

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

AuCoin

Friends of Les AuCoin
P.O. Box 641, Beaverton, OR 97075

THE INCUMBENT

In 1984, for the first time in his political career, five-term incumbent Congressman Les AuCoin will be facing an experienced, well-financed challenger who will have devoted four years to running against him and who will put a premium on negative advertising.

Favorable demographics for Republicans in Oregon's First Congressional District and a viable, experienced opponent would be reasons enough for national Republican strategists to mark Les AuCoin for defeat in 1984. But there are other reasons AuCoin is one of 20 Democrats who were targeted in February of 1983 by the National Republican Congressional Committee: He is a prominent and effective opponent of key Administration policies, and is well positioned on the House Appropriations Committee to make his opposition felt.

- He is a highly successful fighter for the the environment, having used his seat on the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee to ban oil drilling off the coast of northern California and elsewhere, and to deny James Watt funds to open up wilderness areas for oil and mineral exploration. He is the author of House-passed legislation to preserve one million acres of Oregon's untouched remaining national forest lands as wilderness — one of the most important wilderness bills now pending in Congress.

- He is one of two voices on the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee working to restrain President Reagan's \$1.6 trillion military buildup, a national spokesman and floor leader for the nuclear freeze and against the MX, a thoughtful critic of U.S. policies in Central America and an opponent of the "secret" war in Nicaragua.

- He is recognized by pro-choice groups as one of the top legislators in the House of Representatives for freedom of choice on abortion and is an unwavering advocate of the Equal Rights Amendment and the Women's Economic Equity Act.

- He is a prominent advocate for safe, decent and affordable housing; he authored the Emergency Housing Production Act of 1982, which he steered through Congress and came within 12 votes of passing over President Reagan's veto.

- He is a leading voice for expansionist U.S. trade policies, especially in the field of export finance, and for a renewed federal commitment to public education.

For these reasons and many more, Les AuCoin is one of the key progressive voices that Republicans have decided to still by means of a well-financed, nationally coordinated rematch with conservative candidate Bill Moshofsky in 1984.

The AuCoin campaign, however, has been gearing up for several months with a sophisticated fundraising telephone bank and grassroots organizing effort in order to win in 1984. The race promises to be one of the hardest fought in the West.

This booklet is an abstract of the upcoming campaign, provided to you in the conviction that if you believe in progressive government, Les AuCoin is too good to lose. We ask for your support.

THE DISTRICT AND THE RACE

Occupying eight counties in the northwest corner of Oregon, the First Congressional District is a study in vivid contrasts. More than two-thirds of the district's population is concentrated in the affluent neighborhoods of west Portland (Multnomah County) and the fast-growing satellite communities of eastern Washington County: Beaverton, Tigard and Hillsboro.

More than a half-million people moved to Oregon during the 1970s, with the suburbs of eastern Washington County as a primary destination. The magnet was, and continues to be, jobs in electronics and computer firms, many of them transplanted from California's Silicon Valley. During the decade, firms such as Tektronix, Intel, Hewlett-Packard and Floating Point Systems spawned dozens of independent, high-technology companies in the eastern Washington County region, contributing to a population growth rate of 55 percent. By 1982, Washington and western Multnomah counties accounted for 66 percent of the First District's population.

Keeping pace with the upscale transformation of suburban Washington County, GOP power increased. By 1981, Republicans outnumbered Democrats for the first time.

Outside the Portland metropolitan region, the 1970s and early 80s were anything but growth years. Along the Oregon Coast, tourism, timber and fishing are the dominant industries. For the most part, tourism has been a buffer for coastal communities like Newport, Lincoln City and Seaside during a period of steady decline in Oregon's commercial fishing and seafood processing industries, and two recessions which shut down lumber and plywood plants all over the state.

Times have been much harder for the inland mill towns of the Oregon Coast Range, such as Willamina and Sheridan, and the Columbia River communities of St. Helens, Rainier and Clatskanie whose fortunes are tied almost exclusively to the timber industry. For these communities, the Reagan recession was the worst disaster since Hoover's.

In hard-hit Astoria, at the mouth of the Columbia River, the city's last salmon cannery has closed its doors, and the area's major sawmill, in nearby Warrenton, is operating under Chapter 11 bankruptcy procedures. As described in a recent issue of *The Sunday Oregonian's Northwest Magazine*, Astoria was "once the second-largest city in the state, a community of sea captains, loggers, laborers and merchants. Now civic leaders nervously measure the city's pulse as the population dips below 10,000 for the first time since World War I and unemployment climbs above 17 percent." The coastal and lower Columbia River counties of Lincoln, Tillamook, Clatsop and Columbia are the strongest Democratic areas in the First District, but they make up only 22 percent of the district's population.

Rounding out the district are northern and western Polk County and Yamhill County in the lower Willamette River valley south of Portland. These are predominately agricultural areas producing grass seed, hazelnuts and strawberries. Wine production is a fast-growing enterprise in the two counties and in the rural areas of western Washington County to the north. Historically, voters in this region prefer Republicans, but Les AuCoin has been the exception to the rule.

In a larger sense, five-term incumbent Congressman Les AuCoin is the exception to the voting history of the First Congressional District. The district favored Nixon over McGovern, 55 to 45 percent; Ford over Carter, 54 to 45 percent; and Reagan over Carter, 48 to 38 percent. AuCoin is the only Democrat it has ever elected to Congress.

As the 1982 edition of the Almanac of American Politics observed:

"The district was created in almost its present form in 1892, and for 82 years thereafter it always elected Republican congressmen. The progressive era, the Depression of the 1930s, the Goldwater debacle — through all these events the 1st district stayed with the Republicans. Time after time the Yankee-descended Republicans of the Willamette Valley outvoted the lumbermen of the coastal area. That changed in 1974 (with AuCoin's first election)."

Describing the election of the new Democratic Congressman in that year, the Almanac characterized Les AuCoin as "tailor-made for the district."

"At 28, he had been elected to the legislature from Washington County and after one term had become House Majority Leader. So he had home base appeal in the affluent suburbs that might otherwise go Republican. He had good credentials on environmental issues. He was against the Vietnam war. And he backed traditional Democratic positions on economic issues without alienating traditional Republicans."

By increasing margins of 59, 63, and 66 percent, Les was re-elected to Congress in 1976, 1978 and 1980.

In 1982, Les' victory margin dipped to 54 percent. These were the major reasons:

1) In the redistricting of 1981, Les lost Benton County, home of Corvallis and Oregon State University, and western Polk County. Both areas had given him margins exceeding two-to-one in 1980.

2) Republican registration overtook Democratic registration in populous Washington County in 1981.

3) Les was challenged by a well-financed Republican, Bill Moshofsky, a conservative timber company executive. After failing to close ground on Les with a conventional campaign, Moshofsky shifted to an exclusively negative strategy in the closing weeks, attacking Les relentlessly in television ads.

"In congressional campaigns this year," observed political columnist Ron Blankenbaker in the Salem, Ore., Statesman-Journal, "one candidate, incumbent Democrat Les AuCoin in the 1st district, has had so much mud thrown at him by his Republican challenger he's responded with a television ad showing the mud spitting his campaign poster."

