

between 10 and 16 years of age receive through taxpayer-funded programs like the National Youth Sports Program which the National Collegiate Athletic Association has received tens of millions of tax dollars to administer every summer for more than 20 years.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. VINCE SNOWBARGER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the Congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

Mr. SNOWBARGER. Mr. Chairman, during my campaign for Congress last year I said that my primary goals were a balanced budget as scored by the Congressional Budget Office and permanent tax relief for hard-working families. I stressed that these two goals were not mutually exclusive and that both were desperately needed by the American people. Tonight, I have the opportunity to vote for a budget plan that meets both those goals, and will by 2002—for the first time since 1974—reduce the Federal Government's share of the fruits of our labors to less than 20 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product.

This plan was not my first choice. I first supported a better budget, one introduced by Mr. DOOLITTLE, that would have allowed the American people to retain more of their hard-earned money and significantly reduced the bloated Federal Government. Unfortunately, that budget failed. My choice then, is between the balanced budget agreement and the status quo.

The plan currently contains many things that I gladly support—\$135 billion in tax relief for families and investors over 5 years—\$85 billion net; \$600 billion in entitlement reform over 10 years; reforms to ensure the solvency of Medicare for the next decade; and less Government spending than the President would have us spend.

Of course, since the Republican Congress does not have enough of a majority to override President Clinton's vetoes, the plan also includes his own initiatives, many of which I oppose. These include a new taxpayer-financed health insurance entitlement, college tax credits that I, as a former college teacher, believe will only go to fund tuition increases and grade inflation; and reinstating SSI benefits to certain immigrants. However, the most disappointing aspect of this plan is that it doesn't really deflate the bloated Federal Government. The reduction in the share of the Nation's wealth consumed by the Government is based primarily on the assumption that the Nation's economy will grow a little faster than Government spending. But it is the best we can get with this President in the White House.

The other important thing this plan will do is that it should prevent the President from shutting down the Government again. The President has already signaled his willingness to

shut the Government down—just as he did 2 years ago to prevent spending cuts, and blackmailed Congress into higher spending to avoid a shutdown last year. As long as this agreement is followed in good faith, this option should not be available to him.

I think we will be able to fill out the details of the plan in a way that is acceptable to both parties. I will watch carefully as Congress begins to shape the tax relief package and finalize other areas of the plan. As long as the Congressional Budget Office continues to certify that the plan will balance the budget and provide significant tax relief, I will support it.

OVERHAULING THE FOREIGN AID ESTABLISHMENT SUPPORT: H.R. 1486

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1997

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, later this week the House is likely to consider H.R. 1486, the Foreign Policy Reform Act of 1997. I believe that this important legislation, crafted in a responsible and bipartisan manner by the esteemed chairman of the House International Relations Committee, BEN GILMAN of Middletown, NY, offers a historic opportunity to move our Nation's foreign policy in the right direction.

The legislation reported by the International Relations Committee represents a return to proper congressional authorization procedures. It authorizes spending for the State Department and related agencies, as well as for security, humanitarian, and development assistance at levels agreed to by the House and Senate last week in their votes on the budget resolution, and at levels agreed to by the administration.

David Warsh, a business and economics columnist for the Boston Globe, recently wrote a cogent article putting the bill, and Chairman GILMAN's leadership, in the proper historical perspective. Namely, it is a plan for development aid in the post-cold war era that rivals the shrewdness of the Marshall Plan itself.

MARSHALL'S INHERITOR

He was a kid sergeant when General George Marshall was Chief of Staff of the Army—an Army Air Corps navigator with 35 missions over Japan. And when Secretary of State Marshall in 1947 announced the ambitious plan for the reconstruction of Europe that has borne his name ever since, Ben Gilman was a GI Bill student at New York University Law School.

Now Gilman, the little-known chairman of the House Committee on International Relations, is acting as Marshall's inheritor—in ways that are as yet little understood.

Next week Congress takes up his Foreign Policy Reform Act. It is billed as the first major overhaul of the foreign aid establishment since 1961.

More to the point, the bill provides a set of tools for the conduct of development aid in the post-Cold War era that are in many ways analogous—opposite in approach but perhaps equal in shrewdness—to the Marshall Plan itself.

Chief among its features is a streamlining of the baroque foreign policy establishment that grew up during the half-century contest with the former Soviet Union.

Merged into the State Department altogether would be the US Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Agency for International Development, which now reports directly to the president, also would go to work for the secretary of state instead. The expansion of NATO to the countries of Eastern Europe and Russia itself is authorized as well.

Thus the dueling strategies that have given the US government's foreign policy some of its worst moments since the Berlin Wall came down would at last be expected to speak with a single voice.

It was one of these smoldering rivalries that burst into flames last month when the Agency for International Development suspended a \$14 million contract with a unit of Harvard University that has been consulting to the Russian government on various privatization programs.

The reason: The significant others of the two lead advisers—the wife of one, the girlfriend of the other—had been investing heavily in Russian ventures for personal gain.

