

## MASTER QUESTIONNAIRE

[Field dates: Dec. 30, 1994–Jan. 3, 1995]

Note: The following precautions were taken to minimize the effect of bias by averaging out small, deliberate biases introduced in question pre-ambles and response choices. This method also serves to prove that small biases do produce comfortingly small changes in the response statistics, so that the resulting averages not only probably produce less bias than the older method of survey design where preambles and response menu choices introduced by the survey designers are not tested at all. The new method also brackets the effect of bias, and often shows how little dependent on wording-bias responses are, and when they do occur what the exceptions to that rule are and how they arise: Questions were read in the order presented to both half samples. Q1 is identical to Q2 except Q1 has a more "comforting" introduction and Q2 has a more "alarming" introduction. Questions were read to half sample A as presented here. Half sample B had the "comforting" and "alarming" introductions [the words in brackets, like these] interchanged in Q1 and Q2. Half sample B in Q3 and Q8 were read the response choices in reverse order, and half samples A and B in Q12 tested the support for two strong but different reasons for not aiming toward the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

First a little background—

1. (half sample A). [The nuclear arms race has substantially diminished and many nuclear weapons have been eliminated in the last five years.] Should reducing the danger of nuclear weapons now be an important priority for the U.S. government or NOT an important priority? Is that very or somewhat important/unimportant?

Very important, 46%; Somewhat important, 30%; Somewhat unimportant, 17%; Very unimportant, 4%; and DK/NA, 3%.

Important 76%; Unimportant 21%.

1. (half sample B). Very important, 60%; Somewhat important, 21%; Somewhat unimportant, 10%; Very unimportant, 6%; and DK/NA, 3%.

Important 81%; Unimportant 18%.

2. (half sample A). It is also true that [the U.S. Russia still have many thousands of nuclear weapons. Terrorists could buy or steal nuclear weapons from a nuclear state. And other nations such as Iraq and North Korea may be building nuclear bombs.] Knowing that, I'd like to ask you again: Should reducing the danger of nuclear weapons now be an important priority for the U.S. government or NOT an important priority? Is that very or somewhat important/unimportant?

Very important, 61%; Somewhat important, 18%; Somewhat unimportant, 14%; Very unimportant, 5%; and DK/NA, 2%.

Important 79%; Unimportant 19%.

2. (half sample B). Very important, 58%; Somewhat important, 24%; Somewhat unimportant, 11%; Very unimportant, 5%; and DK/NA, 1%.

Important 82%; Unimportant 16%.

Average of four: Q1 and Q2 responses, A and B samples:

Should reducing the danger of nuclear weapons now be an important priority for the U.S. government or NOT an important priority? Is that very or somewhat important/unimportant?

Very important, 56%; Somewhat important, 23%; Somewhat unimportant, 13%; Very unimportant, 5%; and DK/NA, 2%.

Important 79%; Unimportant 18%.

3. How concerned are you that renegade countries or terrorist groups could get nuclear weapons?

Extremely, 21%; Very, 40%; Somewhat, 28%; Not very, 8%; Not at all, 2%; and DK/NA, 0%.

4. How much have you read or heard about President Clinton's policies on nuclear weapons?

A lot, 7%; Some, 30%; Just a little, 37%; Nothing, 26%; and DK/NA, 0%.

5. Are you satisfied with what President Clinton has done to reduce the danger of nuclear weapons?

Extremely, 3%; Very, 9%; and Somewhat, 33%.

Total satisfied, 45%.

Extremely, 6%; Very, 13%; Somewhat, 23%; and DK/NA, 13%.

Total dissatisfied, 42%.

Now some suggestions for dealing with nuclear weapons—

6. Do you favor or oppose the U.S. negotiating an international agreement to end all nuclear test explosion?

Strongly, 56%; and Somewhat, 26%.

Total favor, 82%.

Strongly, 7%; Somewhat, 8%; and, DK/NA, 3%.

Total oppose, 15%.