4) The district came closer to voting its partisan base. Going into the 1982 election, Democrats held a 7-point registration margin over Republicans district-wide (Democrats, 47 percent; Republicans, 40 percent; independents and others, 14 percent). AuCoin's margin of victory was 8 points. Republican voter turnout in the district was 75.9 percent, exceeding the state average by 1.4 percent, district Democratic turnout by 3.5 percent and Independent turnout by 20.5 percent.

The same factors that worked against Les in 1982 will pertain in 1984, only more so: Republicans will have increased their strength, and Republican candidate Bill Moshofsky is running again — this time with three advantages he did not have in 1982:

1) Heightened name familiarity. Following his 1982 defeat, Moshofsky tapped corporate supporters from his campaign to set up the "Coalition for Responsible Spending," with himself as the paid, full-time executive director. Though the ostensible purpose of the organization was to lobby the Oregon Legislature to cut state spending, Moshofsky spent most of his time outside Salem, the state capital, working Rotary groups, Chambers of Commerce and the news media in his assumed role as "the only lobbyist in Salem who cares about Oregon's taxpayers."

2) Campaign experience. 1982 was Moshofsky's first campaign for elective office of any kind. With the "Coalition for Responsible Spending," he is building upon an established campaign base. His "coalition" has run paid newspaper ads with Howard Jarvis themes, featuring "volunteer coupons" for citizens to mail in to join the "anti-spending, anti-taxing crusade." Moshofsky has also discovered that negative advertising is a powerful weapon, and will employ it throughout the 1984 campaign. On February 15 of this year, one day before announcing the creation of the "Coalition for Responsible Spending," Moshofsky sent a letter to corporate contributors informing them of his decision to challenge Les AuCoin again, and soliciting \$1,000 contributions.

3) The National Republican Congressional Committee, buoyed by Moshofsky's 46 percent share in 1982, has targeted Les for attacks in 1983 and 1984. Using newspaper and radio advertisements in selected areas of the First District, together with mailings to AuCoin contributors and news releases, the NRCC has so far falsely accused Les of voting to raise taxes on working Americans while voting for a pay increase for himself, and conniving to limit the tax deduction homeowners can claim on mortgage interest. So reckless was the latter attack — in a state whose leading products are lumber and plywood — that three prominent Republican businessmen called a press conference to denounce it as "a downright disgrace."

The Oregonian

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1982

AuCoin in 1st District

The campaign in the 1st Congressional District between Rep. Les AuCoin, the incumbent Democrat, and Bill Moshofsky, his Republican challenger, centers on the president's economic program, its liabilities and assets, and the philosophical differences and accomplishments of the two candidates. These issues and differences add up to reasons The Oregonians advises voters to support AuCoin.

At 39, AuCoin is proud of his record, arguing he has a different set of budget priorities than does his opponent. He opposes any reduction in Social Security benefits and supports cuts in new weapons programs that are being paid for out of social program cuts. He also comes on strong as a leader of the nuclear freeze movement.

Moshofsky would like to pin a Big Spender button on his opponent. It is Moshofsky's line that AuCoin has argued for balanced budgets but votes the other way and must take responsibility for the huge national debt that has helped run up interest rates and strongly pushed Oregon into a deep depression.

Moshofsky is critical of most federal spending, looking with a jaundiced eye even at U.S. funding for such worthy local programs as the veterans hospital and Tri-Met. In the case of the Banfield light rail project, AuCoin used his position on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Transportation to gain a full funding contract to keep the project on schedule while at the same time voting to make other cuts of \$7 billion in the president's unbalanced budget.

Moshofsky, in some specifics more conservative than the president, strongly contends that federal government cuts under Reagan have not gone far enough. This includes the fat military budget, for which he proposes specific reductions totaling \$21 billion next year and \$193 billion by 1987.

At 58, Moshofsky has acquired a vast background in governmental affairs, both in Salem and Washington, and an insider's corporate experience as counsel for the Georgia-Pacific Corp. Here, before he resigned to run for office, his activities ranged across a wide bookcase of subjects, including energy, transportation, wood processing and environmental issues. If elected, he might well be one of two or three best-

informed members of the House on special problems of the timber industry.

Moshofsky's biggest problem, given the quasi-seniority system in the Congress, is that he would start his congressional career relatively late. The House usually attracts younger persons who can manage to stay in Washington long enough to acquire responsibility and clout. The system does not treat kindly Moshofsky's idea that he should go to Washington, "do a good job and then go home." While he argues that the nation ought to limit congressional terms, an attractive thought, there is no real prospect this soon will happen.

AuCoin has gained strength in his district in the traditional ways. He scored heavily in opposing a Reagan administration user-fee plan that would have crippled the port. Moshofsky, while generally endorsing Reagan's goals, also later opposed the scheme.

AuCoin's most successful 1982 effort came after he fought 180 days to pass his housing bill that was later vetoed by Reagan, despite strong Republican support for the measure in Washington and Salem. It would have reduced interest payments for new homebuyers, thereby stimulating housing and putting an estimated 400,000 to work. Its veto was a case of Reagan getting bad advice.

AuCoin has fought for the clean air act and moved against various efforts by Secretary of Interior James Watt to open up Pacific coastal waters for unlimited oil leasing. He is against such programs as the B-1 bomber and the MX missile, believing some of the funds instead should go for conventional weapons. Moshofsky, also opposed to the MX system and harboring "reservations about the B-1 bomber," believes the nuclear freeze issue helpful in getting arms reductions movement because "we already have enough weapons to blow up everybody."

Moshofsky offers a thoughtful conservative pragmatism in contrast to the incumbent's moderate pragmatism. But AuCoin, who has gained stature on issues important to Oregonians, is the most influential congressman from Oregon in the House delegation. Moshofsky simply has not built a convincing case for replacing AuCoin because of ideological differences or actual performance in office.

While better qualified for Congress than any opponent AuCoin has faced in recent years, Moshofsky, if elected, would not soon be in any position to do much about his convictions. The Oregonian recommends voters in the 1st District support Rep. Les AuCoin.



GOP Campaign Unit Fires Early Salvos in the War of the Words

By Margot Hornblower
Washington Post Staff Writer

the political snake pit known as Hill, Rep. James McC. is one of the gentlemen. The freshman Democrat, a Carolina farmer and son of a minister, is known for demeanor.

what's this? A news release the Washington-based National Congressional Committee (NRCC) that says, "Congress-Clarke . . . evidently feels that to do nothing to prevent our Americans from being beaten on the streets of our na-

Clarke, ambling through of the Capitol in a pale seersucker suit, simply shakes and says, "It's a sorry way business."

business is a high-powered publicity campaign initiated NRCC, which organizes and GOP House races, against 70 incumbent Democrats. Republican and Democratic political have mounted such cam- before, but never has the war so early and so stridently, than 18 months before the

May 11 news release on on red-white-and-blue letterhead, was sent to news- and radio stations in his dis- as well as to several hundred of contributors. It attacks his against an amendment to a jus- assistance act to increase the of crime-protection funds to the elderly.

acknowledges that his vote "politically hasty." He said it the result of confusion over the of the amendment given by Judiciary Committee Chair- Peter W. Rodino Jr. (D-N.J.).

Stan Lundine, a New York was upbraided in an

NRCC release March 9 for voting against an amendment to the jobs bill to provide \$135 million for school and hospital weatherization. The release asks, "How could any member of Congress vote to deny money to keep hospital patients and school children warm in winter?"

