



South Carolina House of Representatives

Legislative Update & Research Reports

A4R
8.L33
Int. v. 1/3
Copy 3

Ramon Schwartz, Jr., Speaker of the House

Interim Volume 1

September, 1985

No. 3

S. C. STATE LIBRARY

SEP 24 1985

STATE DOCUMENTS

CONTENTS

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

1985 Revenues and Expenditures—Action by B&C Board.....	1-2
Program Measures to Evaluate State Agencies.....	1-6
The Kingfish Comes to Columbia—1935.....	1-7

RESEARCH REPORT

Private Prisons.....	2-1
----------------------	-----

AROUND THE HOUSE

NCSL Health Committee to Hold Meeting in Greenville.....	3-1
--	-----

OFFICE OF RESEARCH

Room 324, Blatt Building, P.O. Box 11867, Columbia, S.C. 29211, (803) 758-5096

Legislative Update

1985 Revenues and Expenditures--Action by B&C Board

Background

There have been many questions about 1985 revenues, 1985 expenditures, the 1984-85 budget balance, and recent actions by the Budget and Control Board to insure that expenditures are in line with revenues. This brief report, supplied by the House Ways and Means Committee Staff, should help explain the situation and resolve some of these questions.

Actual General Fund Revenue Compared to Estimates

The chart on page 4 shows the comparison of actual general fund revenue collections and revised estimates of revenue (the revised estimates were made on August 5, 1985). The first column gives the actual revenue figures; the second column has the revised estimates. The third column shows the difference between the two (plus or minus); and the fourth column gives a percentage figure of how close the estimate came to totalling the actual revenue.

For example, actual revenue for the retail sales tax for FY 1984-85 was \$828,271,406. The revised estimate was \$831,300,000--a difference of minus \$3,028,594. This means that the actual revenue for the retail sales tax was 99.6% of the estimate income.

When all the various items are considered, there was a total overprojection of income of \$9,676,641, or a .4% error rate. There still was enough revenue to fully cover the 1984-85 appropriations. However, there was not enough to pay for all of the supplemental appropriations made in the 1985 Appropriations Act.

Shortfall

The second chart, on page 6, compares available revenues against expenditures, showing the \$11,935,636 shortfall. It is interesting to note that there were adequate funds for everything appropriated by the General Assembly, except for the open-ended appropriations which were higher than projected.

Open-ended expenditures are those such as Aid to Subdivisions, or employee contributions; their total amount is determined by pre-set formulas. The General Assembly must allocate funds to cover these expenditures, but must make an estimate as to the total amount required.

This year, for example, the Aid to Subdivisions formulas required \$11,800,000 more than appropriated. Part of this was offset by a \$6.7 million lapse in Aid to Subdivisions. Employee contributions cost \$2,300,000 more than appropriated.

As the second chart demonstrates, total expenditures for FY 1984-85 came to \$2,414,675,932; against this must be set revenues, which amounted to \$2,402,740,296. This left a shortfall of \$11,935,636.

Budget and Control Board Action

The Budget and Control Board has the responsibility to avoid a deficit situation. Although revenues were adequate to cover the 1984-85 Appropriations and the open-ended appropriations, the state was still \$11,935,636 short of funding the 1985 supplemental appropriations. The Board took the position that roughly \$12 million of the supplemental appropriations should be deferred.

Chart three shows the actions taken by the Board in this regard. First, the Board provided for the funding of the increase in the retiree income tax exemption with recurring revenues from FY 1986 by extending from three months to six months the hiring freeze on new positions. This freed up \$3 million in nonrecurring revenues to address the FY 1985 problem. Second, the Board froze the authorization for the expenditure of roughly \$9 million of the supplemental appropriations, including such items as the helicopter, school buses, and asbestos removal operations.

