

RE: SECOND BACON SIPHON, FOLEY V. TONASKET, CAMPAIGN '80

SOURCE: SPOKESMAN-REVIEW  
date 7/18/80

FILE:

clipping

(PAGE 1 OF 2 PAGES)

# Foley's Bacon stand attacked

By ROBERT L. ROSE  
Spokesman-Review Political Editor

Republican congressional candidate Ael Tonasket attacked incumbent Democratic Rep. Thomas S. Foley Friday for supporting a \$2 billion Washington state irrigation project which he said would force farmers off their land.

Tonasket said the Second Bacon Tunnel and Siphon Irrigation project, which would double the present irrigation system from the Grand Coulee Dam to the Tri-Cities, was "not economically feasible," according to a Washington State University study.

Nonetheless, Tonasket told the governmental affairs committee of the Spokane Area Chamber of Commerce, the government "shoved the project down our throat, and you and I are going to have to pay for it for a long time to come."

The Colville Indian leader said the first time Foley was challenged on the project "he didn't even have the information on it... but he said, 'I'm sure it's not \$2 billion.' But that's what it's proven out to be."

That \$2 billion figure represents the total cost for the project to expand the irrigation system. Construction of the

tunnel and siphon alone costs \$43 million.

Tonasket said the way the project works, all the farmers along the irrigation canal are included whether they want to be or not — and it can run some of them out of business.

"Dryland farmers are going to be forced to become irrigation farmers. They will have to buy expensive new equipment. Operating costs (per farm) will go up \$32,000 a year," he said. "I make half that much, so it's hard for me to imagine increasing costs \$32,000 a year."

"These farmers tell me that amounts to the government condemning their land. Strong words. But eventually they're going to be losing more and more money, and then they'll have to sell out."

Tonasket said he couldn't understand why Foley, "one of the most influential, one of the most powerful — ask him, he'll tell you" — men in the House, supported "such a thing that is going to condemn people's land."

The Second Bacon issue came up in the 1978 campaign, when Tonasket ran against Foley as an independent. At that time, a Foley spokesman said farmers had been on record as supporting the

RE: SECOND BACON SIPHON/FOLEY V. TONASKET/CAMPAIGN '80

SOURCE: SPOKESMAN-REVIEW ~~(P. 2)~~  
date 7/18/80

(PAGE 2 OF 2 PAGES)

# Foley's Bacon stand attacked

project; but he added that if farmers didn't want the irrigation project, Foley would withdraw his support.

Tonasket, who said Thursday he was "not throwing mud — and I'm not attacking his personality, it's his professional business that I'm attacking" — continued his attack by saying he didn't like the way Foley conducted his office.

"It gripes me — and this is a quote, maybe it's not exactly word for word — but when Tom Foley says 'I don't vote the 5th District, the 5th District might be wrong,' that's a slap in the face for those of us who live in the 5th District," he said.

"That's like saying I'm dumber than Tom Foley. Well, I might be, intellectually. But I know what I need in my house so I can feed my family, so that I can go to work every day and be a donating part of society.

"The elderly who live down the river know what they need so they can put food on their table, so they can have good health and a reason to wake up tomorrow. Tom Foley has not that feeling. He doesn't experience the day-to-day kinds of anguishes that people go through, worrying whether they're going to survive tomorrow."

RE: HEATHER FOLEY/CONSTITUENT SERVICE/FOLEY PERSONAL POLITICAL POWER  
(SEE: LETTER/PHONE CALL BY FOLEY/KOREAGATE)

SOURCE: THE SEATTLE TIMES, A-11

date 6/20/80

(PAGE 1 OF 2 PAGES)

FILE: \_\_\_\_\_

"DID PRESSURE FROM LAWMAKER'S WIFE RESULT IN LOAN APPROVAL?" *Clipping*

by Dean Katz

Times Washington bureau

WASHINGTON — When a congressman gets a call from the

home district to help resolve a constituent problem, what starts out as an attempt to help cut through government red tape

sometimes can turn into pressure politics.

A case involving Heather Foley, the wife of Representative Tom Foley, Spokane Democrat, straddles the fine line between inquiry and interference.

Mrs. Foley made repeated telephone calls to federal officials on behalf of a group of constituents trying to get a \$1.4 million loan

guarantee from the Farmers Home Administration. The money was to be used to establish a ski resort called Bluewood in the Blue Mountains in Southeastern Washington.

The group called Foley's office for help after state F.H.A. officials expressed concern whether the project could make it financially.

Mrs. Foley, who doubles as the congressman's administrative assistant, said: "I don't think we did anything you don't normally do as a congressional office."