Lundine, a fourth-term from Jamestown, said five or six NRCC releases have been sent to news outlets and contributors in his district.

"This idea of sending it to your contributors—it's very close to being dirty tricks," he said.

News-release attacks were first organized into a sophisticated centralized operation by the NRCC in 1975.

It was called "News From the Other Side," but the Republican committee abandoned the tactic during the last election cycle as ineffective. The Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (DCCC), however, began sending out negative releases in 1981, making political hay on GOP budget and Social Security votes.

Now the Republicans have started up again, with the new twist of sending the releases to campaign contributors. The NRCC has sent out more than 7,000 releases since February. It is also running paid newspaper and radio ads attacking incumbents in their districts for voting "wrong" on various issues.

Rep. Tony Coelho (D-Calif.), chairman of the DCCC, attacked the GOP campaign as "lies and below-the-belt tactics." He said the efforts "didn't work in 1982 and won't be effective in 1983 or 1984 either."

However, Joseph R. Gaylord, executive director of the NRCC, said, "We're just using some of the weapons the Democrats used on Social Security. They found it pretty easy to take cheap shots, so we can take cheap shots, too. And we have more guns."

The NRCC budget for this year is \$26 million, Gaylord said, raised

mostly through a sophisticated direct-mail operation with 1.2 million contributors.

It already is into candidate recruitment for the 1984 House races, and has begun training workshops. Gaylord said direct cash contributions to GOP races will amount to \$8 million and that GOP candidates will have access to "state-of-the-art" video equipment to make television commercials, as well as a new computer service providing daily information on incumbent Democrats' votes.

By contrast, the DCCC, which began late in the direct-mail business, expects to spend only \$8 million to \$10 million for the two-year election cycle, and is still formulating a political game plan. Nonetheless, Coelho predicts that the Democrats, who gained 26 House seats in 1982, will add five to eight seats in 1984.

Gaylord said his negative media campaign is "a good tactic. It helps motivate people at the local level."

Besides press releases on individual votes, 20 Democrats were targeted as "the taxing 20" for voting in favor of the House Democratic budget, which, like the budget favored by Senate Republicans, included tax increases that President Reagan opposes.

The news release sent to Clarke's district—identical to those mailed to the 19 other districts—charged that Clarke "is forcing his average constituent to cough up \$3,550 over the next five years while making it possible for him to receive an increase in his congressional pay of \$2,792 in just the first year."

There were similar radio ads. However, in Clarke's case, WWNC, the largest station in Asheville, N.C., refused to air the ad on the ground that it was "distasteful."

That prompted an NRCC release blasting the station. "The only thing

'distasteful' about the ad is the decision of WWNC to become an editorial censor," it said.

Several members fought back, demanding equal air time to point out that the budget included no congressional pay raise, but allowed for an across-the-board raise for federal workers.

In one counter radio ad, Rep. Les AuCoin (D-Ore.) said, "I'm not intimidated by these lie and smear tactics . . . If you're troubled by this kind of campaign, contact my Portland office . . ."

Freshman Rep. Ronald Coleman (D-Tex.) got some favorable publicity from the experience. An editorial in his home-town paper, the El Paso Herald-Post, said Coleman was "rightly incensed" adding that the congressman "emphasizes that his concern is to do something about a whopping deficit that poses serious threats to the economy."

Over Memorial Day weekend, another wave of releases went out from NRCC headquarters to about 20 Democrats' districts, coupled with paid newspaper and radio ads charging that the Democrats proposed capping interest on mortgage payments at \$10,000.

In fact, the cap was merely listed as one of many revenue-raising options in a report issued by the Democratic Study Group, an in-house information service subscribed to by 220 House Democrats.

"How could anyone in their right minds even think about capping home mortgage deductions?" the release asked. "Families depend on that deduction when they buy a home."

The paid ads, which ran in such papers as the Asheville Times and Newsday, gave readers the name and telephone number of their congressman and advised them to call and "tell him to get his own House in order. And not to tamper with yours."

Excerpted from:

Congressional Quarterly

Weekly
Report

July 2, 1983

Volume 41, No. 26

Pages 1325-1392

Three-Pronged Strategy:

Wealthy and Well-Organized GOP Panel Eyes 1984 Elections

* * *

Target: Class of 1974

Meanwhile, the NRCC is taking a fresh look at the Democrats first elected in 1974, the year the GOP took a beating at the polls because the party's image was tarnished by the Watergate break-in scandal. (1974 Almanac p. 845)

"There are many of those Democrats who were elected from what we believe are essentially Republican areas, or potentially Republican areas," Vander Jagt says.

* * *

Second-Time Candidates

One of the focal points of NRCC recruiting efforts for 1984 is the group of Republicans who lost House elections in 1982. "This committee has historically encouraged second-time candidacies," Gaylord says.

Several of the 1982 losers are seen by the NRCC as particularly promising prospects for 1984, among them Bill Moshofsky of Oregon, who won 46 percent of the vote against Democratic Rep. Les AuCoin, and Pat Haggerty of Texas, who polled 44 percent in an open, traditionally Democratic district.

Moshofsky and Haggerty, both of whom say they may run again, were in a group invited to an April "recap session" in Washington, at which the NRCC staff sought the losers' comments on the 1982 elections and discussed prospects for 1984.

Among the anti-incumbent mailings the NRCC has already sent out is one that accuses 20 Democrats who voted for the Democratic budget alternative for fiscal 1984 of favoring a \$300 billion tax increase over the next three years; in another mailing, the NRCC charged certain Democrats with endorsing elimination of the tax law that allows homeowners to deduct interest paid on home mortgages from their taxes.

There has been a howl of Democratic protest that the NRCC mailings are misrepresentations. The budget did not include a specific tax hike figure, Democrats say, and eliminating the mortgage interest deduction was simply an option offered by a party study group to reduce the deficit.

The NRCC has been studying records at the Federal Election Commission (FEC), and it is sending its anti-incumbent mailings to people listed by the FEC as campaign contributors to the targeted Democrats. Democrats say that practice smacks of Watergate-era "dirty tricks," but Vander Jagt scoffs at the criticism.

"I would call that making the record known. To say that is gutter politics . . . borders to me on desperation." He says the practice is proper because the NRCC is not soliciting contributions (FEC data may not be used for that purpose), but simply providing information.

"The third wave [of anti-incumbent mailings] will be going out shortly after the August recess," Vander Jagt promises, although the NRCC has not decided what issue it will address.

April, 1983:
AuCoin among
20 Democrats
attacked.

May, June
and August:
AuCoin hit
again.

Three NRCC
mailings to
AuCoin givers
so far.

Until AuCoin,
Oregon's 1st
District al-
ways elected
Republicans.

Moshofsky
already
running.

February 15, 1983

Mr. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Portland, Oregon 97[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]:

I have decided to run again.

The need for change in Congress is greater than ever, and I am just as concerned about our nation's future as I was two years ago.

We came very close to winning last time in a very uphill race. With the tremendous base of support we now have, I feel confident we can win - if we capitalize on that base.

That is why I am starting now by retaining one person at least half-time to (1) develop the in-depth organization we need; (2) analyze voting results; (3) coordinate opposition research; (4) handle preliminary fund raising among our 3,000 prior contributors; and (5) work on letters to the editor.

