

E 1386

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — *Extensions of Remarks*

April 5, 1983

use as our guide in public life. He was a deeply committed man and his dignity and courage in the face of his terrible illness only gives evidence to the strength and determination of his will. We shall miss him. ●

HR 240

**THE POLYGRAPH: A HINDRANCE TO FULL EMPLOYMENT**

**HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1983

● Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to prohibit the use of polygraph—"lie detector"—tests in connection with applications for employment or as a condition of continued employment in private industry. Interest in the issue of polygraph testing has been revived as a result of President Reagan's recent directive ordering the increased use of polygraph tests on tens of thousands of Government employees. Although my bill does not directly address the use of polygraphs in Federal employment, it would correct a practice which threatens the employment future of hundreds of thousands of Americans each year.

With unemployment currently at a still unacceptable rate of 10.3 percent, it is unthinkable that individuals applying for jobs in private industry often find it necessary to submit to the intrusion and intimidation of a polygraph test in order to return to the work force. Furthermore, the practice of requesting current employees to undergo periodic lie detector tests can create ill will and embarrassment, irretrievably damaging the employer-employee relationship. While employers often claim that participation is entirely voluntary, there can be nothing voluntary about a decision to undergo a polygraph in order to obtain or maintain employment in today's tight job market. Employees who have taken the test frequently admit to feelings of fear, intimidation, and worthlessness after the experience. I do not believe an individual should have to surrender his constitutional right to privacy in order to pursue employment in this country. My bill would protect Americans from such gross violations of personal privacy.

Mr. Speaker, half of the States in the United States currently place some type of restriction on the use of polygraphs in conjunction with employment. Sixteen States, including Connecticut, ban the test entirely as a condition of employment, as does the District of Columbia. And the trend is growing—four new antipolygraph laws have been passed in the last 3 years alone. In other States, polygraph examiners are restricted from asking certain specific questions—typically those pertaining to sex, religion, race, creed, or union activity—when administering

a polygraph. While I endorse the steps these restricting laws represent, they implicitly endorse the technique by allowing polygraphs to remain at all. Rather, I believe we must insist upon an outright ban of this intrusive method of job screening in private industry. It is time Congress listened to the wisdom of those 16 States, and passed such a law.

The Polygraph Control and Privacy Protection Act of 1983 would prescribe fines and imprisonment for those employers who request or require that their employees or applicants for employment take a polygraph test as a condition of employment. A willful violation could be punished by up to a year in prison or a \$1,000 fine or both. The bill also establishes civil penalties of up to \$10,000 to be payable to the Federal Treasury. Finally, a private remedy is provided to allow a person who has been the victim of a violation of the act to recover damages from the employer for losses resulting from the violation. While the bill covers employers in the private sector, Federal organizations, especially those within the intelligence community, are intended to be exempt at this time.

Renewed consideration of the polygraph issue is clearly timely. In New York State, the number of complaints received by the Civil Rights Bureau concerning polygraphs doubled within a recent 6-month period. In addition, on March 25 a Connecticut jury awarded damages of \$219,000 to 22 employees of the Lehigh Oil Co., ruling that they had been illegally fired for refusing to take, or failing to pass, required polygraph tests. The subject of polygraph testing has not even escaped treatment on television, where viewers watch individuals, some of them accused criminals, answer questions while the lie detector machine presumably determines their truthfulness, hence their innocence or guilt.

In fact, the reliability of polygraph tests is extremely suspect. Studies show it to be accurate only about one-third of the time. The polygraph concept presumes that an identifiable physical reaction can be attributed to a specific emotional stimulus. The fact is, however, that no two human minds are alike. The Department of Justice recognized this liability when it recommended against the use of polygraph evidence in criminal trials. In explaining its position to the House Government Operations Committee in 1976, the Department pointed out that there is no specific physiological reaction indicative of deception and that even the same person may have inconsistent physiological reactions associated with deceptive responses. The Justice Department also maintained that a person's reactions may be affected by a number of factors, including his moral attitude toward lying, his mental condition, the influence of depressant drugs, and the physical circumstances incidental to the examination. Add to this the fact that only a

few States require polygraph examiners to be certified, and the potential for a false reading or poorly administered test is magnified.

