 1982

Hon. Alan K. Simpson, Chairman Senate Committee on Veteran Affairs United States Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Sir:

11

In his book, Born on the Fourth of July, Ron Kovic, a veteran who became a paraplegic in 1967 while serving in Vietnam, describes in shocking detail the deplorable conditions at the V.A. Hospital, Bronx, New York, where he was hospitalized twice.

On page 39 of the Pocket Book edition, published in 1977 by Simon and Schuster, New York City, Mr. Kovic writes:

The wards are filthy. The men in my room throw their breadcrumbs under the radiator to keep the rats from chewing on our numb legs during the nights. We tuck our bodies in with the sheets wrapped around us. There are never enough aides to go around the wards, and constantly there is complaining by the men. The most severely injured are totally dependent on the aides to turn them. They suffer the most and break down with sores. These are the voices that can be heard screaming in the night for help that never comes. Urine bags are constantly overflowing onto the floors while the aides play poker on the toilet bowels in the enema room. The sheets are never changed enough and many of the men stink from not being properly bathed. It never makes any sense to us how the government can keep asking money for weapons and leave us lying in our own filth.

On pages 129 and 130 Mr. Kovic writes:

It is like being in a prison....There is one nurse who always tells me I am crazy...The walls are almost as dirty as the floor and I cannot even see out the window....I am lying in my own excrement and no one cares....I have

ORGANIZATION For

FISCAL

INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

December 16, 1982

Hon. Alan K. Simpson

Sir (continued):

been screaming for almost an hour when one of the aides walk by. He sticks his head in the door, taunting me and laughing. "I'm a Vietnam veteran," I tell him. "I fought in Vietnam and I've got a right to be treated decently."

"Vietnam," the aide says loudly. "Vietnam don't mean nothing to me or any of these other people. You can take your Vietnam and shove it up your ass."

Mr. Kovic's account of the care he received at the Bronx V.A. Hospital is truly appalling. The Organization for Fiscal Integrity wants to know if these horrible conditions still exist at the Bronx V.A. Hospital, and if so, what steps are being taken to eliminate them?

The American taxpayer needs to be assured that those persons who gave so much for their country are receiving the best possible care and are being treated humanely and with dignity and compassion.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

President

Frederic Nicholson First Secretary ORGANIZATION For

FISCAL

INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

December 18, 1982

Hon. G. V. Montgomery, Chairman Committee on Veteran Affairs House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Sir:

Enclosed is a copy of a letter from H. L. Roy that appeared in the December 20, 1982 edition of the Federal Times. In his letter Mr. Roy states that he is "...a current federal employee with a compensable VA disability...."

It is my understanding that the purpose of service-connected compensation is to provide supplementary income to veterans who are not fully employable due to an injury or illness incurred while on active duty. The amount of compensation is based on the nature of the injury or illness and the degree to which it limits the veteran's employability.

With the above in mind, it seems to me that the only acceptible reasons for a veteran, such as Mr. Roy, to receive VA compensation while employed full-time is if (a)the compensation is needed to enable the veteran to maintain his employment; or (b)the income earning potential of the veteran is significantly reduced due to a service-connected disability that effectively limits his choice of occupations.

The following questions are raised:

- 1. Are service-connected veterans entitled to compensation if their service-connected disability does not (a)prevent them from being employed full-time; or (b)create a need for the purchase of supportive services or adaptive equipment to enable the veteran to remain employed?
- 2. When a veteran is awarded compensation, is this a permanent entitlement or is it subject to periodic review?

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

December 18, 1982

Hon. G. V. Montgomery

Sir (continued):

- 3. Is the employability of service-connected veterans periodically reviewed?
- 4. Are there categories of service-connected veterans who are automatically considered permanently unemployable? If there are, what are the categories?

Thank you for your prompt consideration of this matter.

Sincerely yours.