She said the partnership seeking the loan guarantee thought the director of the state F.H.A. office then, Mike Horan, "was prejudiced against them. All I did was get them a hearing."

But Horan is chairman of the House Agriculture Committee and wields significant power over the budget and programs of the federal Agriculture Department, which counts among its agencies the F.H.A.

Horan, now an orchardist in Wenatchee, said the loan guarantee was rejected three times by his office but, each time, was "resurrected" by officials in Washington, D.C., after they received phone calls from Foley's office.

"It was the most politically influenced loan during the 9½ years I was state director," Horan said. "There was a lot of political pressure out of Congressman Foley's office."

Horan said the state F.H.A. office's "analysis was that there wouldn't be enough business generated to make it profitable. Even today, I don't think it was a good loan."

Horan said there is "no doubt" that the national office bent under the pressure of the repeated inquiries.

"The national office didn't like

6 20 80

(PAGE 2 OF 2 PAGES)

"DID PRESSURE FROM LAWMAKER'S WIFE RESULT  
IN LOAN APPROVAL?"

the loan, either," he said. "Nobody did, except the 400 people who invested."

Horan was appointed under the Republican administration of Richard Nixon, and his father, Walter Horan, was the incumbent Republican congressman whom Foley defeated in 1964 when he first was elected to the House.

But Horan dismissed any suggestion that politics was at play in his comments, noting that he stayed on for nearly two years after President Carter took office.

Foley responded: "If he thought my office was exercising improper pressure on the loan, I think he had an obligation to report it to me. Why didn't he bring it up then?"

As for Horan's suggestion of excessive political pressure, Foley said: "That's a value judgment. I remember that the matter had come back here a couple of times for a review. I was aware that the loan had gone to Washington for review, but that's not unusual."

Keith Sattler, a Democratic Party chairman in Walla Walla County who was appointed as Horan's replacement in late 1978, said that on December, 6, 1976, the state office sent a letter to Washington, D.C., which said, in part:

"We still have many reservations concerning the project but feel that using an outside consultant to advise us on how to proceed should be followed, and his recommendation is that the loan guarantee should be approved."

On December 20, the national office wrote back, authorizing processing of the loan guarantee, Sattler said.

After the application had been rejected by the state office three times and sent back by Washington, D.C., for yet another review, Horan said his office set preconditions for the loan guarantee that "we thought no bank would agree with, but they did, so we approved it on the fourth try."

Sattler, who was appointed to the state F.H.A. post with Foley's blessing, during an interview read only a selected part of one letter in the Bluewood file.

A review of the 4-inch-thick file in federal F.H.A. headquarters shows that Horan and other F.H.A. officials at the national office expressed repeated concern about and opposition to the project.

Heather Foley said that when the Bluewood group contacted her she called F.H.A. and "asked them to give the application a fair review. I called various people at the F.H.A., at the most 10 times. It may have been five times. But never, ever did we ask for them to make a decision they didn't consider in their best judgment."

Mrs. Foley said that putting pressure on federal agencies "has never been Tom's style" and "I wouldn't be in the office if I did something like that."

Foley said he hopes his position as chairman of the Agriculture Committee "carries a little extra special weight, or I'd be disappointed."

"As chairman, I have vigorously pursued requests with this and previous administrations and been turned down. I have made some strong representations with some departments — right to the point of introducing special bills, and I don't make any apologies for that — but never anything that could be construed as excessive pressure."

"On loans, we have always been extremely careful to not ask an agency to make any loan they do not feel is an appropriate loan."

"I still don't understand, frankly, what the fuss is all about . . . As far as we were concerned, we were trying to help the economy of a depressed area. I have no connection with any of the people who were supporting this."

Sattler said the business- and industrial-loan guarantee program is used only if a bank already has agreed to make a loan to the business involved.

Although the key government approval was granted in 1976, Bluewood has not yet met all the conditions necessary to obtain the loan guarantee, Sattler said. Final approval is expected from state F.H.A. officials before the end of the month.

SOURCE: SPOKESMAN-REVIEW

date 9/1/77

"DID FOLEY PLACE FOR PARK?"

III. Foley  
Clipping

By ROBERT ALLEN  
Spokesman-Review staff writer

A new allegation against Rep. Thomas S. Foley, D-Wash., is contained in the secret indictment of South Korean businessman Tongsun Park which was made public in Washington, D.C., Tuesday.

The indictment asserts that Park had Foley, sometime in 1971 or 1972, place a telephone call to "an (unnamed) official of the executive branch of the United States government" for an unspecified purpose.

A Foley spokesman denied the allegation.