Finally, the invasion of privacy that the polygraph represents is completely unacceptable. Although the polygraph is a machine of questionable accuracy, the tests are used 200,000 to 400,000 times per year in the United States by such major businesses as Montgomery Ward, 7-Eleven, and Coors brewery, in addition to countless smaller companies. In July 1977 the President's Privacy Protection Study Commission concluded that this polygraph use is "an unreasonable invasion of personal privacy that should be proscribed." Similar conclusions have been reached independently by two congressional committees.

To illustrate the nature of this privacy violation, let me describe briefly an average polygraph test. After being advised that the polygraph is nearly infallible, the subject is led into a sparsely decorated room where he is seated. A rubber tube is placed around his chest, cuffs are attached to the upper arms, and electrodes are clipped to the hands. The test is taken with the machine, but generally not the examiner, in sight. The subject is left, in essence, talking to the machine. The examiner asks a series of questions, some material, some immaterial, in order to register differences in breathing pattern, blood pressure, pulse rate, and skin resistance to external currents. In order to test a subject's control response, examiners are free to question their subjects on any aspect of their past lives. Job applicants have been questioned on highly personal topics ranging from sexual conduct to religious beliefs to emotional well-being. Convinced that the lie detector is infallible, subjects have confessed aspects of their personal lives which they might not have revealed otherwise except to a close friend or a clergyman. On the basis of this type of information, clearly unrelated to job performance, individuals can be failed and blackballed in the job market.

It was reported in 1977 that approximately 90 percent of job applicants rejected after having taken a preemployment polygraph examination were rejected on the basis of their own admissions, not on the basis of the results obtained from the polygraph test itself. In cases such as these, the polygraph no longer serves to detect truth of falsehood. Rather, it serves as a means of intimidation which gives the polygraph examiner the ability to elicit personal and intimate information from the subject and to report that information to the employer. That, Mr. Speaker, is a violation of a constitutional right. As long as we allow this practice to continue, we are condoning that violation. Documented examples of this type of polygraph abuse are far too numerous to mention here.

April 5, 1983

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

E 1385

anniversary on April 16, 1983. Incorporated in 1908, this southern California city has flourished for 75 years to become the second largest city in the lush Imperial Valley. Located on the California-Mexico border, Calexico has accordingly been named "The Gateway to Mexico."

Calexico, founded in 1900 when surveyors working on the project for diverting water from the Colorado River to thirsty southern California located a working camp there, got its name from Mr. L. H. Holt. Mr. Holt combined the words California and Mexico to produce Calexico on the U.S. side of the border and Mexicali, Calexico's recently proclaimed sister city in Mexico.

Today Calexico has grown to a community of more than 14,000 people and it promises to continue to grow. Indeed, industrial development will spur that growth; Calexico has begun the development of a 66-acre industrial park. This park's location offers access to all major western markets from the Calexico International Airport, railroads, as well as major State and interstate highways.

Calexico can also boast of its growth in the educational field; the Imperial Valley campus of San Diego State University provides a strong liberal arts curriculum in addition to several professional programs, including administration, law enforcement, teaching, and human services.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to pay tribute to Calexico and all of its citizens. Mr. Holt probably could not have foreseen what Calexico has become, but thanks to the community's far-sightedness and hard work, we should all be able to project continued growth and prosperity for "The Gateway to Mexico."●

## POETRY

## HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1983

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I heard an interesting ditty, By CBS's Charles Osgood of New York City.

It really made a lot of sense,  
It had to do with nuclear defense.  
His proposal is preposterous at best,  
But no more so than all the rest.  
So for my colleagues who like arms absurdity,  
I am entering it in the RECORD for all posterity.

CHARLES OSGOOD. Newsbreak. Defense Secretary Weinberger said an interesting thing yesterday. He said it would be an enormous step for mankind if the Soviet Union were to develop a space-age nuclear defense system like the one President Reagan wants us to develop for the United States.

CASPAR WEINBERGER. I would hope and assume that the Soviets with all the work they have done and are doing in this field would develop, about the same time we did, the same kind of effective defense.

OSGOOD. Now, bear in mind that the idea of the American system would be to render Russian missiles useless for attacking the United States. So what you just heard the Secretary of Defense say, in effect, is that he hopes the Russians will develop a system that will make our American missiles useless for attacking them. Poetic justice, some might say. I don't know about the justice, but we'll go for the poetry in just a minute.

OSGOOD. If we do have a system, in the sweet by and by,  
That would knock an attacker right out of the sky  
So that incoming missiles just wouldn't come in,  
There'd be no sense for such an attack to begin.