I have lined up a top notch person from the Atiyeh campaign who can mobilize my supporters as well as Vic's, and handle well the other assignments.

We need the seed money to get this essential activity under way, and I would greatly appreciate your helping again. Your early help in the last campaign gave us a big boost - we ended up raising nearly \$600,000 and running one of the top five Republican challenger races in the country.

Hope you will help at the \$1,000 level. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Bill

Bill Moshofsky

BM/sp/4253F

FROM

THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

GUY VANDER JAGT, CHAIRMAN

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Monday, April 18, 1983

Contact: Nancy Bocskor
202-479-7070

LES AUCOIN NAMED AS MEMBER OF "TAXING TWENTY"

WASHINGTON -- The National Republican Congressional Committee today named Les AuCoin to their list of the "Taxing Twenty".

Rich Galen, Director of Public Affairs for the NRCC, said AuCoin was named to the list of 20 Democrats because of his recent vote to increase taxes on working Americans by \$265 billion over the next five years, while voting himself a 4% pay hike.

"It's outrageous AuCoin would vote to increase income taxes by over \$3,500. That \$3,500 would pay the grocery bill for a family of four from now until the end of 1983," Galen said. "It's obvious that AuCoin would have that money go into the hands of the government rather than into the mouths of working families."

A family of four earning \$30,000 in 1983 will pay an additional \$3,550 in income taxes between now and 1988 because of the recently passed Democratic budget. The Democratic budget proposal would force the cancellation of the third year of the tax cut and would eliminate indexing tax brackets for the rate of inflation, scheduled to go into effect in 1985.

"If you want to dig into the budget and find out where the money is going, you don't have to look any farther than Les AuCoin's own pocket. Among other things, AuCoin is forcing his average constituent to cough up \$3,550 over the next five years while making it possible for him to receive an increase in his Congressional pay of \$2,792 in just the first year," Galen said.

"The Democrats in Congress want to raise income taxes for working Americans while protecting their own incomes by doing away with tax indexing," Galen said. "If indexing is repealed it would mean that the Democrats would continue to be the primary beneficiaries of the high inflation rates they created several years ago."

"All of us who pay taxes are smarting over the amount we had to shell out last week to the IRS, and unless we write and call Congressman AuCoin, we're going to be writing bigger and bigger checks to the IRS in the years ahead," Galen concluded.

-0-

Which political party is out to cut the tax break for homeowners?

Guess again.

One political party doesn't seem to know—or care—what it costs to own a home these days.

In fact, they're out to make it a lot costlier. By putting a ceiling on the tax deduction for mortgage interest. Even though millions depend on that deduction to meet the payments on their American dream.

Which party would do something so unfair?

The Democrats.

Surprised? You shouldn't be.

Because it's the Democrats in the House of Representatives who have a new, big-spending budget to fund. To do that, they've proposed a list of 41 tax increases.* Cutting back your homeowner's deduction is just one of their ideas.

Republicans in the House know that's unfair. They realize that millions of Americans are making ends meet only because of the homeowner's deduction. And that it's wrong to snatch it away from them.

Where does your Democratic Representative, **Les AuCoin**, stand? Call him today at **221-2901** and ask.

You might also tell him to get his own House in order. And not to tamper with yours.

*Democratic Study Group Special Report, "Revenue Options for FY 1984," March 21, 1983

*Paid for by the National Republican Congressional Committee. Not authorized by any candidate.

They're still at it!

FROM

THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

GUY VANDER JAGT, CHAIRMAN

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Thursday, May 26, 1983

Contact: Nancy Bocskor
202-479-7070

GOP ASKS LES AUCCOIN TO EXPLAIN DEMOCRAT MORTGAGE CAP SCHEME

WASHINGTON -- A major policy-making committee of the Democrats in the U.S. House of Representatives, the Democratic Study Group, has issued a list of proposed methods of raising federal taxes including capping home mortgage interest deductions for taxpayers.

More than 220 House Democrats belong to the Democratic Study Group, including U.S. Rep. Les AuCoin, (D-Ore.). Dues for full research services for the group are \$2,200 a year, paid for out of tax dollars.

In an official report issued by the group, entitled "Revenue Options for 1984," the Democrats proposed capping interest on mortgage payments at \$10,000.

"How could anyone in their right minds even think about capping home mortgage deductions?" asked Rich Galen, Director of Public Affairs for the National Republican Congressional Committee. "Families depend on that deduction when they buy a home. We've started to see improvement in the housing market since the economy is getting back on the right track, and now the Democrats want to put on the brakes," Galen said. "AuCoin should tell his constituents if he's supporting his party's proposal."

Almost 25% of families who bought a home in March, 1983, would be affected by the \$10,000 cap on interest deduction. With current annual sales of 2.7 million homes, 648,000 families would be affected by the cap. Even moderate increases in inflation and interest rates would drag enormous numbers of homebuyers into this scheme. If we should return to the runaway inflation and interest rates we had under the Carter Administration the \$10,000 cap would affect even more hard-working families who are trying to buy a home."

"The Democrats want us to foot the bill for their new, big-spending budget," charged Galen. "They've put together a list of 41 new tax increases for Fiscal Year 1984. Once they get their foot in the door with this cap, I'm sure they'll want more and more of our tax dollars."

"AuCoin's constituents have a right to know if he supports the Democrats' proposals. Folks who depend on the mortgage deduction so they can attain the American dream of home ownership should give AuCoin a call to find out if he supports his party's position on this issue," Galen concluded.

-0-



FROM

THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE
GUY VANDER JAGT, CHAIRMAN

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Friday, June 24, 1983

Contact:
Steve Lotterer
202-479-7070

AUCOIN VOTES TAX HIKE FOR MIDDLE INCOME FAMILIES AND SMALL BUSINESS

WASHINGTON -- U.S. Rep. Les AuCoin (D-OR) voted today to increase the federal taxes of middle income families and over 2.4 million small businesses by capping the third year of President Reagan's tax cut.

Although Democratic leaders claimed the capping vote would "penalize the rich", U.S. Treasury Department estimates show that the tax cut cap would hit middle income Americans and small businesses the hardest and that wealthy Americans would be exempt from the cap.

According to the Treasury Department, the tax cut cap AuCoin voted for would raise tax rates to insure that no one's tax cut would be in excess of \$700. However, the bill would not raise the maximum tax rate of 50%, meaning that wealthy individuals already in that tax bracket would not be affected by the cap.

"The tax cut cap really hits middle America over the head," said National Republican Congressional Committee Executive Director Joseph Gaylord. "A family with two wage earners earning just over \$35,000 would see their tax rate go up 12% because of AuCoin's vote. And since over 85% of the small businesses in the nation file personal, not corporate, income tax returns, the tax hike would hit 2.4 million small businesses as well."

"I find it unbelievable that the Democrats are trying to pass off this tax hike as a vote which will only affect wealthy Americans when the facts show the wealthy will be the ones who are excluded from the effects of the cap," Gaylord said.

The real reason AuCoin joined Speaker Tip O'Neill in supporting the tax cap was to finance the big spending Democratic budget, which AuCoin also supported," Gaylord said. "By pretending to penalize the rich, AuCoin is managing to dip into the pockets of middle income Americans to pay for more federal spending."

Gaylord also charged that Democratic leaders are out of touch with reality by placing families earning \$35,000 into the category of wealthy Americans. "When a family is struggling to make ends meet, I don't think it's fair to label them as 'wealthy'," Gaylord said.