Harvard economics professor Andrei Shleifer and Moscow program director Jonathan Hay were fired from its programs last week by the Harvard Institute for International Development. But the suspended contract is expected to be canceled soon, with permanent damage to the Russian faction that has been Washington's brightest hope for reform.

But there were deeper currents. HIID might never have had the contract in the first place but for the rump State Department that was the AID mission to Moscow—something like 300 hard-to-control employees. In fast-moving events after the attempted coup against Mikhail Gorbachev in 1991—and especially after Bill Clinton moved into the White House—the Harvard Institute came to be used as the principal, if unofficial, instrument of US macroeconomic policy in Moscow, responsive to instructions from the White House in ways that the well-entrenched AID mission in Russia never was.

It was amid such back-channel maneuvering that the burgeoning conflicts of interest on the part of the administration's preferred advisers, Shleifer and Hays, went unnoticed—or at least unchallenged.

With everybody in the foreign policy apparatus working for the president—as they would be under Ben Gilman's Foreign Policy Reform Act—such mischief would be far less likely to occur.

Harry Truman called Marshall “one of the most astute and profound men I have ever known.” At a distance of 50 years, it is clear that Marshall understood that with a devastating war just ended but an even more threatening possibility in prospect, a concerted effort by the Americans to rebuild Europe would be required to keep Soviet tanks out of Paris.

Conditioned by the sacrifices of the war, a bipartisan Congress dug deep and came up with money—\$13.5 billion, paltry even at 10 times that sum in current dollars—necessary to jump-start the European miracle. Peace and prosperity—and a strong line of defense against an expansionist Soviet empire—was the result.

Today, the situation is nearly opposite. Instead of a world hobbled by war, the United States looks outward to a world pretty much at peace with itself. Instead of relatively easily repaired physical damage, the harm done to many of the world's great nations—Russia, China, India—has been self-inflicted. It is institutional regeneration that is needed, not spare parts and heating oil.

And, of course, instead of facing a powerful and unpredictable foe, America finds itself alone as a global superpower. It is, however,

one among many nations seeking to compete in global markets, and without the comfort of an enemy to galvanize its will.

In these circumstances, Ben Gilman's approach to foreign policy deserves to be understood for what it is: the best possible approach under the circumstances. It amounts to a return to the stripped-down apparatus with which America entered the post-World War II era: a president who makes foreign policy through his secretary of state, with the advice and consent of Congress, but without the bureaucratic barnacles that have grown up over 50 years.

Like the foreign policy of the Marshall Plan, the support for the Foreign Policy Reform Act is self-consciously bipartisan. Freshmen hotheads made a bold attempt to derail Gilman's ascension to the international relations committee's chair (he replaced Representative Lee Hamilton) following the surprise Republican conquest of the House in 1994; he was too much a Rockefeller Republican for some. (A moderate, Gilman was elected to Congress on Richard Nixon's coat-tails in 1972.)

Yet Gilman works well with his Republican counterpart in the Senate, Jesse Helms. Gilman retains the respect of the Democrats. And he keeps a light checkrein on the Clinton administration, causing few embarrassments, but regularly extracting compromises in cases where he believes US policy is overly soft or harsh—in China, in Bosnia, in Somalia, in Haiti, in the Ukraine.

It is picturesque that debate should be scheduled to begin on Gilman's bill on Tuesday—in time to offer the possibility that it could come to a vote in the House on the 50th anniversary of Marshall's famous speech at Harvard, June 5.

So never mind the nostalgia. Great deeds are still being undertaken. The shaping economic development around the world has replaced defense as the cutting edge of foreign policy. It is possible that the next 50 years will be even better than the last.

JOBS FOR OLDER WORKERS

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1997

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to an uplifting story in the San Jose Mercury News, describing how a Silicon Valley entrepreneur, Mr. Jessie Singh, has built his high-tech enterprise with the help of senior workers including many immigrants.

It is a sad fact that older workers face significant obstacles in obtaining employment. But, as Mr. Singh's model shows, seniors can excel at the workplace.

As our country continues to address the issue of welfare reform, we need to recognize that many older workers do want to work hard, and will work hard, if given the opportunity. Our economic future depends on employing the talents of all our residents.

[From the San Jose Mercury News, Apr. 8, 1997]

THREESCORE YEARS—AND HIRED MILPITAS HIGH-TECH FIRM FINDS ITS OLDER WORKERS TO BE LOYAL DEPENDABLE

(By Carolyn Jung)

It's a familiar sight at many Silicon Valley high-tech companies—throng of 20- and 30-somethings hunched over computer terminals, assembling circuit boards, chomping pizza or playing foosball.

But visit BJS Electronics Inc. in Milpitas and you'll find several workers of a decidedly different age, with a few more gray hairs, embarking on a new career in their golden years.

The company, one of the largest independent distributors of memory chips, is doing something few other high-tech firms seem willing to do—hiring older workers in their 50s and 60s. In BJS' case, many of them are also immigrants who face the loss of Supplemental Security Income funds in August because they are not naturalized citizens.