Park was indicted Aug. 26 by a federal grand jury, but details of the indictment were not made public until Tuesday.

It charges Park with conspiracy, bribery, mail fraud, racketeering activities, failure to register as a foreign agent and making political contributions which are prohibited for foreign agents.

Park is a native South Korean who was educated in the United States. Headquartered in Washington, D.C., he acted as an agent for American companies selling rice to Korea.

Recently, however, he has been the

subject of an investigation which alleges he acted as an agent of the South Korean government, giving parties for and making campaign contributions to high American government officials. In exchange, he is said to have been hoping to gain favorable treatment for the South Korean government.

Thirty-six federal corruption charges against Park are contained in the indictment. In it, Foley was named among congressman who allegedly cooperated with various aspects of the Park scheme.

The congressman, who is a Spokane native, has previously acknowledged receiving a \$500 campaign contribution from Park in 1970. However, at that time it was not illegal to accept contributions from residents of foreign countries. He therefore saw nothing unusual about receiving the gift, he said.

In an earlier interview, Foley said he had not suspected that Park might have been working as an agent for the South Korean regime of President Park Chung-hee.

Foley also has said earlier that Park had asked him to draft two letters, one praising Park and the other praising changes in the Korean government.

Foley said he denied those requests.

Tuesday's unsealing of the Park indictment contained the first mention of the telephone call allegedly made by Foley to an executive branch official.

William S. First, Foley's administrative assistant in Washington, said, "We have no recollection of any such phone call."

Foley could not be reached for comment. He was vacationing in Bermuda Tuesday, First said.

The staff in Foley's office Tuesday was searching their records to see if they could uncover any evidence that Park had requested such a call, said First. But so far, nothing had turned up.

"We did not cooperate," reiterated First.

The letter requests, the campaign contribution and the alleged telephone call were all mentioned in the indictment against Park.

The indictment also lists former Rep. Richard T. Hanna of California as an unindicted co-conspirator.

Park, Hanna and two former directors of the Korean Central Intelligence Agency conspired from about 1967 until Dec.

31, 1975, to bribe members of the House and Senate, the indictment said.

According to the Associated Press, Park specifically was charged with giving more than \$175,000 to Hanna as payment for Hanna's official statements boosting the South Korean government and his efforts to promote congressional trips to South Korea and influence his colleagues to assist the Park regime.

Foley did visit the Republic of Korea in 1971 as a member of a U.S. House of Representatives delegation. The Foley spokesman said the parliamentary exchange trip was sponsored by former Speaker of the House Carl Albert. If Hanna helped arrange the trip, Foley had no knowledge of it, the spokesman said Tuesday.

"We were led to believe it was a goodwill trip at the invitation of the Korean General Assembly," he said.

The 30-page indictment was filled with 27 names of present and former members of Congress who received money, sometimes in the form of campaign contributions from Park.

Atty. Gen. Griffin Bell said Tuesday he will ask President Carter to contact South Korean President Park Chung-hee

to have Park returned to the United States to face the charges.

Park has been out of the country for about a year, having left about the time the investigation of his alleged activities began.

He recently flew from London to South Korea to visit his ailing mother.

Observers said the unsealing of the indictment signals stepped-up pressure for Park's return to the United States from Seoul.

RE: FOLEY RESPONSE/TONASKET ON SECOND BACON SIPHON/CAMPAIGN '80  
(SEE: FOLEY AS DEMOCRAT)

SOURCE: SPOKESMAN-REVIEW, A-6

date 8/6/80

FILE: \_\_\_\_\_  
Clipping

*'Not based on fact'*

# Foley questions Tonasket stand

By ROBERT L. ROSE

*Spokesman-Review political editor*

U.S. Rep. Thomas S. Foley, D-Wash., said Tuesday that Mel Tonasket, a GOP candidate for his job, was making statements "not based on fact" on the cost and scope of a giant Columbia Basin irrigation project.

Earlier Tuesday, Tonasket said Foley, by backing the Second Bacon Siphon and Tunnel project, was promoting "one of the grandest boondoggles that has ever been presented to the general public."

The Colville Indian leader, citing a 4-year-old study prepared by professors at Washington State University in Pullman, said the plan to bring 500,000 acres of land under irrigation would eventually cost \$2.5 billion and would "never be economically feasible."

"The economists who wrote the report pointed out it's never too late to stop the project," Tonasket told a news conference at his Spokane campaign headquarters.

However, Tonasket said he was not asking a halt to the project, but merely that the project be re-evaluated by some agency outside the government to see just how much it will cost and if it is now feasible.