"Because the tax cut hasn't gone into effect yet, AuCoin is gambling that voters won't know their tax cut has been reduced," Gaylord said. "We don't intend to let that happen."

320 First Street, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003

PAID FOR BY THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE



news

FROM

THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

GUY VANDER JAGT, CHAIRMAN

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Friday, August 26, 1983

Contact: Nancy Bocskor
202-479-7070

CONGRESSMAN LES AUCOIN NAMED AS "RECOVERY KILLER"

Washington -- The National Republican Congressional Committee today named U.S. Rep. Les AuCoin (D-OR) as one of the "recovery killers" in Congress.

"AuCoin has fought economic recovery every step of the way in 1983," said Rich Galen, Director of Public Affairs for the NRCC. "He has consistently voted for higher taxes and more government spending, which could have robbed the economy of the fuel necessary for continued growth and job creation."

Indicators of economic performance have improved dramatically over the past year. The GNP increased 9.2% during the second quarter of 1983. Inflation now stands at 3.2%. Interest rates are 11%. Housing starts have increased 47%. Monthly mortgage payments have dropped \$102. New car sales are up almost 40%. Industrial production increased 7.1%. Retail sales are 10.3% higher.

In 1983, AuCoin voted for the Democratic budget calling for the elimination of the third year tax cut and indexing--a measure that would have increased the income tax for a family of four by over \$3,500 over the next five years. (Congressional Quarterly vote #42)

AuCoin supported the budget conference report that included a 4% pay raise for federal civilian employees, as well as tax increases of over \$73 billion over the next 3 years. (CQ #204)

AuCoin voted against a measure to reduce government spending by \$12 billion, which, if passed, would have eliminated the need for higher taxes. (CQ #206)

AuCoin supported the income tax cut cap, which would have hit middle-income families and small businesses the hardest. (CQ #207)

"Obviously, AuCoin would rather have us return to the failed policies of the past -- policies that caused interest rates so high that families couldn't buy homes. Policies that produced inflation rates so painful that the elderly couldn't survive on fixed incomes. Policies that required taxes so exorbitant that working Americans could not save for their future and their children's future," charged Galen.

"We need Congressmen who deeply care about the direction our country is going, not those who just practice 'politics as usual' and follow the liberal Democratic leadership," said Galen. "The NRCC urges AuCoin's constituents to demand an explanation of his irresponsible behavior here in Washington," concluded Galen.

320 First Street, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003

PAID FOR BY THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

BILL MOSHOFSKY
P.O. BOX 8827
PORTLAND, OREGON 97207

RECEIVED

OCT 17 1983

October 1983

Dear Friend:

In 1982, I thought Les AuCoin should be defeated and replaced in the Congress. In 1984, I'm sure he can be and I know he must be.

Thanks to the loyal support from you and thousands of Oregonians in the First Congressional District, we almost retired Mr. AuCoin last year. I need your confidence and help to finish the job we started in 1982.

We had a lot of help last year. . . and the fact we gave AuCoin the toughest race of his career couldn't have happened without you.

Even though the 1982 elections were not very kind to Republicans overall, we knocked over 12 percent off AuCoin's 1980 victory margin.

1984 will be better -- it has to be!

President Reagan will be on the ballot. He carried our district by 10 percentage points against Jimmy Carter. The President on the ticket will help me, I have no doubt.

The President's economic policies are really starting to cause a turn-around in the Northwest. That was not the case last year. . . and it will make a difference.

We need to gain only about 4 percent more of the vote than we had in 1982, and I am convinced we can do that. I just would not subject my family and supporters like you to another campaign if I didn't believe that.

We learned a lot last year and I'm sure we can avoid some first time candidate mistakes because of it.

The National Republican Congressional Committee (NRCC) believes that too. So much so, NRCC has made us the number two priority out of all challenger races for 1984. I've already been in Washington, D. C. for top level briefings and training to get ready for next year.

But the heaviest responsibility falls on us here in Oregon. And that's why I'm writing to you now.

We simply can't wait until next year to start raising money. And much as I don't want to ask now, I must. I do need your help now. And that of over 3,000 people who gave in 1982.

The early \$100, \$50, or \$25 you send today will get us started now.

I haven't formally announced my candidacy, as you know, but we can't wait for that to conduct research, broaden our grassroots organization, and publicize the incumbent's voting record.

The campaign committee -- Moshofsky for Congress -- is filed and your contributions will qualify this year for tax credits.

But the real issue is to get moving and expose AuCoin's Oregon rhetoric compared to his Washington D. C. votes.

You and I know what he does -- he talks of holding down the deficit and votes for more and more spending; he votes against a strong defense and claims fiscal responsibility.

And AuCoin knows that. He's been sending out anti-Moshofsky news letters since March! He plans to raise \$100,000 from big labor and the big spenders by the end of 1983.

AuCoin is telling his supporters he faces the toughest challenge of his career in 1984. I don't plan to disappoint him. I know you won't either.

While AuCoin has been in Washington, D. C. this year trying to re-start inflation with his big spending votes, I worked here in Oregon to keep the lid on state government spending to hold down taxes.

Some said I was a voice in the wilderness. But we put a lot of pressure on state legislators and they cut about \$150 million dollars from state budget proposals.

If I can help hold the line here in Oregon, I know my voice and vote in Congress can help hold the line on federal spending.

That's why I need your help today!

Please make out your check for as much as you can afford to Moshofsky for Congress and get it in the mail.

I can promise you a strong race in 1984. We know what has to be done and we're laying a solid ground work now. Your contribution of \$100, or as much as you can send, will mean much to me and to the campaign effort.

Thank you. !!

Sincerely, ,



Bill Moshofsky

P.S. If you have any thoughts about the campaign, or any corrections for our mailing list, be sure to include them in the envelope. Please don't delay your contribution. The opposition is moving and we can't afford to give away valuable time to them.

PEACE

Congressman Les AuCoin believes that as a nation, our role in the world is to defend the people and territory of the U.S., deter nuclear war, and reduce the international tensions that can lead to war.

That means having a defense that's second to none, but which does not strive for an illusory "superiority." Les believes in a lean, cost-effective military based on conventional forces, adequate pay, and a foreign policy that puts arms reductions at the head of the list.

Les is fighting five major battles in the 98th Congress to advance the prospects for peace and help reduce the \$200 billion deficit by trimming the Pentagon's \$1.6 trillion weapons build-up.

First, a nuclear freeze. Les co-authored an Oregon ballot measure for the nuclear weapons freeze in 1982 and led the state campaign that passed it, 60 to 40 percent. Then he was one of the key leaders of the successful drive for a nuclear weapons freeze resolution in the House of Representatives.

Second, nerve gas. In the 97th Congress, and again in the 98th, Les fought to block appropriations to resume production of nerve gas weapons.

Third, the MX missile. Les helped organize and focus opposition in the House to the multibillion-dollar MX missile, a weapon that he has warned will increase the risk of nuclear war, instead of reduce it.

Fourth, El Salvador. Having traveled the region and talked to all sides, Les rejects the Administration's arms requests for the military regime in El Salvador, and is working with colleagues in the House to (1) strengthen the certification process, and (2) base any form of aid on unconditional negotiations among all parties in the civil war.