Phillip W. Weiss President

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

December 21, 1982

Hon. Mary Rose Oskar, Chairwoman Federal Pay and Benefits Subcommittee House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Madame:

In recent weeks several newspapers have reported that Congress may consider extending full Social Security coverage to Federal employees. My organization is categorically opposed to this plan. Federal employees already contribute into a Federal retirement system and do not need nor desire Social Security coverage. Moreover Federal employees do not want to be burdened by a Social Security tax that is without a doubt the most onerous, oppressive and regressive tax ever perpetrated against the workers of the United States.

Extending full Social Security coverage to all Federal employees will prove to be nothing more than a "quick fix" that will fail to restore fiscal integrity to a very sick system and will only add more weight to the yoke of taxation that is slowly crushing the American worker.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD SERVE ITS PEOPLE, NOT BLEED THEM.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

ORGANIZATION For FISCAL INTEGRITY

> 12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

> > December 21, 1982

Hon. J. J. Pickle, Chairman Ways and Means Social Security Subcommittee House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Sir:

In recent weeks several newspapers have reported that Congress may consider extending full Social Security coverage to Federal employees. My organization is categorically opposed to this plan. Federal employees already contribute into a Federal retirement system and do not need nor desire Social Security coverage. Moreover Federal employees do not want to be burdened by a Social Security tax that is without a doubt the most onerous, oppressive and regressive tax ever perpetrated against the workers of the United States.

Extending full Social Security coverage to all Federal employees will prove to be nothing more than a "quick fix" that will fail to restore fiscal integrity to a very sick system and will only add more weight to the yoke of taxation that is slowly crushing the American worker.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD SERVE ITS PEOPLE, NOT BLEED THEM.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

President



United States Office of Personnel Management Washington, D.C. 20415

In Reply Refer To

Your Reference

• December 27, 1982

Honorable Alan Cranston United States Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Cranston:

In his letters to you of July 6 and 9, 1982, your constituent, Phillip W. Weiss, expresses his continuing concern about the payment of the stipends accompanying Presidential Rank Awards. His concerns appear to be based, at least in part, upon misconceptions about the functions of these awards and the role private citizens played in selecting recipients. Perhaps I can help to dispel those misconceptions.

Mr. Weiss apparently believes that the cash stipends accompanying the Presidential Rank Awards are intended as a supplement to inadequate basic salaries. My letter to you of May 24, 1982, written in response to an earlier inquiry from Mr. Weiss on the same subject, spoke briefly to this issue. I emphasize again that such is not the case. These awards are recognition accorded the very best and most productive Federal executives for contributions that in most cases span a full career. They are awarded to very few people; the ranks of Distinguished and Meritorious Senior Executive were conferred by the President upon 38 and 161 people this year, respectively, out of a population of over 6,500 Senior Executives. In short, the Presidential Rank Award Program is far too selective for there to be any validity to the charge that it functions to supplement executive pay surreptitiously.

Mr. Weiss charges that Government managers have used the rank award stipends "to circumvent the pay schedule enacted by Congress." Payment of rank award stipends in no way circumvents the will of Congress. Quite the contrary; these stipends were specifically authorized by Congress when it passed the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 (See 5 USC 4507). Over the three years since this legislation took effect, Federal agencies, the Office of Personnel Management, and two Presidents have exercised considerable restraint by making substantially fewer awards than the six percent actually authorized under the law.

Mr. Weiss questions "on what authority do they (private citizens) make recommendations on matters concerning the expenditure of public funds?" OPM Director Donald J. Devine sought the advice of a review board of private citizens in recommending rank award nominees to the President to help avoid any taint of the "cronyism and backslapping" Mr. Weiss suspects in the selection of rank award recipients. We have gone to great lengths to bring complete objectivity to the selection process and the convening of a review board of private citizens with no vested interest in the outcome helped to insure this goal. Me nominating agency had a hand in selection of review board members. The review board had no other connection with OPM and no opportunity to influence or comment upon any aspect of OPM policy beyond the review of nominations. Once this task was completed, the Board was disbanded.

I hope this information will be helpful to you in responding to the concerns expressed by Mr. Weiss.

Sincerely,

George Hesterczuk Associate Girector . for Administration

AXP:PArnold:rrm:12-8-82 revised:rrm:12-16-82 ORGANIZATION For FISCAL INTEGRITY.