7. Do you favor or oppose negotiating an agreement where all nations with nuclear weapons agree to further reduce the world's total stockpile of nuclear weapons?

Strongly, 72%; and Somewhat, 19%.

Total favor, 90%.

Strongly, 4%; Somewhat, 3%; and DK/NA, 3%.

Total oppose, 7%.

8. [Asked of 90.4% who favor in Q7] Reduce the world's nuclear weapons stockpile how much? Of those asked:—

A little, 7%; A lot, 26%; Almost complete, 27%; Completely, 39%; and DK/NA, 2%.

Of total sample:—

Eliminate completely, 35%; Eliminate almost completely, 24%; Reduce a lot, 24%; Reduce a little, 6%; Oppose reduction (from Q7), 7%; and DK/NA (Total of Q7 and Q8), 4%.

Total reduce a lot, complete or almost, 82%.

9. Do you favor or oppose increasing the U.S. military budget?

Strongly, 32%; Somewhat, 21%.

Total favor, 54%.

Strongly, 22%, Somewhat, 21% and, DK/NA, 3%.

Total oppose, 43%.

10. Do you favor or oppose building an anti-missile system to protect the overseas troops of the U.S. and its allies from nuclear missile attack?

Strongly, 43%; and Somewhat, 25%.

Total favor, 68%.

Strongly, 12%, Somewhat, 15%; and, DK/NA, 4%.

Total oppose, 27%.

11. In addition, some say we need a new anti-missile system to protect the U.S. from accidental launches, unauthorized launches and threats of attack from third world nations. Others say that such systems will be expensive, will work poorly—in some circumstances not at all—and would sooner or later violate our ABM treaty obligations. Do you approve or disapprove of trying to build an anti-missile system that will try to shoot down missiles launched at the U.S.?

Strongly approve, 38%; and Somewhat approve, 26%.

Total approve, 64%.

Strongly disapprove, 19%; Somewhat disapprove, 13%; and DK/NA, 4%.

Total disapprove, 32%.

12. (A half sample) As a general goal, which of these two things do you think is more desirable—

1. The elimination of all nuclear arms in the world, 55%; or

2. For a few countries, including the U.S. to have enough nuclear arms so no country would dare attack them, 44%; and

3. DK/NA, 1%.

12. (B half sample). As a general goal, which of these two things do you think is more desirable—

1. The elimination of all nuclear arms in the world, 60%; or

2. For a few countries, including the U.S. to have nuclear arms, while trying to keep the rest of the world from getting them, 36%; and

3. DK/NA, 0%.

## A DUAL IN THE DEFICIT WAR

## HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the January 15 Rocky Mountain News editorial, "A Dud in the Deficit War."

The dud in question is the much-ballyhooed balanced budget amendment. The Rocky counsels that the "Republicans would better spend their time devising real cuts in real programs and leave the hocus pocus to Barnum and Bailey."

I'm afraid, however, that the Rocky's call for real cuts in real programs is falling on unreceptive ears. One of our distinguished Republican budget-cutters recently launched an assault on the deficit by proposing the elimination of the Board of Tea Tasters.

## A DUD IN THE DEFICIT WAR

The issue: The balanced budget amendment.

Our view: Sounds good, but probably wouldn't work.

The centerpiece of the Republican Party's Contract With America promises a line-item veto and a balanced budget amendment. The veto is a good idea, nearly everyone agrees, but the same cannot be said for the budget amendment, even if the principle behind it attracts the supports of 80% of Americans.

Few would deny that the idea of making the federal government spend no more than it takes in is pleasing to the ear. That, after all, is the economic philosophy private citizens ignore at their peril, at least in the long run. There was a time, in fact, when the idea of running a deficit in peacetime was thought to reflect a sort of moral shortcoming.