Of the company's 68 employers, 10 range in age from 52 to 69. They have been hired as security guards, warehouse workers and circuit-board testers. With these jobs, they say, they've gained self-esteem and greater respect among friends and family members. And at a time when many employees routinely jump from job to job, company officials say they've garnered a group of dependable employees who work hard and remain loyal to the company.

Company Chief Executive Jessie Singh, who came here from India with only \$8 in his pocket and now owns a company that boasts \$240 million in sales annually, said he made a special effort to hire older workers because he understands how they feel.

"Seniors are mostly unwanted in society or used by their children who bring them to this country just to babysit the grandchildren," said Singh, 38. "This is chance for them to get out of the house. They can prove they're not less than anyone else."

Bill Payson, president of Senior Staff, a job databank for seniors in Silicon Valley, applauds BJS Electronics' hiring practice, which he calls a rarity in this industry. While many of the 3,500 seniors listed with the databank want to work in high-tech, the job listings Payson gets from such companies are few.

Indeed, industry representatives for Joint Venture: Silicon Valley and the Santa Clara Valley Manufacturing Group said they are unsure if any high-tech companies make an effort to hire older workers.

OVER 35 IS OVER THE HILL

"High-tech companies are notoriously prejudiced against older folks. They think anyone over 35 is over the hill," Payson said. "For this company (BJS) to have that large a proportion of older workers, I'd give them high marks for that. This is the coming trend. And this company is ahead of the wave."

About 21 percent of the population in Santa Clara County is age 50 or over, according to U.S. Census data. About 9 percent is age 65 or older. (Payson and some advocacy groups designate people over 50 as seniors. The federal government has no single definition. Laws governing housing, social services and medical care set different age limits.)

Of the age 50-and-over group, 50 percent work because they need the money or because they want to stay useful, Payson said. For those with good computer and office skills, jobs are not as hard to find, advocates for the elderly said. But for those who speak limited English, who have transportation problems or who have little work experience in this country, it can be far more difficult.

"Most of the older people I work with feel there's discrimination out there, that they're under-rated as far as their health and skills," said Sue LaForge, director of the National Council on Aging's job-training program. "But the situation is getting better. Employers are starting to see seniors as a desirable addition to their workforce."

COST OF LIVING A FACTOR

LaForge hopes more Silicon Valley high-tech companies follow suit, particularly because more seniors—the fastest-growing seg-

ment of the population—find it necessary to continue working because of the high cost of living here.

At BJS Electronics, seniors such as Sampuran Singh work alongside other workers half their age. For the past four months, the retired bank inspector from India has helped fill sales for the \$1,300 memory chips that are assembled onto circuit boards and sold to companies such as Hewlett-Packard.

"I want to contribute to the economy of America," said the 61-year-old immigrant who came to the United States a year and a half ago. "We don't want to be dependent on the government. We shouldn't be a burden on others."

Jessie Singh, BJS' chief executive, said he got the idea to hire the seniors when he heard Mayor Susan Hammer speak last summer about the jarring effects welfare reform could have on legal immigrants.

He approached San Jose's Northside Community Center, which provides nutritional and social services for Indo-American and Filipino-American seniors, to find a senior to employ. The center sent over four. Jessie Singh hired all of them.

Of the 10 older workers at BJS Electronics, eight are Indo-Americans, one is of Chinese descent from the Philippines and another is white. Their previous occupations include physical education teacher, cab driver, farmer and army officer. None had ever worked at a high-tech company.

Now, they work full time, 40 hours a week, making about \$7 an hour with full medical benefits. Advocates for the elderly said they consider that a fair wage. Payson noted that many of his seniors get paid up to \$14 an hour, but those are usually part-time jobs that don't include benefits.

Jessie Singh said he wanted to help those struggling to regain a foothold in life because it's an experience he knows all too well, having left Punjab, India, 11 years ago with almost nothing and moving to Santa Clara with his wife, Surinder, after a traditional marriage arranged by their parents.

Even though he had an engineering degree and once supervised 1,500 employees in India, he found it nearly impossible to get a skilled job here.

RESUMES AT THE GAS PUMP

So for the first four months, he delivered pizzas and pumped gas. He would hand out his resume at the full-service pump, figuring anyone buying premium could hire him.

"I did get a lot of response from that," he said. "But they all still wanted work experience in the United States, and I didn't have any. I was so frustrated."

He started asking friends in India for help. One friend, a distributor of computer chips, asked Singh to help him purchase from Silicon Valley vendors some memory chips that would be sold to buyers in India.

"I didn't even know what a memory chip was," Singh said about the component that stores data temporarily while the microprocessor carries out its work.

Even so, he went to work, buying the chips for his friend and making a 10 percent commission on each deal. He soon realized that instead of being just a middleman, it would be more worthwhile to strike out on his own.

He borrowed money from friends and relatives and ran a one-man operation out of his Santa Clara apartment.

These days, the millionaire businessman operates out of a 45,000-square-foot, high-security building where more than 10,000 memory chips go out each day.

Now, Jessie Singh hopes other companies will copy his efforts in hiring seniors. Surjit Sohi, 57, who has worked as an operations manager at BJS Electronics for more than a year, hopes so, too.