It may not be such an impossible dream,  
Some laser perhaps or some particle beam  
Might put up an invisible shield don't you know  
Like those toothpaste commercials from long, long ago?

No nuclear weapons, whatever its yield  
Could get through the Guard-all invisible shield.

That's what President Reagan hopes we can do,  
And we're hoping the Russians will do the same, too.

The Russian, Guardalski, the Kremlin then uses  
Would protect them from all of our Pershings and cruiser.

And there never could be any nuclear fuss  
For we couldn't hurt them and they couldn't hurt us.

So with nuclear missiles quite useless in war,  
There'd be simply no reason to build any more.

And then we might find, or so some people teach,  
True disarmament somewhat more easy to reach.

Although folks who make weapons, whatever the store of,  
Do not like to stop but to keep making more of

Whatever it is and wherever they're hidden,  
Ad infinitum or ad Armageddon.

But now comes a perceptive and very smart chap,  
Defense leader Weinberger, whose friends call him "Cap,"

And if what Mr. Weinberger says is quite true,  
If he does want the Russians to do what we do

And develop a system a whole lot like ours  
To make use both mutually self-cancelling powers,

Then think of the saving and building expense  
If we build the thing jointly, doesn't that make sense?

Though the reasons for working together are strong,  
It does not seem too likely that they'd go along;

And if Russia should somehow comply with our wishes,  
Then some people here would get very suspicious.

But we could pool our funds for such projects as these  
And farm out the job to the good Japanese.

In the Kremlin and Pentagon they might go berserk,  
But the Guard-all might stand at least some chance to work.

Or like projects America's done in the past,  
Like the A-bomb we thought of and brought along fast

Or the time that we landed those men on the moon,

We might make this Guard-all thing come alive soon.

The Russians wouldn't love it, in my bones I just feel it.

If only we worked it out so they could steal it:

We could let the most secret parts leak out somehow

With security sort of like what we have now  
And the Soviet leaders, with their Byzantine flair,

Would love thinking they'd stolen the thing fair and square.

And we'll both live and romp in Elysian Fields

Safe and secure 'neath invisible shields.●

SENATOR EDWARD P. THOMAS

## HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1983

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to report the sorrowful passing of a very dear friend of mine and an outstanding citizen of Maryland, Senator Edward P. Thomas. Senator Thomas was the minority leader of Maryland's Republican Party.

As the Baltimore Sun so eloquently stated in an editorial at Senator Thomas' death, "he was one of the quiet men of Annapolis. He believed that actions, not rhetoric, mattered. For his dedication to government and party, and for his basic decency and love of people, Eddie Thomas was a beloved figure in Annapolis."

He, with his wife, Lois, his son, and three daughters, represented what is best in America—a dedicated, spirited family, working together in good times and bad, and contributing to the society which nurtured them. He brought his family to Frederick, Md. after a 10-year career in Virginia as a sportscaster. In Frederick, he bought a bowling alley and office complex, and, by 1970, he won a seat in the Maryland Senate representing Frederick and Carroll Counties. In 1972 he was the Republican State party chairman. He remained a counselor, fundraiser, and general adviser to the State party until his death.

In 1979 Ed found out he had cancer, and he approached the news in the same way he did everything—in his quiet manner he set about to defeat the enemy. In 1981 he thought he had won, and indomitable in spirit, he told a Sun reporter, "You just don't know. But I'm not losing any sleep over it, I can tell you that. I consider myself just damn lucky to be alive."

Despite the strength of his will, his body did not respond, and earlier this month he succumbed.

Mr. Speaker, Ed Thomas was a much beloved man and his presence in our midst is sorely missed. I know my colleagues would want to join me in sending heartfelt condolences to his family. For Ed has certainly left an outstanding legacy of public service and good will, one which we could all

April 5, 1983

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Rema.