Yet there are several problems with the GOP's amendment. While the amendment promises to lock the government into a balanced budget and, in fact, outlaw deficits, a quick look at the not-so-fine type finds king-sized loopholes. By the mere act of securing a three-fifths vote, Congress can bust the budget with joyful abandon. We're not talking about wartime emergencies, which would suspend the amendment in order to allow for rapid increases in defense spending. No, the three-fifths vote looms like a bottle in a "reformed" drunk's basement—a strong temptation to backsliding.

Another ploy to get around the amendment's demands would be to use unrealistic budget assumptions and balance the budget merely on paper, a trick any politician who has been in Washington 15 minutes knows how to perform. There is also an element of deception in the fact that the amendment applies only to the formal budget document, not the actual operating budget.

A larger concern comes from state governments, which fear, for no little reason, that Washington's strapped politicians will pass on the cost of programs to them. Clearly enough, it is a great deal easier for Washington to force states to take up the slack than

to order service cuts, job losses and new taxes. Washington pols could easily be tempted to make promises to valued constituencies and send the bill to states and municipalities. The federal budget might not suffer, but the jolt to local taxpayers could be immense.

Just now, the GOP hopes to assure governors and state legislators that another plank in its Contract, which calls for a crackdown on unfunded mandates, will eliminate this option. No doubt many Americans, and perhaps their state legislators, are so fed up and frightened by federal deficits that they are willing to take this leap into the unknown. Assurances that unfunded mandates will no longer be allowed may provide the security necessary to make that leap.

Even opponents of the amendment such as ourselves hardly believe it would be the end of the world. But to truly balance the budget, especially without tax increases, will mean eliminating services, slowing the growth of entitlement benefits and ending tax breaks. This is true even under optimistic scenarios for economic growth, given the ballooning deficits projected for the next century when the baby boomers retire.

Republicans would better spend their time devising real cuts in real programs and leave the hocus procus to Barnum and Bailey.

#### CHURCH RETIREMENT BENEFITS SIMPLIFICATION ACT

#### HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 17, 1995*

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Church Retirement Benefits Simplification Act of 1995. I am pleased to have Representative SHAW of Florida join me as an original cosponsor of this legislation.

The Church Retirement Benefits Simplification Act, which has in past Congresses had nearly 100 cosponsors, will simplify the rules in the Internal Revenue Code which apply to retirement plans sponsored by our country's religious denominations.

The centerpiece of the legislation is a proposed new section 401A of the Tax Code which would bring together in one place and clarify tax rules governing church retirement plans. By providing a separate code section which sets forth these rules as they apply to religious denominations, the bill will remove a great source of confusion and complexity. The relief provided by the bill applies to churches and to church ministry organizations, but not to church-related hospitals and universities.

The bill will extend relief already provided to churches which maintain 403(b) plans to churches and church ministry organizations which offer plans under section 401A. In the Tax Reform Act of 1986, Congress exempted churches with 403(b) plans from coverage and related rules. It is time to provide the same treatment to churches with 401(a) plans and remove the disparity we created then.

The need for this legislation stems from the fundamental differences between churches and the secular business organizations to which the coverage and related rules are primarily designed to apply. Churches and church ministry organizations are tax exempt. They therefore lack the incentive private sector employers have to maximize tax deductible employee benefit payments.

A related point is that the coverage and related rules are designed to limit the amount of income highly compensated employees can be paid on a tax-deferred basis. According to the 1994 Church Pensions Conference, however, ministers' salaries averaged just over \$33,000. These modest salary levels leave little cause for concern about the dangers non-discrimination testing is designed to prevent.

While some provisions of the Tax Code have no meaningful application for church plans, other requirements of the Tax Code are directly at odds with the theology and polity of particular denominations. While some denominations are hierarchical, others include many small, independent churches which have neither the personnel nor the resources to deal with complex compliance requirements.

By exempting churches and church ministry organizations from coverage and related rules, this legislation will permit them to devote their resources to fulfilling their spiritual and community-oriented missions.

#### A JUST AND LASTING PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST: WHAT CON- GRESS CAN DO

#### HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 17, 1995*

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, the leadership of the Churches for Middle East Peace have co-written a letter to all Members of Congress concerning steps Congress can take to help build confidence between Palestinians and Israelis in order to continue making progress toward lasting peace.