Fifth, Nicaragua. Les is a leading House opponent of the "secret" war in Nicaragua, which violates international and U.S. law and supports remnants of the Somoza regime and threatens to ignite a regional war, starting with Nicaragua and Honduras.

Les' record consistently underscores his belief that our vital interests can be protected by spending our defense dollars more sensibly. While fighting to delete funds for the MX and B-1 bomber, he has supported a pay increase for military personnel and increased funding to upgrade conventional weapons systems which the Reagan Administration is leaving so weak that even Gen. Bernard Rogers, NATO commander, said may not be capable of surviving a conventional assault in Europe.

Les also . . .

. . . Backed creation of a National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution.

. . . Co-sponsored legislation to create a World Peace Tax Fund.

. . . Supports a foreign policy that respects legitimate aspirations for self-determination, social justice and economic progress.

Final House Action Elusive on Nuclear Freeze

The nuclear freeze debate dragged on through its fifth day on the House floor April 28 with supporters and opponents of the measure (H J Res 13) testily accusing each other of delaying tactics.

At day's end, House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Clement J. Zablocki, D-Wis., announced he would seek May 2 a new rule governing floor debate on the resolution that would set a limit on further debate over amendments to the bill.

Freeze critics bristled at the suggestion that they sought merely to delay House approval of the freeze.

"You've already accepted 12 [of the critics'] amendments," William S. Broomfield, R-Mich., the senior Foreign Affairs Committee Republican, told Zablocki. "That shows how imperfect the resolution was that was reported from our committee."

But Zablocki cited the more than 30 hours the House already had spent debating the resolution in four earlier sessions, the first on March 16. "Never in my 35 years [in the House] have I seen so much time wasted," he said.

The House leadership set renewal of the freeze debate for May 4.

Amendments

As they consistently have been able to do, supporters of the resolution prevailed April 28 in what has become

—By Pat Towell

a repetitive procedural minuet. (Vote 66, p. 860)

Whatever its final form, the freeze resolution is deemed certain to pass the House by a large margin.

But backers of the freeze clearly fear that a carefully worded amendment could undermine either of the resolution's two symbolic cornerstones:

- The call for negotiation of a "freeze" on nuclear weapons development and production before "reductions" in the number of such weapons;
- Prohibition within any negotiated freeze of nuclear arms "modernization," in the sense of replacing existing weapons with more lethal ones.

So on April 28, in the same way that the freeze critics tried to avoid a straight up-or-down vote on the proposal to "freeze," the freeze backers continued to evade a vote on any amendment in the form proposed by the freeze critics.

'Sequence' Amendment. By a 215-194 margin, freeze backers eviscerated with an amendment of their own an amendment to the resolution by Mark D. Siljander, R-Mich., that would have deprived the "freeze" of its primacy over "reductions" as an arms control goal.

Siljander's amendment would have set a freeze and reductions as co-equal goals of U.S. arms control negotiators. "All we're trying to make clear is that we're not talking about a freeze

with no hope of reductions," he said.

But Jim Leach, R-Iowa, insisted that the sequence of freeze first, followed by reductions, was essential if the resolution were to keep its basic character as a vote of no-confidence in administration arms control policy.

"Use of the term 'reductions' would make room for the administration's complete multibillion-dollar weapons program," warned Les AuCoin, D-Ore.

Modernization Issue. Faced with an amendment by James G. Martin, R-N.C., that could have been construed as an indirect allowance of "modernization" under a freeze, backers of H J Res 13 took another tack.

The amendment provided that a freeze be negotiated with due regard for preserving the essential equivalence of the U.S. and Soviet nuclear forces "at present and in the future." Martin said this was intended to take account of the fact that most U.S. nuclear weapons are older than the Soviets' and would require replacement within the scope of any freeze.

But AuCoin minimized the amendment's significance, arguing that even if U.S. weapons were older, their "technology is so infinitely superior that they are in no way inferior." Then freeze backers deprived Martin's amendment of symbolic value as an "anti-freeze" vote by voting for it un-animously themselves. The amendment was approved 397-0.



"Use of the term 'reductions' would make room for the administration's complete multibillion-dollar weapons program."

—Rep. Les AuCoin,
D-Ore.

"All we're trying to make clear is that we're not talking about a freeze with no hope of reductions."

—Rep. Mark D.
Siljander, R-Mich.



WNET/Thirteen: 356 West 58th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019
Transcripts: MacNeil-Lehrer Report, Box 345, New York, N.Y. 10101
press contact: Roz Boyle (212) 560-3016

THE MACNEIL-LEHRER REPORT

MX and START Talks

LEHRER: A Democratic congressman who did not switch his vote on the MX and still opposes it and the position taken by Aspin and company is Les AuCoin of Oregon. Congressman AuCoin, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, has been one of the leading critics of the MX. So far, so good for you, Congressman?

Rep. LES AuCOIN: Well, I can hardly say that. One of the supporters— one of the Democrats who supported the administration and voted for the MX today after the President's speech said he was very pleased with the lowering of the decibel level in the remarks of the President towards the Soviet Union, and he appreciated the tone of the President's remarks. Well, that's been exactly my point from the beginning. What the President got was an MX missile in this great bargain that was struck. What the Congress apparently has got is a change in tone, a difference in the rhetoric. I don't really call that a bargain worthy of going forward with a missile that I think could just as easily be matched by the Soviet Union with a buildup of similar kinds of missiles like the MX on their part as opposed to an inducement to the bargaining table.

LEHRER: I take it then that you don't see what the President said today, and as explained now by Secretary Dean, as anything particularly new or flexible?

Rep. AuCOIN: Well, we're going to have to wait to see the details. So far we have a softer tone, but no arms control. That's better what we had before. We had a harsher tone and no arms control. But I think what the American people want to see is forget the tone, give us an arms control agreement that's worthy of its name. And so far the record has not been good. Flexibility was stressed today, and the President had to do that because he risked support within the Congress that he recently won for the MX. The problem with flexibility is, how do you verify flexibility?

LEHRER: Do you still reject Congressman Aspin's argument that the MX could be a good bargaining chip with the Soviets or a lever toward arms control?

Rep. AuCOIN: Well, the problem with bargaining chips is, first, that the administration indicated that this is not a bargaining chip, that it does intend to build the MX regardless of a treaty on START. That has been what my impression has been. Secondly, the history of the arms race is that both arsenals are filled with bargaining chips from each side. The MIRV missile at one point was a bargaining chip by the United States. Now it's in our arsenal. I just think the point has come at which we ought to say we don't need a weapon with the kind of first-strike capability that the MX represents in order to threaten the Soviet Union. They've been negotiating since 1969 with us, not because they only fear their silos, but because they fear the capability of our arsenal to threaten some 690 million Russian citizens.

LEHRER: Congressman, do you think that regardless of what your feeling is on it that the President is going to get his MX as a result of what he did today?

Rep. AuCOIN: My sense of it is, and it is too close to call. My sense of it is that it could go either way. And the President was walking on eggshells today, I believe, and for very good reason. There are a lot of members who are watching very, very carefully. They're sincere members who want to give him a chance. I want to give him a chance, too, but I don't believe that he needs an MX in order to get the bargaining position or the treaty that he asks for. My sense of it is that it could come down to a very few votes either way. Some people stayed with him last time because it was not a question of procurement of this missile. It was largely a question of advanced R&D of the basing mode and flight tests and those kinds of things.