E 1387

Mr. Speaker, the polygraph could soon symbolize the threat which the abuse of technology poses to the traditions of our Constitution. Employers have used the machine, inaccurate as it is, to save the time required to make a conventional investigation of potential employees. Personnel managers have used the machine to make sweeping investigations whenever something has been found missing from an office or warehouse. Fortunately, however, the fight against the polygraph has finally begun in earnest. Let us not abandon it now. ●

THE CONSUMER DEBTOR BANKRUPTCY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1983

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1983

● Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 2, I was pleased to join my Judiciary Committee colleagues, MIKE SYNAR, HAL SAWYER, and BARNEY FRANK and Congressmen TRENT LOTT, GILLIS LONG, BUTLER DERRICK, DICK GEPHARDT, BILL EMERSON, HAL DAUB, BILL GRAY, and VIC FAZIO in introducing H.R. 1800, the Consumer Debtor Bankruptcy Amendments Act of 1983. This badly needed legislation would go a long way toward curbing the increasing number of unnecessary chapter 7, straight bankruptcy filings and toward guaranteeing the continued availability of unsecured credit to the average American consumer.

Mr. Speaker, the new Bankruptcy Code, enacted in 1978, made a number of important changes designed to aid consumer debtors and to insure their ability to obtain a fresh start if and when they fall into unintended financial difficulty. But those laudable goals will be endangered if the consumer credit industry continues to face the large numbers of unwarranted straight bankruptcies with which they must now contend. In our zeal to protect the consumer debtor, we must not forget the good-faith lender who since 1978 is increasingly confronted with chapter 7 petitioners who need not seek that chapter's protections. Unless we act quickly to encourage debtors who can pay their debts to do so, lenders will more and more be forced to limit the availability of unsecured credit, a fact that would most severely hurt low-income borrowers who may not have the collateral necessary to secure a consumer loan.

During lengthy and informative hearings held last year by the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law, testimony confirmed the urgent need for reform of our bankruptcy system to restore needed balance between debtor and creditor rights. In the years since the new code was enacted, there have

been unprecedented increases in the number of straight bankruptcy filings, and a dramatic decrease in the number of debtors willing to reaffirm their debt obligations. Moreover, there have also been truly substantial abuses, such as the stacking of exemptions in order to retain personal estates intact and loading up expensive consumable goods in anticipation of bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt about the need for reform of our consumer bankruptcy laws. Some experts feel that as much as \$1 billion of the \$6 billion annually scheduled in bankruptcy is unnecessarily discharged in chapter 7 proceedings. To a large extent, I believe this is because so few consumer debtors are aware of the availability of the loan rearrangement provisions of chapter 13. According to the National Bankruptcy Commission, many consumer debtors are unaware of the chapter 13 alternative, and, as a consequence, needlessly jeopardize their future ability to obtain credit by filing in chapter 7. Under the provisions of H.R. 1800, however, bankruptcy counseling would be made available to consumer debtors so that an informed decision could be made regarding the chapter 7 and chapter 13 provisions. Moreover, a bankruptcy judge is permitted, on his own motion and only his own motion, to abstain from or dismiss a straight bankruptcy proceeding where to do otherwise would constitute an abuse of the Bankruptcy Code. In this manner, unnecessary chapter 7 filings would be discouraged without in any way infringing upon the rights of consumer debtors.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to H.R. 1800, at least two other consumer bankruptcy reform bills will likely be considered in the House Judiciary Committee during this Congress: H.R. 1169, introduced by Congresswoman MARILYN LLOYD BOUQUARD, and H.R. 1147, introduced by Judiciary Committee Chairman PETER W. ROMANO. Both are good bills that take different approaches to resolving the problems of our consumer bankruptcy system. I believe that H.R. 1800 represents a middle ground between these bills; one that would curb the abuses of our bankruptcy system while firmly protecting the rights of consumer debtors to a fresh start.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1800 also addresses the problems faced by farmers during grain elevator bankruptcy proceedings. In essence, the legislation would attempt to remedy the problems caused by the courts' inability to distribute crops quickly to farmers who have merely stored their product in a grain elevator without transferring title to the grain elevator operator. Among other things, H.R. 1800 would impose a 120-day time limit on a bankruptcy judge to determine grain ownership and require those courts to accept valid warehouse receipts and scale tickets as proof of ownership. The bill also permits holders of valid warehouse receipts to share in the dis-

tribution of assets and those not holding receipts to share in second tier distribution. These and other provisions would provide needed help to farmers caught up in the throes of grain elevator proceedings. I urge my colleagues to give these and all provisions of H.R. 1800 both speedy and favorable consideration. ●

TRIBUTE TO COL. JOHN DAVIDSON

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1983

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would this afternoon like to honor Air Force Col. John Davidson, who is about to be transferred from the Air Logistics Center in Sacramento to become the commander of the Air Force Guidance and Metrology Center in Newark, Ohio.