The letter articulates two issues with profound implications for negotiations in the months ahead and which are also of urgent concern to the churches: The future of Jerusalem and the protection of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, the group, Churches for Middle East Peace, are made up of a broad range of religions and religious beliefs and practices, and they include: The American Baptist Churches, USA, American Friends Service Committee, Church of the Brethren, Episcopal Church, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers, Mennonite Central Committee, Presbyterian Church [USA], Roman Catholic Conference of Major Superiors of Men, Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations, United Church of Christ, and the United Methodist Church.

They encourage us, as Members of Congress, to actively support the Israeli-Palestinian peace process which lies at the core of the broader Arab-Israeli conflict, because they believe the process is presently at risk of breaking down. In support of their belief that the process is, or may become, at risk, they particularly cite the following:

Jerusalem: It is critical that the 104th Congress not hinder these negotiations by urging President Clinton to implement a policy that favors Israel's claims to the portion of the city annexed in 1967. Members of Congress can make an important contribution by encouraging the President to keep the question of Jerusalem open for the parties to negotiate and to respect the rights and aspirations of both parties. The letter goes on to say ". . . it is crucial that the U.S. Government vigorously op-

pose Israeli building of settlements or the expansion of existing settlements in the territory occupied by Israeli forces in 1967."

Human rights: We are concerned that human rights abuses, perpetrated both by the Israeli authorities and the Palestinian National Authority continue and that the U.S. Government in its role as a cosponsor of the peace process is doing little to promote respect for human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues this joint letter, and urge their reading of it in its entirety. The letter is reprinted here with the blessings and hope of the Churches for Middle East Peace for our thorough understanding of the issues, and for all necessary action to further a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

CHURCHES FOR  
MIDDLE EAST PEACE,  
*Washington, DC, January 3, 1995.*

Hon. NICK J. RAHALL,  
*U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House  
Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RAHALL, The members of Churches for Middle East Peace (CMEP), a coalition of the Washington offices of Protestant, Roman Catholic Episcopal, and historic peace churches, encourage your active support for the Israeli-Palestinian peace process which lies at the core of the broader Arab-Israeli conflict. We are writing to you now because we believe that process is at risk and there are steps the U.S. Congress can take to help build confidence between Palestinians and Israelis in order to continue making progress toward lasting peace.

There are a number of problems that may undermine the peace process. We would like to draw your attention at this time to two issues with profound implications for negotiations in the months ahead and which are also of urgent concern to the churches: the future of Jerusalem and the protection of human rights.

Jerusalem: The Declaration of Principles, signed by Israel and the PLO on September 13, 1993, stipulate that the final status of Jerusalem is to be determined by the Government of Israel and the representatives of the Palestinian people in the context of the "permanent status negotiations", now scheduled to begin no later than May, 1996. It is critical that the 104th Congress not hinder these negotiations by urging President Clinton to implement a policy that favors Israel's claims to the portion of the city annexed in 1967. Members of Congress can make an important contribution by encouraging the President to keep the question of Jerusalem open for the parties to negotiate and to respect the rights and aspirations of both parties.

Israelis and Palestinians must be encouraged to avoid unilateral actions that would prejudice the permanent status negotiations on Jerusalem. Most importantly, it is crucial that the U.S. Government vigorously oppose Israeli building of new settlements or the expansion of existing settlements in territory occupied by Israeli forces in 1967. Many observers fear that the settlement activity is an attempt by Israel to preempt the negotiations on Jerusalem by creating overwhelming facts on the ground.

The permanent status of Jerusalem, and the process by which it is determined, holds the potential for either promoting reconciliation between Jews, Christians, and Muslims or fostering conflict between them. We urge the U.S. Government to advance a vision of Jerusalem, "city of peace," as a symbol of reconciliation for the three faiths and for Palestinians and Israelis.