"The facts should be brought up to date," he

said. "That's healthy both ways, whether the recommendations come back to halt the project or to go ahead and specialize in certain crops to fit within an overall market potential."

Tonasket said his \$2.5 billion figure included not only construction costs of the tunnel

---

## Columbia Basin irrigation project — Section B, Page 5

---

and siphon system, but also eventual costs of installation of on-farm distribution systems, energy costs in pumping the water, and "social costs" of building communities for workers who would carry out final irrigation system construction.

Foley, in an interview here, said Congress already was re-evaluating the project, estimated to have cost up to \$45 million so far, to see if it should be continued and implemented.

"Congress is committed to project costs nothing like Mr. Tonasket is suggesting," Foley said.

"The project is being constantly reviewed."

Foley was asked whether Congress will say no to further development if the current reviews show the project costs getting out of hand.

"That's exactly right," Foley said.

Also, he said, Tonasket was wrong in saying farmers were being forced into the irrigation project.

"Tracts of the project are approved segment-by-segment by the farmers involved and by the irrigation districts that will carry on the actual operation and maintenance of the program," he said. "And they have been negotiating with the Department of Interior for some time on the costs."

"Mr. Tonasket's statements are not based on fact in terms of the operation of the program or in his suggestion that farmers are forced into participation against their will."

"The fact of the matter is, Congress has to review the matter periodically during the course of the development of a project of this kind, including all questions of feasibility. The individual farmers have to vote on several occasions whether they want to participate."

RE: FOLEY AS DEMOCRAT/DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION/CAMPAIGN '80  
(SEE: FOLEY RESPONSE/TONASKET ON SECOND BACON SIPHON)

SOURCE: SPOKESMAN-REVIEW (FRONT PAGE)  
date 8/6/80

FILE: \_\_\_\_\_  
clipping

# Demo opening day crucial for Carter

## *Foley: Nomination or fight on his hands*

By **ROBERT L. ROSE**  
Spokesman-Review political editor

President Carter will know by the end of the first day of the Democratic National Convention in New York next week whether he has the nomination in the bag, or a fight on his hands, U.S. Rep. Thomas S. Foley said Tuesday.

The Spokane Democrat, who has the ticklish job of convention parliamentarian, pointed out that the vote on Rule F(3)c, the controversial rule requiring Carter delegates to stick to their man on the first ballot, comes up Monday.

If it's defeated, that means a so-called "open convention," which Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., and other anti-Carterites are calling for. It also means the door is open to Kennedy and other possibles, such as Sen. Henry Jackson, D-Wash.

"If one assumes that the delegates who are pledged to Jimmy Carter all vote for the so-called Rule F(3)c, then it would be fairly mathematically certain that the rule would be applied and that the rule would mean a first-ballot nomination of President Carter," Foley said, choosing his words carefully.

"I have been reticent myself about making any statement

whether I favor the rule or not or oppose it, because there may be — very likely will be — questions involved about the interpretation of the rule and the circumstances under which it should be considered by the convention.

"That will involve possible rulings from the chair, and I want to be very careful about that."

However, planting one foot firmly on each side of the fence, Foley

---

### ● *Foley assails*

*Tonasket's statements,*  
*page 6*

● *Carter's delegates in*  
*region to stick by him,*  
*page 6*

---

pointed out that some delegates, even though they are pledged to either Kennedy or Carter, may feel that pledge applies only to his vote for the nomination — and not on whether there should be an open convention.

"That's the basis, I suppose, on



**REP. THOMAS S. FOLEY**  
Chooses words carefully

which some people see the rule being rejected and the minority report (for an open convention) being adopted," he said. "Whether that will obtain or not is not clear yet."

Any guesses?

"I'd really rather not say."

Spokesman Review 5-18-80

# Here's how they rated

By **ROBERT L. ROSE**  
Spokesman-Review political editor

Following are tables of ratings by conservative and liberal special-interest groups of Inland Empire members of the U.S. Congress.

In each case, the higher the score, the more the legislator is liked by the group that scores him.

The five organizations that did the scoring chose from 18 to 27 votes, which each considered representative of its position, and then rated the legislators on a scale of 0 to 100.

The five, listed in order at the top of the tables, are:

1. The Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) — Founded in 1947 by a group of liberal Democrats, including the late Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey, D-Minn., and Eleanor Roosevelt.

Its vote tabulations include such issues as abortion, windfall profits tax, a moratorium on nuclear power and the MX missile.

2. COPE (The Committee on Political Education) — Formed in 1955 as an arm of the AEL-CIO.

COPE concentrated on labor issues but also included votes on the economy, civil rights and foreign policy.

3. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States — Founded in 1912 to be "a voice for organized business in Washington, D.C."

It ran two ratings lists on the U.S. Senate after several members complained it had not used representative votes in its original tally. Only the results of the rerun are tabulated here. The Chamber focused on issues such as energy, business regulation, spending and inflation.

4. The Americans for Constitutional Action (ACA) — Formed in 1958 at the request of a group of conservative senators to elect more "constitutional conservatives" to Congress.

Its tabulations covered a wide range of issues including foreign policy, the economy, energy, defense, abortion and domestic spending.

5. The National Taxpayers Union — Founded more than 10 years ago, represents 150,000 dues-paying members, the NTU says, interested in reducing taxes, government waste and spending.

It said it tabulated "every vote" concerning federal spending to come up with a "spending score" — the higher the score, the more the legislator voted to cut spending.

The ADA, ACA, and Chamber compiled their own scores.

The COPE scores were computed by Congressional Quarterly, the source for all four lists.

The NTU supplied its scores to The Spokesman-Review.

## Representatives

### Idaho

	1	2	3	4	5
Symms, R	5	5	94	100	78
Hansen, R	0	5	100	95	77

### Montana

	1	2	3	4	5
Williams, D	79	80	33	25	26
Marlenee, R	21	32	72	92	56

### Oregon

	1	2	3	4	5
AuCoin, D	68	58	44	29	36
Ullman, D	63	67	31	4	22
Duncan, D	42	47	75	21	27
Weaver, D	84	78	12	24	55

### Washington

	1	2	3	4	5
Pritchard, R	32	30	82	46	33
Swift, D	79	85	28	12	17
Bonker, D	84	85	18	4	20
McCormack, D	58	65	41	4	19
Foley, D	53	60	56	8	16
Dicks, D	63	75	22	22	20
Lowry, D	84	85	11	15	14

## Senators

### Idaho

	1	2	3	4	5
Church, D	42	65	29	24	28
McClure, R	0	0	93	85	64

### Montana

	1	2	3	4	5
Baucus, D	63	89	31	12	23
Melcher, D	58	89	33	33	21

### Oregon

	1	2	3	4	5
Hatfield, R	58	63	46	40	40
Packwood, R	32	47	43	38	33

### Washington

	1	2	3	4	5
Jackson, D	68	95	31	11	12
Magnuson, D	53	94	27	15	20



# Candidate takes double-barreled aim

By ROBERT ROSE

George Bible and John Sunneland are both out to get Ron Foley.

But what bugs Bible is that Sunneland won't stand still so he can get him out.

Both are trying, along with Mel Harkins, to win the Republican nomination to challenge incumbent Democrat Foley for the Congressional seat he has held for 16 years.

Bible, a relative unknown, says he is confident that Sunneland, who claims a 40 percent name recognition factor compared to the campaign, won't debate him.

"I would like to challenge you to a debate anywhere, anytime. I'll be there with bells on," Bible told Sunneland after he agreed to a joint appearance before a Cambridge Area Democratic Committee meeting.

Sunneland, who's been around the block a couple of times, wasn't having any.

"I mean, why should he attract an extra audience for a guy nobody knows?"

"George," he said, "I hope this appearance will stand in as a reasonable debate."

Bible: "No way."

Bible, whose main claim to fame is he wanted to launch an expeditionary force of mercenaries to free the American hostages in Iran, called for a show of hands among the audience of 60 orange juice and coffee-politics watchers.

"How many people in this room feel the voters in the 5th District would be well-served by a debate among the Republican candidates?" he asked.

About half a dozen raised their hands.

"Thank you," said Bible, who looks like about half John, who is in your lap."

De-lapping the ball, Sunneland said, "Actually I feel the only way to get is the incumbent out. And that's going to be my target."

Persisting, Bible said the joint appearance was "not enough" and going to rest until we get together some kind of forum.

Sunneland: "George, do you want to come over for dinner?"

Hangin' in there, Bible hand-delivered a press release upon Harkins, saying Sunneland was "well-chicken." He asked voters to tell Sunneland "hand-dancers" and demand a debate.

"I ask publicly," Bible declared, "what is he afraid of?"

Privately, the political response appeared to be much biter.

Foley

STAFFS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEES

AGRICULTURE 347

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK AND GRAINS

Rep. Charles Rose (D NC - 7), Chairman

MAJORITY: (12 D.) Representatives Rose, Bedell, English, Daschle, Stenholm, de la Garza, Fithian, Skelton, Jones (TN), Nolan, Baldus and Harkin.