CHART ONE
GENERAL FUND REVENUE ESTIMATES BY CATEGORY
Fiscal Year 1984-85

	ACTUAL FY 84-85	REVISED EST. (5/8/85)	DIFFERENCE	ACTUAL AS % OF ESTIMATE
<u>Regular Sources</u>				
Retail sales	828,271,406	831,300,000	(3,028,594)	99.6
Casual sales	7,737,814	8,100,000	(362,186)	95.5
Income tax (total)	1,042,964,786	1,056,000,000	(13,035,214)	98.8
Individual	850,813,835	875,000,000	(24,186,165)	97.2
Corporate	192,150,950	181,000,000	11,150,950	106.2
 Total, Income & Sales	 1,871,236,192	 1,887,300,000	 (16,063,808)	 99.1
<u>All other revenue</u>				
Admissions tax	6,160,122	6,400,000	(239,878)	96.3
Aircraft tax	457,936	450,000	7,936	101.8
Alcoholic liquor tax	43,402,169	45,300,000	(1,897,831)	95.8
Bank tax	7,632,432	7,600,000	32,432	101.4
Beer & wine tax	60,026,647	58,900,000	1,126,647	101.9
Business license tax	22,842,057	30,100,000	(257,943)	99.1
Cable TV fees	576	7,000	(6,424)	8.2
Coin-operated device tax	5,756,105	6,400,000	(643,895)	89.9
Commercial nuclear waste tax	4,855,892	4,850,000	5,892	100.1
Contractors license tax	745,643	760,000	(14,357)	98.1
Corporation license tax	25,002,396	24,800,000	202,396	100.8
Department of Agriculture	5,539,332	5,457,300	82,032	101.5
Department-supported appropriations	8,736,714	8,098,409	638,305	107.9
Documentary tax	16,359,744	16,300,000	59,744	100.4
Earned on investments	66,624,459	66,165,005	458,454	100.7
Electric power tax	13,411,125	13,400,000	11,125	100.1
Estate tax	22,441,987	19,500,000	1,941,987	115.1
Fertilizer inspection tax	217,078	200,000	17,078	108.5
Gasoline tax--counties	15,902,373	15,800,000	102,373	100.6
Gift tax	1,496,355	1,250,000	246,355	119.7
Insurance tax	56,594,079	55,301,700	1,292,379	102.3
Miscellaneous				
Department Revenue	17,729,448	17,568,076	161,372	100.9
Motor transport fees	4,867,511	4,662,500	205,011	104.4
Private car lines tax	1,056,557	1,050,000	6,557	100.6
Public service assessment	3,060,168	4,738,200	(1,678,032)	64.6
Public Service Authority	1,700,398	1,700,200	198	100.0
Retailers License tax	3,776,169	3,625,000	151,169	104.2
Savings & Loan				
Association tax	(12,371)	20,000	(32,371)	-61.9
Soft drinks tax	14,969,762	14,500,000	469,762	103.2
Workers Comp.				
Insurance tax	7,960,935	9,100,000	(1,139,065)	87.5
 Total, all other revenue	 446,313,794	 444,004,390	 2,309,404	 100.5
 Total, regular sources	 2,317,549,986	 2,331,304,390	 (13,754,404)	 99.4

	ACTUAL FY 84-85	REVISED EST. (5/8/85)	DIFFERENCE	ACTUAL AS % OF ESTIMATE
<u>Miscellaneous Sources</u>				
Circuit & Family				
Court Fines	1,739,367	1,377,622	361,745	126.3
Debt service transfers	17,992,656	18,062,139	(69,483)	99.6
Earned funds	5,243,224	3,000,000	2,243,224	174.8
General revenue sharing	715,110	700,000	15,110	102.2
Health Insurance				
reserve fund transfer	26,716,572	26,716,572	0	100.0
Housing Authority				
reimbursement	350,921	374,058	(23,137)	93.8
Indirect cost recoveries	14,542,180	14,914,056	(371,876)	97.5
Mental Health fees	3,800,000	3,800,000	0	100.0
Nonrecurring revenue	0	0	---	---
Parole & Probation				
supervision fees	1,802,086	1,900,000	(97,914)	94.8
Unclaimed property				
fund transfer	2,526,659	500,000	2,026,659	505.3
Waste treatment				
loan repayment	393,437	400,000	(6,563)	98.4
<u>Total, miscellaneous sources</u>	75,822,210	71,744,447	4,077,763	105.7
<u>TOTAL, GENERAL FUND REVENUE</u>	2,393,372,196	2,403,048,837	(9,676,641)	99.6