At McClellan Air Force Base in Sacramento, he has been the director of plans and programs. It has been a challenging assignment. McClellan is the largest industrial complex in northern California with more than 14,000 civilian and 3,500 military personnel. It is a facility with major needs for modernization and growth. Colonel Davidson has worked hard and successfully to see that those needs have been met and that McClellan is equipped to do the best possible job of maintaining critical military aircraft.

I am most familiar with John, however, because of a separate responsibility; one which may be a sidetrack for him, but which has been vitally important to me. He has been the one to educate me, and especially my staff, about the base and its problems. Logistics is a complex and very technical field, but John has been excellent in making those details come to life and have meaning for us and to fit the role of McClellan into our framework of understanding the Air Force and its operations. His liaison with me and my office has always shown evidence of extra effort and no lack of candor. We will miss him in the Sacramento community.

Colonel Davidson graduated from West Point in 1960 and got a master's degree from MIT. His previous assignments have included missile programs and the Space Shuttle programs, various logistics and engineering positions, and tours of duty in Germany, Japan, and Thailand. Among his decorations are the Bronze Star, the Defense and USAF Meritorious Service Medals, and the Air Force Commendation Medal.

As commander of the Air Force Guidance and Metrology Center, he will be responsible for calibration of Air Force test equipment, the targeting components of missile systems, and depot level maintenance of Air

E 1388

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — *Extensions of Remarks*

April 5, 1983

Force and Defense Department guidance and meteorological equipment. Being his own boss as a commander is a promotion well deserved. It is a challenge I know he will carry out with the same talent, thoroughness, and dedication I have seen in him in Sacramento.

My wife, Doris, and I wish John and Kay Davidson and their sons, Joe and Scott, the very best in their future. ●

#### ACCOUNTABILITY AT THE PENTAGON

**HON. ROBERT GARCIA**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 5, 1983*

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, voo-doo economics and now 20th century Don Quixote weapons systems. It seems the President and the Pentagon are suffering from a credibility gap. Of course, it is hard to determine whether the gap initiates with the President or with the Pentagon. At the Pentagon, where the double-think of 1984 is, and has been, standard operating procedure for sometime, cutting costs can mean adding 9.5 percent.

As the following article from *Time* magazine so vividly illustrates, the Pentagon's double think, double talk, paranoia raises serious concerns relative to its ability to serve the best interest of this country. Historically, the Pentagon's slippery accounting outlined in the *Time* article continually encourages the public to distrust the space invaders war games they want to play with our lives and our tax dollars.

We all want to save democracy from communism, but accountability is a web of many strands. There is no one chain that will bind down those in power. All must be strong. Together they can preserve our liberty.

#### WHO SAYS NUMBERS NEVER LIE?

AT THE PENTAGON, CUTTING COSTS CAN MEAN  
ADDING 9.5 PERCENT

Billion-dollar cost overruns? Massive problems in paying for weapons? When Pentagon Analyst Franklin Spinney (*Time*, March 7) raised these possibilities in explosive congressional testimony, his superiors loftily replied that these were merely "historical" problems that Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger's cost cutters have brought under control. Moreover, they hinted that they would shortly have proof in the form of a new report on weapons costs. Spinney's boss, David Chu, promised the Senate Armed Services Committee "a pleasant surprise." The Pentagon unveiled the document last week, and the chief surprise turned out to be how clumsy it had been in practicing accounting sleight of hand.

The Selected Acquisition Report (S.A.R.) proudly trumpeted a drop of \$18.4 billion, or 4 percent, in the expected costs of 40 major weapons systems between last Sept. 30 and Dec. 31, the first such decline in a decade. It resulted almost entirely from a lower estimate of future inflation and reduction of the numbers of weapons being bought under some programs. Still, even without these factors, expected costs rose only \$7.5 billion, or 1.3 percent, the smallest increase

since 1975. That would be an impressive achievement, if the figures could be believed.

But when reporters at a press briefing examined the data on individual programs, the figures turned slippery. The Air Force, for example, claimed a saving of \$4.2 billion on the purchase of air-launched cruise missiles because of "quantity decrease." That "saving" will disappear rapidly when the service switches to a new and more expensive type of missile. But its costs are secret.

The S.A.R. does show an expected cost of \$102.5 billion for 13 other new weapons systems. This is not included in the comparisons because a new program by definition cannot rise in cost during the quarter in which it begins. Fair enough if the systems are really new, but might some of them be old programs masquerading under new names?