MINORITY: (8 R.) Representatives Sebelius, Johnson (CO), Hagedorn, Coleman, Symms and Marlenee.

Freeman, Claude, Jr. Subcom. Consultant LHOB 1301 225-2171

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OILSEEDS AND RICE

Rep. Dawson Mathis (D GA - 2), Chairman

MAJORITY: (5 D.) Representatives Mathis, Jones (NC), Bowen, Whitley and Stenholm.

MINORITY: (2 R.) Representatives Findley, and Thomas.

Leighton W. Subcom. Consultant LHOB 1301 225-2171

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TOBACCO

Rep. Walter B. Jones (D NC - 1), Chairman

MAJORITY: (5 D.) Representatives Jones (NC), Whitley, Mathis, Rose and Baldus.

MINORITY: (2 R.) Representatives Kelly and Hopkins.

Farrell, Charlotte H. Subcom. Consultant LHOB 1301 225-2171

OPERATIONAL SUBCOMMITTEES

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT

Rep. Ed Jones (D TN - 7), Chairman

MAJORITY: (12 D.) Representatives Jones (TN), Harkin, Huckaby, Glickman, Hance, Brown (CA), Richmond, Baldus, Bedell, English, Panetta and Daschle.

MINORITY: (6 R.) Representatives Madigan, Jeffords, Kelly, Coleman, Marlenee and Hopkins.

Spencer, Robert A. Subcom. Consultant LHOB 1301 225-2171

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATIONS, OVERSIGHT, AND RESEARCH

Rep. E (Kika) de la Garza (D TX - 15), Chairman

MAJORITY: (7 D.) Representatives de la Garza, Brown (CA), Fithian, Skelton, Glickman, English and Daschle.

MINORITY: (3 R.) Representatives Wampler, Heckler and Grassley.

Perez Humberto R. Subcom. Consultant LHOB 1301 225-2171

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC MARKETING, CONSUMER RELATIONS, AND NUTRITION

Rep. Frederick W. Richmond (D NY - 14), Chairman

MAJORITY: (8 D.) Representatives Richmond, Panetta, Nolan, Glickman, Akaka and Harkin.

MINORITY: (3 R.) Representatives Symms, Heckler and Grassley.

Joseph R. Subcom. Consultant LHOB 1301 225-2171

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FAMILY FARMS, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, AND SPECIAL STUDIES

Rep. Richard M. Nolan (D FL MN - 6), Chairman

MAJORITY: (8 D.) Representatives Nolan, Akaka, Harkin, Daschle, Anthony, Richmond, Mathis and Panetta.

MINORITY: (4 R.) Representatives Grassley, Sebelius, Coleman and Thomas.

Easters, James W. Subcom. Consultant LHOB 1301 225-2171

Vertical stamp or text on the right margin, possibly "Library of Congress".

Seattle P.I. 9-15-80

# McCormack and Foley Blast Extremist Groups

SPOKANE (AP) — Two political candidates unleashed a verbal attack yesterday — not against rivals but against what they branded as "extremist groups" that could change the outcome of Tuesday's primary election in Washington state.

The candidates were part of a group of politicians, including Gov. Dix Lee Ray, who were guests of the Joint Council of Deans No. 23, holding its semi-annual meeting in Spokane.

The problem, defined by Rep. Mike McCormack, R-Wash., is the "emergence of new and powerful extremist groups and movements in our society today." He said there is no doubt "the most vital, most vibrant political activity in the state of Washington comes from these extremist groups."

"They present the greatest internal danger there is to this country today," said McCormack, running for Senate in November. He said he had no personal quarrels with any of the groups.

"Such activity is especially dangerous because it's characterized by and clothed in such appealing, innocent-sounding and high-minded phrases as patriotism and morality and religion and anti-communism on the one hand and environmental protection or conservation on the other hand," he said.

Whether the groups stand to the left or right, McCormack said, "We who are trying to build a better America are under attack."

He called the newly formed Moral Majority an "infringement on the right to work."

He said the Moral Majority is "based on a dualistic, militant and they're right."

"They are the most active political force moving today," he said.

McCormack said a Spokane lawyer and executive director of the Moral Majority in Eastern Washington was out of town and the

available for comment on McCormack's remarks.

Congressman Thomas D. Wash. said about the "darker forces" and "this movement" and some of the risks we face. I agree with you that the Moral Majority is not here to help you who have a stake.

The many people in this country who are doing the "wrong" thing have lost as well to work that our country has lost its competitive and its defense capability. It's been completely changed.

"Most of us, many day speakers and the right. There is nothing this country has the capacity to exceed and that's nonsense. Our country can handle any activity," Foley said.