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

January 10, 1983

Hon. Robert Dole, Chairman Finance Committee U. S. Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Sir:

Thank you for your response to our letter of November 23, 1982 in which Mr. Weiss expressed our organization's opposition to extending Social Security coverage to Federal employees.

We must point out, however, that while your panel ponders ways to keep Social Security solvent, over one hundred localities, including the City of Los Angeles, have withdrawn from the system. Although their decision to pull out of the system is understandable, we think it undermines your efforts to restore fiscal integrity to Social Security and is unfair to those employees who continue to pay or who may have to "contribute" in the future. What is the use of extending Social Security coverage to Federal employees if other employees can pull out at any time?

Since every American has an interest in maintaining the solvency of the system, then everyone, without exception, should be required to share the burden of supporting it. Only in this way will the viability of the Social Security system be re-established, provided, of course, that benefits are also brought more in line with the original intent of the program.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

President

Frederic Nicholson First Secretary ORGANIZATION For FISCAL INTEGRITY.

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

January 14, 1983

Hon. Ted Stevens United States Senate Washington, D.C. 2051.0

Sir:

My organization is firmly opposed to any legislation that would require federal employees to pay into Social Security while localities, such as the City of Los Angeles have the right to pull out. Although their decision to pull out of the system is understandable, it undermines the efforts of the Social Security reform commission to restore fiscal integrity to Social Security and is unfair to those employees who continue to pay or who may have to "contribute" in the future. What is the use of extending Social Security coverage to Federal employees if other employees can pull out at any time?

Since every American has an interest in maintaining the solvency of the system, then everyone, without exception, should be required to share the burden of supporting it. Only in this way will the viability of the Social Security system be re-established, provided, of course, that benefits are also brought more in line with the original intent of the program.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss President

ORGANIZATION For FISCAL INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

January 19, 1983

Hon. Patricia Schroeder Chairwoman Civil Service Subcommittee House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Madame:

The manner in which Maxine Savitz was removed from her position in the Department of Energy is shocking. My organization demands that this matter be investigated to determine: (1)whether Maxine Savitz's firing was politically motivated and (2)whether Joseph Tribble's actions were consistent with accepted managerial practice.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

President

cc: Mr. Joseph Tribble

ORGANIZATION For

FISCAL

INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

January 19, 1983

Hon. William Proxmire U. S. Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Sir:

According to an article that appeared in the 1/24/83 edition of the Federal Times, a bureaucrat named June Koch, who is a deputy undersecretary for intergovernmental relations, continues to illegally use chauffeur-driven limos despite a warning to cease this practice.

This is another example of an arrogant, self-centered bureaucrat who places her personal needs before the needs of the American people who she has sworn to serve.

Since bureaucrat Koch has violated her oath of office, my organization strongly believes she ought to be impeached. Also, my organization wants to know the function of a "deputy undersecretary for intergovernmental relations" and when this position was created.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

President

cc: Ms. June Koch

enclosed: copy of article.

ORGANIZATION For FISCAL

INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

January 21, 1983

Mr. Donald Lambro c/o The Register 625 North Grand Santa Ana, California 92711

Dear Mr. Lambro:

In reference to your column on GSA administrator Gerald Carmen that appeared in the January 19, 1983 edition of the Orange County Register, you failed to mention that "Jerry" was severely criticized by the House civil service subcommittee for practices that were found to be wasteful, unfair and politically motivated. This finding was reported in an article that appeared in the August 2, 1982 edition of the Federal Times. I have enclosed a copy of this article for your review.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

President

ORGANIZATION FOR FISCAL INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

January 22, 1983

Hon. Jerry Patterson House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Sir:

It has come to the attention of my organization that effective July 1, 1983 the Federal government will require that ten percent of the interest from savings and ten percent of the income from pensions be witheld for tax purposes.

This law must be repealed as it is oppressive and will unfairly punish the vast majority of taxpayers who report their earnings from savings and pensions and do not seek to cheat the Internal Revenue Service. It will also further reduce the incentive to save money and will place savings institutions and pension funds in the role of tax collectors.