MX Opponents Call Basing Plan Too Costly and Short of Objective

By STEVEN V. ROBERTS

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, April 12 — The recommendation by a Presidential commission to base 100 MX missiles in existing silos was criticized today by a wide range of arms control advocates and Congressional opponents of the weapon.

The heart of the critics' argument is that the missiles will not be invulnerable to Soviet attack and thus are not worth the billions of dollars they would cost to build and deploy. In fact, the critics maintained that the weapons would increase the danger of war by inviting Soviet attack, while draining funds from other military needs at a time of tight budgets and high deficits.

The commission's report said deployment of the MX was an interim step until a less vulnerable weapon could be developed. Supporters also say the weapon could persuade the Soviet Union to make concessions in arms limitations talks.

"This is the time to kill the MX," asserted Representative Les AuCoin, an Oregon Democrat who is on the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. "Kill it clean, kill it now."

Opponents Face Difficulty

But Mr. AuCoin noted that the debate over the MX was shifting to favorable ground for opponents. For the last two years, the issue has been whether to deploy the missile in one of several new basing modes. And since each of the proposed basing systems contained obvious flaws, lawmakers were willing to vote to delay production of the weapon.

Now, however, with the recommendation of using existing silos, lawmakers say the question becomes whether to kill the missile outright or decide to move ahead. Critics acknowledge that this gives supporters a tactical advantage.

"It's very easy to vote no on an absurd basing mode," said Senator Paul E. Tsongas, Democrat of Massachusetts. "It's more difficult to vote no on a whole system."

Critics of the MX, which stands for missile experimental, also concede that the commission report scored a tactical victory for supporters in advancing the MX as an interim weapon only.

Key Role of Midgetman

Representative Joseph P. Addabbo, Democrat of Queens, a leading opponent of the MX, acknowledged that several Congressional critics had been induced to switch sides because they liked the concept of a smaller, mobile missile, nicknamed Midgetman.

The MX issue will probably reach Capitol Hill in several forms. Under legislation passed last December, the Administration cannot spend \$560 million for engineering development of the basing system until Congress specifi-

cally approves a basing plan.

The White House has held off endorsing the commission report until after Congress deals with two other issues, a nuclear freeze resolution and President Reagan's nomination of Kenneth L. Adelman to head the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

In a separate action, the Administration is expected to ask Congress to appropriate money for the actual purchase of new missiles. Those funds were dropped by Congress last year until the basing question is resolved.

Opponents of the MX say budget constraints will provide them with one of their most useful arguments against financing the missile. Representative AuCoin described the MX fight as "the first test of whether Congress will respond to clear public feeling that they want less defense spending."

The main argument of opponents outside of Congress to the MX is that the missiles are not needed because the United States already has enough weapons to deter a Soviet attack or retaliate in the event of one. Moreover, they maintained, the original reason for developing the MX, to have a missile that could withstand Soviet attack, is no longer valid.

Paul C. Warnke, chief American arms negotiator under President Carter, said of the MX, "There is literally no justification for it."

Herbert Scoville Jr., a former Deputy Director for Research at the Central Intelligence Agency, told a news conference that the missiles were "the most dangerous weapons designed to date" and "they make nuclear holocaust much more likely."

ENVIRONMENT

Since his days in the Oregon Legislature, when he helped write and pass Oregon's landmark "Bottle Bill," the first such anti-litter, recycling law in the nation, Congressman Les AuCoin has been an outspoken and effective defender of the environment. He and Chairman Sid Yates are recognized as the strongest environmental advocates on the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee — the panel that controls how the Secretary of Interior uses his budget.

Offshore drilling: In the 97th Congress and again in the 98th, Les blocked Secretary James Watt from opening up the outer continental shelf off the coast of central and northern California for oil and gas drilling, because of the huge environmental risks. With Les' support, the ban on drilling was extended recently to Georges Bank off the coast of Massachusetts — one of world's most productive fishery areas.

Wilderness: Les is a principal sponsor of the Oregon Wilderness Act of 1983, which the House of Representatives approved March 21 by a vote of 252 to 93. This significant legislation affects the most heavily forested region in the country. Out of three million acres of roadless federal lands in Oregon, the bill preserves one million acres of critical wildlife habitat, salmon spawning grounds, and old-growth forests as wilderness, while opening two million acres for multiple-use management by the Forest Service. Les also engineered an amendment to the Interior Appropriations bill for 1984 prohibiting mining and drilling in wilderness and wilderness study areas.

James Watt: Les and 28 other House members were the first to ask President Reagan on July 31, 1981, to remove Secretary Watt. On Oct 27, 1981, Les officially conveyed to the House the petition signed by 1.1 million Americans asking Congress to dismiss Watt.

Land and Water Conservation Fund: From his seat on the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, Les has been instrumental in overturning the Administration's plans to halt all federal land acquisitions for parks, wildlife sanctuaries and recreation areas. With his leadership and support, such acquisitions as the Appalachian Trail, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, the Great Dismal Swamp, and others across the country have been made.

Clean Air: Les sponsored legislation expressing the commitment of the House to uphold the standards of the Clean Air Act, at a time when the Administration was pressing for a major gutting of the law, including a rollback of auto emission standards to 1977 levels and a relaxation of federal enforcement activities.

Coastal Zone Management: Throughout his tenure in Congress, Les has supported strong coastal zone management. He opposed Commerce Department efforts to weaken the voice of states in determining what activities should be allowed in coastal waters.

The Sacramento Bee

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA, Friday, June 12, 1981

Panel Rebuffs Watt, OKs Ban On Oil Drilling

□ Despite pleas from budget slashers, \$7 million was approved to purchase private holdings at Lake Tahoe. Page A12.

By Leo Rennert
Bee Washington Bureau Chief

WASHINGTON — In a sharp rebuff to Interior Secretary James Watt, a key congressional panel approved a ban Thursday against oil drilling off the Central and Northern California coast. The House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee voted 5-3 to add the ban as a rider to an \$11 billion budget bill for the Interior Department and related agencies for the fiscal year starting Oct. 1.

The anti-drilling amendment, sponsored by Rep. Les AuCoin, D-Ore., specifically prohibits Watt from spending federal money for leasing, exploration or development of four offshore tracts between Morro Bay in San Luis Obispo County and the Oregon border.

The tracts, totaling 700,000 acres, include the Santa Cruz basin off San Mateo and Santa Cruz counties, the Bodega basin off Marin and Sonoma counties, the Point Arena basin off Mendocino County and the Eel River basin off Eureka.

Watt is leaning in the direction of opening these offshore areas to commercial production. He expects to make a final decision in a few weeks.

Technically, the secretary could proceed to award drilling leases under the AuCoin amendment by acting before Oct. 1. But that might be a futile gesture because the amendment would block issuance of follow-up exploration permits and other necessary supportive actions required by long-term drilling operations.

Watt had no immediate comment on the subcommittee's action. A spokesman declined to speculate on

whether the secretary still might go ahead with a lease sale before Oct. 1 if Congress adopts the AuCoin amendment.

Privately, Interior officials told The Bee the department would be severely hampered to get oil production going under the provisions of the amendment.

The subcommittee's action represents the first congressional backlash against Watt's controversial moves to expand oil production off the California coast.