Ray said, "I don't understand why people think that Mike McCormack is talking about anything concerning the

We do have a lot of problems in a state without them. There's no such thing as a free lunch. We have plenty of problems and we can deal with them. There's nothing wrong with the common sense of

the 1980 fiscal year. Similarly, his voting record reflects a philosophy contrary to a reduction in the amount of federal regulation. In 1980, Mr. Foley likewise voted against cutting taxes.

In the additional area of defense, a majority of those who responded felt our military defense posture was already weak and correspondingly favored increasing our defense budget (61 percent). Again, the incumbent's voting record over the past four years has opposed increasing our Naval and air capabilities.

LLOYD C. BILLINGS

Cheney, Wash.

*S.R. Letter to Editor 8/20/80*

### Sees inconsistencies

Rep. Thomas S. Foley recently released the results of a questionnaire circulated among residents of the Fifth Congressional District.

A comparison of the responses to these important questions relating to domestic, economic and social problems with Mr. Foley's voting record clearly reveals an inconsistency.

Some of the more prominent inconsistencies, for example, may be seen in the question relating to inflation. Eighty-three percent of the respondents favor a balanced budget, 67 percent would reduce federal regulations, and 53 percent would decrease federal taxes. Roll call voting, as published in Congressional Quarterly, shows Rep. Foley consistently voted to increase the budget deficit for

*Spokesman Review  
Letter to - Editor  
8-20-80*

# Foley raps anti-cancer law

WASHINGTON (AP) — The chairman and ranking Republican on the House Agriculture Committee questioned on Thursday the wisdom of a law that has led to federal action to ban some widely used food substances.

Chairman Thomas S. Foley, D-Wash., and Rep. William C. Wampler, R-Va., commented at a news conference after this week's announcement of a new finding that there is no reason to ban nitrites from food preservation.

"I hope Congress will consider in the future the basic question of whether we should revise the so-called Delaney Clause and adopt — on the basis of scientific consensus — a new procedure which would allow scientists to evaluate the risks and benefits of food additives," Foley said.

The Delaney Clause tells federal regulators to ban food substances that are found to cause cancer in man or animals. It was the basis for Food and Drug Administration action against saccharin, a widely used artificial sweetener, and by FDA and the Department of Agriculture against nitrite, which is commonly used to preserve meat.

The new study, released Tuesday, found no basis for the ban proposed by the two agencies on use of nitrite to preserve food.

Wampler agreed with Foley and urged hearings on his bill to establish a National Science Council to decide scientific questions on suspect chemicals. He said the proposal is "the way to head off future regulatory fiascoes like those involving saccharin — and now, nitrites."

Spokane Review  
8-22-80

RE: Primary Campaign/Contributions/MT For Congress '80

SOURCE: SEATTLE P - I p. A-12

DATE: September 4, 1980

### Indians Give Foley \$1,000

Congressman Tom Foley, D-Wash., has received a \$1,000 campaign contribution from a group that one of his opponents used to chair. The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation announced the contribution yesterday.

Mel Tonasket, chairman of the council's legislative committee, is one of four Republican candidates hoping to run against Foley in the November election. A spokesman for Tonasket said he turned down an equal amount of money from the tribes because he felt the tribe did not have enough money to give anyone campaign contributions.

## Cunningham, Foley Hit

Clipping

829  
Nader Rates Congressmen

By Joel Connelly

Washington's two U.S. senators scored high marks in a new congressional rating by Ralph Nader's "Public Citizen" organization, but several of the state's congressmen received low ratings and reprimands.

The consumer group gave Rep. Jack Cunningham, R-Seattle, a rating of 10 (out of a possible 100), one of its lowest scores for any member of Congress.

Rep. Tom Foley, D-Spokane, received a score of 53 but was nominated for one of Public Citizen's five "Biggest Disappointment of the Year" awards.

Public Citizen charged that Foley had backed off from previous support of a federal consumer protection agency.

Its report said: "Three days after the election of a reactionary Republican from Seattle (Cunningham), Foley suddenly released an intemperate press statement denouncing the consumer office in language largely indistinguishable from Chamber of Commerce propaganda."

Nader himself had harsh words for Cunningham, who was elected last May. Nader said in a statement accompanying the ratings that the congressman "consistently voted the anticonsumer, big business position on crucial consumer legislation."

Cunningham could not be reached for comment. Foley confirmed last night that he did switch sides on creation of the consumer agency.

"I feel there should be a clear case for the establishment of any new federal agency," said Foley.

"In this case, the Carter administration has energetically protected the consumer and put dozens of consumer activists in positions of influence.