Note: Detail may not add due to rounding
Source: Board of Economic Advisors, 8/8/85

Legislative Update, September 1985

CHART TWO
FISCAL YEAR 1984-85 FINAL BUDGET BALANCE

Revenue

\$ 2,393,372,198	Actual 1984-85 Revenue Collection
9,368,098	Reserve Fund Surplus
<u>\$ 2,402,740,296</u>	Total Revenue Available

Expenditures

\$ 2,349,764,086	Part I Appropriation for 1984-85
16,000,000	Part III in 1984-85 Corrections Construction
66,571,947	Part III in 1985-86 Supplemental
14,233,538	Open-ended appropriations
(31,893,639)	Lapsed Funds/Unspent appropriations
<u>2,414,765,932</u>	Total Expenditures

Balance

2,414,675,932	Appropriations
(2,402,740,296)	Revenue
<u>11,935,636</u>	Shortfall

CHART THREE
ITEMS IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT
 FROZEN BY THE BUDGET & CONTROL BOARD

Shortfall	\$ 11,935,636
Revenue Section	
Retirees Income Tax Exemption (Delay of New Hiring Fund)	<u>(3,000,000)</u>
	8,935,636
Expenditure Section	
Aeronautics - Helicopter	(2,900,000)
Francis Marion Asbestos Removal	(2,205,000)
USC Asbestos Removal	(3,500,000)
Dept. of Education - School Buses	<u>(330,636)</u>
Shortfall	-0-

Program Measures to Evaluate State Agencies

Pursuant to a proviso in the Appropriations Act, the State Reorganization Commission has developed program measures for all state agencies. These measures, referred to as "efficiency" and "effectiveness," describe what an agency does with its appropriations.

Instead of seeing a line item such as "telephone" and \$1,000,000, you might see measures indicating the types of calls, numbers of calls, purpose of calls, and some method of measuring the efficiency and effectiveness of them. The measures are intended to tell you, as legislators, what the agency is doing with its appropriations, and measure how efficiently and effectively they are spending them. Over time, measures are meant to lead to a better understanding of the programs and services of government, and how they relate to appropriations and revenues.

The General Assembly has requested up to ten agencies be selected as pilot agencies to use program measures and a new budget format. The following members of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee have been appointed to select the agencies and continue to review this effort: Representatives McLellan, Kirsh, McAbee, Evatt; and Senators Waddell, Lindsay and Leatherman.

The Committee met and selected the following agencies:

- Alcoholic Beverage Control Commission
- Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission
- Coastal Council
- Criminal Justice Academy
- Highways and Public Transportation
- Parole and Community Corrections
- Veterans Affairs
- Vocational Rehabilitation

The Committee directed the staff to closely monitor the time and effort involved in providing the program measures. The Committee wants to be absolutely certain that no new employees are added by state agencies or central state government in order to provide these program measures. Depending upon the reaction to and use of these measures, there will be data to show man-hours involved in their preparation, and the General Assembly can weigh the costs versus the benefits of providing this information in the future.

The Kingfish Comes to Columbia:
Huey Long's 1935 Visit and the General Assembly

Background: The Kingfish

Fifty years ago this month, Huey Long was assassinated in the state capitol in Louisiana. Long was one of the most controversial figures of this century, arousing intense and emotional reactions far beyond the borders of his native state. Both as Governor and Senator, he was a national figure.