Although everyone recognizes the need to reduce the budget deficit, there must be more equitable ways to accomplish this goal that will not unduly impact on those individuals who depend on savings and pensions for their income.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

President

ORGANIZATION For FISCAL

INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

January 25, 1983

Hon. Patricia Schroeder House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Madame:

According to a column that appeared in the 1/19/83 edition of the Orange County Register, Gerald Carmen is finally thinking about leaving his job as GSA administrator. Of course, based upon the conclusions of your subcommittee's investigation into Mr. Carmen's activities, his decision to leave is welcome news to the American taxpayer.

What we cannot understand, however, is how a "scrappy former auto-parts dealer" could be appointed administrator of a large government agency. If this was Mr. Carmen's background, then clearly he was not qualified for that position. Hopefully he will soon leave and be replaced by someone who at least has a background in public administration.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

President

Frederic Nicholson First Secretary

enclosed: copy of article.

cc: Gerald Carmen

ORGANIZATION FOR FISCAL

INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Stret Suite 127 Garden Grove, Califor 92645 (714) 891-6822

January , 1983

Hon. Jerry Patterson House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Sir:

As a follow up to my letter of 1/22/83, I have enclosed a copy of an article that appeared in the 1/23/83 edition of the Los Angeles Times. According to this article, the plan to withhold ten percent of all interest and dividend payments will cause savers to lose about \$1.5 billion in the first full year of its implementation. My organization strongly urges you to take immediate action to rescind this law.

This withholding plan is another example of the kind of taxation that is rapidly choking the American economy; and instead of reducing the budget deficit, it will merely provide the government with more money to spend — or rather, to waste. How much longer can the American people be expected to bear this ever—increasing burden of taxation?

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

President

cc: Fred Nicholson

ORGANIZATION For FISCAL INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

February 1, 1983

Hon. Cardiss Collins Chairperson Manpower and Housing Subcommittee House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Madame:

The Organization for Fiscal Integrity applauds the decision to suspend Emanuel Savas and urge that you apply pressure to have him removed from office for the sake of the taxpayers who have to pay his salary.

Savas is another example of a political hack who all too often is placed in positions of authority where he can abuse his privileges and act in ways that are detrimental to the welfare of the people who he has sworn to serve.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss President

enclosed: copy of Federal Times article.

ORGANIZATION For FISCAL INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

February 1, 1983

Hon. Jack Brooks, Chairman Committee on Government Operations House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Sir:

The Organization for Fiscal Integrity is shocked and appalled that a responsible civil servant was persecuted for exercising his constitutional right to free speech. According to an article that appeared in the January 31, 1983 edition of the Federal Times, William C. Bush, a NASA engineer, "... was demoted from GS-14 to GS-12, endured a long administrative process and ultimately was reinstated with back pay..." for complaining about waste in his agency.

Mr. Bush would not have been harrassed if there had not been some truth in his allegations. It appears that Congress must take action to insure that all federal employees will be able to exercise their right to free speech without fear of retaliation.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss President

enclosed: copy of article.

ORGANIZATION For FISCAL

INTEGRITY

12062 Valley View Street Suite 127 Garden Grove, California 92645 (714) 891-6822

February 1, 1983

Mr. Donald Lambro United Features Syndicate 200 Park Avenue New York, N.Y. 10017

Dear Mr. Lambro:

In reference to your column on GSA administrator Gerald Carmen that appeared in the January 19, 1983 edition of the Orange County Register, you failed to mention that "Jerry" was severely criticized by the House civil service subcommittee for practices that were found to be wasteful, unfair and politically motivated. This was reported in an article that appeared in the August 2, 1982 edition of the Federal Times.

Based upon the findings of the subcommittee, it appears that "Jerry" cannot even be called a bureaucrat. He is something much worse - a political hack.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip W. Weiss

President

cc: Frederic Nicholson First Secretary

enclosed: copy of Federal Times article.