"The legislation provided few guidelines as to how the agency would operate. The standards were so vague that the agency would decide by itself how the consumer was to be protected."

Two other state congressmen received low ratings. Rep. Joel Pritchard, R-Seattle, scored a 35 (up from 26 in 1976) and Rep. Mike McCormack, D-Richland, received a 33 rating (compared with 49 in

1976.)

Rep. Don Bonker, D-Ridgefield, fell from a 77 to a 70, and Rep. Lloyd Meeds, D-Everett, dropped from 75 to 58. Rep. Norm Dicks, D-Bremerton, Washington's other first-term congressman, was rated at 55.

Washington's senators were a different story. Sen. Henry M. Jackson scored a 70 while Sen. Warren G. Magnuson was given a favorable 65 rating.

Public Citizen praised the senators for votes against oil industry tax loopholes, support of low-cost electrical rates for the elderly, and an unsuccessful Jackson-

sponsored amendment which would have rebated revenue from President Carter's crude oil tax to consumers rather than oil companies.

Nader's group marked down different congressmen for different reasons. Pritchard was praised for votes against pork barrel water projects, but was labeled as "opposing the pro-consumer position" on taxation and regulation of oil and gas producers.

McCormack was given a low rating for his votes to weaken strip mining legislation and

auto emission standards, and fighting Carter's plan to eliminate the Clinch River, Tenn., nuclear breeder reactor program.

Public Citizen described Congress' overall performance as "disappointing."

Public Citizen rated senators and congressmen on the basis of about 40 votes. The issues included consumer protection, government reform (such as publicly financed campaigns), energy policy, tax reform, nuclear power, ecology and waste in government.

Clippings Foley

829

# Nader Rates Congressmen

By Joel Connelly

Washington's two U.S. senators scored high marks in a new congressional rating by Ralph Nader's "Public Citizen" organization, but several of the state's congressmen received low ratings and reprimands.

The consumer group gave Rep. Jack Cunningham, R-Seattle, a rating of 10 (out of a possible 100), one of its lowest scores for any member of Congress.

Rep. Tom Foley, D-Spokane, received a score of 53 but was nominated for one of Public Citizen's five "Biggest Disappointment of the Year" awards.

Public Citizen charged that Foley had backed off from previous support of a federal consumer protection agency.

Its report said: "Three days after the election of a reactionary Republican from Seattle (Cunningham), Foley suddenly released an intemperate press statement denouncing the consumer office in language largely indistinguishable from Chamber of Commerce propaganda."

Nader himself had harsh words for Cunningham, who was elected last May. Nader said in a statement accompanying the ratings that the congressman "consistently voted the anticonsumer, big business position on crucial consumer legislation."

Cunningham could not be reached for comment. Foley confirmed last night that he did switch sides on creation of the consumer agency.

"I feel there should be a clear case for the establishment of any new federal agency," said Foley.

"In this case, the Carter administration has energetically protected the consumer and put dozens of consumer activists in positions of influence.

"The legislation provided few guidelines as to how the agency would operate. The standards were so vague that the agency would decide by itself how the consumer was to be protected."

Two other state congressmen received low ratings. Rep. Joel Pritchard, R-Seattle, scored a 35 (up from 26 in 1976) and Rep. Mike McCormack, D-Richland, received a 33 rating (compared with 49 in

1976.)

Rep. Don Bonker, D-Ridgefield, fell from a 77 to a 70, and Rep. Lloyd Meeds, D-Everett, dropped from 75 to 58. Rep. Norm Dicks, D-Bremerton, Washington's other first-term congressman, was rated at 55.

Washington's senators were a different story. Sen. Henry M. Jackson scored a 70 while Sen. Warren G. Magnuson was given a favorable 65 rating.

Public Citizen praised the senators for votes against oil industry tax loopholes, support of low-cost electrical rates for the elderly, and an unsuccessful Jackson-

sponsored amendment which would have rebated revenue from President Carter's crude oil tax to consumers rather than oil companies.

Nader's group marked down different congressmen for different reasons. Pritchard was praised for votes against pork barrel water projects, but was labeled as "opposing the pro-consumer position" on taxation and regulation of oil and gas producers.

McCormack was given a low rating for his votes to weaken strip mining legislation and

auto emission standards, and fighting Carter's plan to eliminate the Clinch River, Tenn., nuclear breeder reactor program.

Public Citizen described Congress' overall performance as "disappointing."

Public Citizen rated senators and congressmen on the basis of about 40 votes. The issues included consumer protection, government reform (such as publicly financed campaigns), energy policy, tax reform, nuclear power, ecology and waste in government.