The figures listed for the Trident missile-firing submarine raised suspicions. According to the S.A.R., the expected cost of the Trident program dropped a stunning \$11.3 billion last quarter because only eight submarines, rather than 15, are now planned. Astonished journalists asked if the Navy had really slashed almost in half one of the nation's most important nuclear-deterrent programs. No, replied Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Joseph Kammerer: the seven missing submarines have been renamed Trident IIs and designated as a new program.

In what way are they new? Rear Admiral Frank Kelso, director of the Navy's Strategic Submarine Division, was summoned to explain. The Trident II will carry a more advanced missile, he said, but otherwise "it's the same submarine." The expected cost of building all 15 Tridents, far from declining sharply, has risen \$2.7 billion, to \$31.1 billion, an increase of 9.5% in only three months.

The new report obviously is not going to cool the fiery debate about whether the Pentagon is letting hardware costs run out of control. The Reagan Defense Department's main weapon in holding down these costs is the "Carlucci initiatives," a set of 32 guidelines drawn up by Frank Carlucci, then No. 2 to Weinberger, in 1981. They call for more realistic cost estimates, more competition among contractors, stabler and more efficient production rates, and changes in the way contracts are funded—principally heavier initial financing and the signing of contracts for several years rather than just one—in order to produce that stability and efficiency.

There has been some resistance to these reforms within the Pentagon. A vivid example is a memo written last year by Assistant Secretary of the Navy George Sawyer that *TIME* has obtained. Sawyer urged the Navy to put forth its "most optimistic estimate" when drawing up its shipbuilding budget for fiscal 1984. Among other things, he proposed that the Navy "assume no [cost] growth beyond target" and eliminate all calculations of how much changes in ship specifications might increase the cost of building vessels. Which of his recommendations, if any, the Navy might have accepted in preparing its request for \$12.7 billion in shipbuilding funds for fiscal 1984 is unknown, but there are some clues that Navy figures on the costs of building vessels may be unrealistically low. The Navy assumes, for example, that its next three *Los Angeles*-class nuclear-powered submarines will take only 62 months to build, although the previous three required and average of 97 months.

The Defense Department seems genuinely committed to the Carlucci reforms, although it concedes that it has not yet imple-

mented all of them. But some critics complain that the initiatives were inadequate to begin with. In a report written for the Council on Economic Priorities, a liberal research group in New York, Defense Specialist Gordon Adams contends that the initiatives fail to address some of the worst problems of weapons production, notably the Pentagon's reliance on cost estimates from contractors, estimates that it makes little effort to check.

Adams argues that some of the Carlucci reforms might make cost problems worse. The initiatives aim at reducing the number of reviews that top officers must conduct of the decisions made by lower-ranking contracting officials. The aim is to speed decisions and cut paperwork. But the effect, Adams says, might be to let contractors get away with overruns that a high-level review might spot.

Overall, the reforms, if fully implemented, ought to help. But the Pentagon has a long way to go in proving that it is really trying to cut costs rather than merely playing the kind of numbers games that it seemed to be playing last week.—By George J. Church, Reported by Bruce W. Nelan and Christopher Redman/Washington. ●

#### INTRODUCTION OF OLDER AMERICANS MONTH RESOLUTION

**HON. BILL McCOLLUM**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 5, 1983*

● Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, since 1963 the President has proclaimed May as the month to express this Nation's gratitude to its senior Americans. In keeping with this tradition, Congress last year passed the Older Americans Month resolution and so joined in official and public recognition of the contributions our senior citizens have made and continue to make to this country.

I was proud to be the House sponsor of Older Americans Month last year, and I am proud to introduce this resolution again today. It is important that Congress join in this annual recognition of the contributions our senior citizens have made. The United States did not become the leader of the free world overnight. It took the lifetimes of today's senior Americans to help build the foundation for the standard of living and the democratic institutions that make our Nation so great.

Our older Americans represent a wealth of knowledge and experience that continues to contribute to this Nation's growth and Congress would be remiss not to express its recognition of this wealth. I, therefore, ask for my colleagues' support for this concurrent resolution to declare May as Older Americans Month.

A copy of the text of this proposed resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 318

Whereas older Americans have contributed many years of service to their families, their communities, and the Nation;

**Page Denied**

Next 12 Page(s) In Document Denied