Gov. Brown and members of the California congressional delegation staged a strong lobbying drive in recent days in support of the drilling ban.

Anti-drilling forces cautioned, however, that they scored only a preliminary victory. Getting the AuCoin amendment through the House and the Senate will not be an easy task, they said.

"We took the administration by surprise," said Rep. Leon Panetta, D-Monterey County. "But now that they've been alerted, it's going to be tough getting the ban through the full appropriations committee, the House, and the Republican-controlled Senate."

The vote essentially was along partisan lines. AuCoin had the support of Subcommittee Chairman Sidney Yates, D-Ill., and Reps. Clarence Long, D-Md., Norman Dicks, D-Wash. and John Murtha, D-Pa.

Voting against the amendments were Reps. Joseph McDade, R-Pa.; Ralph Regula, R-Ohio, and Tom Loeffler, R-Tex.

There was a break in Republican ranks, however, when Rep. Silvio Conte of Massachusetts, the ranking GOP member on the full Appropriations Committee, abstained from voting — apparently because he didn't want to take sides openly against the administration and

members of his own party.

Conte later said he supported AuCoin's efforts.

AuCoin said Oregon fishing interests would be adversely affected by possible spills from oil drilling off the California coast.

"I believe in a sensible approach to conservation and development of natural resources," he said.

AuCoin said he didn't extend his drilling ban to the Santa Maria basin off the California coast for which the Interior Department recently received drilling bids from oil firms. The congressman said he didn't want to tackle Santa Maria because some tracts in that area are tied up in litigation. Potential oil and gas reserves in Santa Maria, he said, are also much greater than those in the other four basins covered by his amendment.

The Oregon lawmaker said he can't believe Watt would be "arrogant enough" to rush into a leasing program to beat the Oct. 1 deadline.

He also said Watt's expanded drilling program has run into strong opposition from cities, counties and community groups along the coast, most members of the California congressional delegation and California Republican Chairman Tirso del Junco.

In a related development, Rep. James Weaver, D-Ore., offered — but then withdrew — an amendment on the House floor for a study of the feasibility of including the four offshore tracts north of Santa Maria in the naval petroleum reserve system. Panetta said anti-drilling forces persuaded Weaver that such an approach simply would transfer authority over drilling and production decisions to another set of federal officials — without any additional safeguards that some of California's most scenic coastal stretches would be adequately protected.

EDUCATION

Oregon Congressman Les AuCoin obtained his college education at Pacific University in Forest Grove, Ore., under the GI Bill and the college work-study program. A product of the public schools "and proud of it," he personally understands the good that education programs have done.

During nine years in Congress, Les has voted consistently to maintain and strengthen the federal commitment to educational opportunity.

Les believes good schools are as important to the nation's long-term security as its military strength, that economic stability is jeopardized without federal support for education, and that education is at least as deserving of a place at the cabinet table as commerce, energy, transportation, labor and justice.

Les rejects flatly the proposition that the government has no obligation to help those who, due to happenstance of birth, could not otherwise afford to obtain an education.

Les sponsored legislation creating the cabinet-level Department of Education in the 96th Congress. In the 97th Congress, he was a leading sponsor of legislation to restore the GI Education Bill of Rights. In the 98th Congress, Les is the author of a resolution reaffirming the principle of equal educational opportunity and a federal responsibility to provide for the educational needs of children and youth.

Les voted YES . . .

. . . To create the Department of Education.

. . . To establish an Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages in the Department of Education.

. . . To create Career Education Programs in elementary and secondary schools and to authorize Career Education grants to states.

. . . To appropriate funds for labor, health and education programs exceeding the Administration's budget request by \$87 million, while voting to make offsetting cuts elsewhere.

Les voted NO . . .

. . . To Tuition Tax Credits.

. . . To cut and consolidate elementary and secondary education programs in block grants to states.

. . . To cut Title I compensatory education for the disadvantaged by 33 percent.

. . . To budget resolutions and reconciliation bills mandating absolute cuts in elementary, secondary and higher education programs.

WOMEN

For 12 years — in Congress and in the Oregon Legislature — Les AuCoin has been a forceful, effective voice for equal rights for women.

As a state representative, he was floor manager of the Oregon Legislature's ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment in 1973. As a congressman, he fought to extend the ratification deadline when the right wing stymied the natural ratification process. He lobbied state legislators holding up ratification to change their position. Now, with the deadline for ratification having expired, Les is an original sponsor of the reintroduction of the Equal Rights Amendment in the House of Representatives.

A member of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, Les cosponsored the Economic Equity Act to end discrimination against women in pensions, taxes, regulation, military retirement, and insurance.

And, he is recognized as one of the leading House opponents of the New Right's efforts to make a woman's right to a safe and legal abortion illegal.

Les voted YES . . .

. . . To increase the childcare tax limit.

. . . To make it easier for non-working spouses to establish IRAs.

. . . To repeal the widow estate tax.

. . . To prohibit employment discrimination based on pregnancy.

. . . To create Women's History Week.

. . . To legislation targeted at aiding displaced homemakers.

. . . To appropriate funds for critical programs such as day care, job training, family planning, maternal and child care, and education, offset and cuts elsewhere.

Les voted NO . . .

. . . To eliminate the Social Security minimum benefit; 90% of the recipients are women who spent years working for low wages.

. . . To eliminate funds for the Women's Educational Equity Act.

. . . To gut the Legal Services Corporation; 67% of those who require this legal aid are women.

. . . To budget resolutions and reconciliation bills mandating cuts in day care and job-training programs which help women obtain and keep jobs in the workforce.

HOUSING

Les AuCoin has rapidly become "Mr. Housing" in Congress. The issue means shelter, as well as jobs in the construction, timber and wood products industries. It means economic opportunity for millions of Americans — an opportunity to increase personal wealth and get ahead in the world. It means family, neighborhood and basic values.

Since coming to Congress in 1974, Les has played an active role in shaping national housing policy. And he's gotten results — results for homebuilders and homebuyers, for the poor and the elderly, for the handicapped and those in our rural communities.

With an Administration hostile to housing, Les took the lead and organized a bipartisan Congressional Housing Caucus to protect our nation's long-standing commitment to a national housing policy.

Les . . .

. . . Authored The Family Housing Production Act of 1982 — a bill vetoed by President Reagan and narrowly sustained after a furious fight — which would have injected new life into the depressed housing industry and made the dream of home ownership come true for millions of Americans.

. . . Wrote the law that allows "single-room occupancy" hotels and boarding houses to qualify for federal rehabilitation funds, making housing available to thousands of elderly and low-income tenants.

. . . Fought for fair housing practices for the handicapped.

. . . Pushed through a bill to extend home ownership and community development programs to rural residents.

. . . Helped author the Community Development Block Grant program.

. . . Enacted legislation eliminating burdensome government regulations that drive up the cost of new homes.

. . . Is sponsoring the Homeownership Incentive Act of 1983 to help first-time home buyers save for a downpayment on a house through contributions to tax-exempt Individual Housing Accounts.

. . . Sponsored mortgage revenue bond legislation to make 500,000 additional homes available to American families and help restore some of the 2 million housing-related jobs lost since 1980.

. . . Opposes any efforts to phase out FHA and GNMA government mortgage programs which have been instrumental in securing loans for millions of first-time homebuyers.