Nicknamed "The Kingfish," Long promoted his own program to end the Depression of the Thirties. Promising to make "Every man a king," the Kingfish developed his "Share Our Wealth Program." He promised every family a "homestead of \$5,000, enough for "a home, an automobile, a radio, and the ordinary conveniences." The government would also guarantee an annual family income of \$2,000 to \$3,000; pensions for the elderly; and free college educations.

"Share Our Wealth" proposed to do just that: the program would be paid through taxes on capital. No family would own a fortune of more than 5 million dollars (300 times the fortune of the average family, as Huey Long pointed out); and taxes would prevent any family from earning over 1 million dollars a year.

These and other proposals, as well as his often outlandish but always commanding personality, kept Huey Long in the headlines. By the early 1930s, it was starting to look as if the Kingfish was seriously interested in challenging Franklin Roosevelt for the 1936 Democratic nomination.

Here Comes the Kingfish

In February, 1935, Long began a speaking tour of the country. In March he came to Columbia to speak to a student audience at USC. Long had carefully planned the event himself, sending Share Our Wealth student organizers from Louisiana State University to Columbia; the LSU students secured an invitation for the Kingfish.

Long appears to have been using South Carolina as a test state for his strength against the President. He is reported to have told an associate: "South Carolina is the strongest state for Roosevelt. If I can sell myself here, I can sell myself anywhere."

By the time Huey got to Columbia, however, efforts had been made to deny him a platform from which to make his sales pitch.

Concurrent Resolution: Stay out of South Carolina

By March 13, the General Assembly was considering the following concurrent resolution:

Whereas, Senator Huey P. Long, of the State of Louisiana, is regarded by many of the people of our State as a public enemy, now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the said Huey P. Long is hereby requested not to visit the State of South Carolina; that the Clerk of this House do transmit a copy hereof to the said Huey P. Long.

Debate followed, and the motion was tabled. However, Representative A.G. Sloan asked that the following be printed in the journal:

With reference to the visit of Czar Huey P. Long to our State I desire that the records show that I am opposed to him or any one of his kind "if there by any such" coming into our State to tear down and destroy the policies of our President. In his invitation to our State, I am inclined to paraphrase what the Poet said, and say

Ill fares that land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where hybrid politics rule and men decay.

[JOURNAL of the House, Wednesday, March 13, 1935]

House Resolution: Stay out of the Capitol

Representative Sloan was not done with the Kingfish, however. Along with Representative Gibson he introduced a Resolution asking if permission had been granted for "Huey P. Long, U.S. Senator from Louisiana to use the State House for the purpose of making a public address." The Resolution stated there was concern, because Long's public record had been characterized by:

(1) his nullification in his "dependency" of Louisiana of every traditional American right of freedom, such as, for example, freedom of speech, free press, free assembly, and representative government; (2) by his resort to armed force in the administration of diabolical edicts wrought from a subservient General Assembly of his own selection; (3) by his repeated and constant attacks upon the present National Democratic Administration, particularly upon President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and by his more or less successful efforts, with the assistance and encouragement of Republican spokesman for privilege, to impede and hinder the present Administration; and, lastly, by the extraordinary courage of his personal body-guards...

The resolution was tabled.

House Resolution; No Invitation or Encouragement

One more time, the House turned to the question of who had invited the Kingfish into the State, and where he was going to speak. A Resolution was introduced carefully pointing out that the General Assembly had nothing to do with any of this:

Whereas, the United States Senator from Louisiana, Huey P. Long, has been invited by some individual or groups of persons to visit the State of South Carolina and to delivery one or more addresses in this State, and

Whereas, the report is current that an invitation was extended by, or on behalf of, the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, and

Whereas, said report is untrue and no such invitation has been extended, and

Whereas, the said Huey P. Long is known as one of the chief opponents of the President of the United States and his administration and policies, and

Whereas, the South Carolina General Assembly is in hearty accord with our great President and his policies, and

Whereas, it is beyond the prerogative of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina to prohibit any person to visit this State or to deny to him the right to address any assemblage within the State of South Carolina, now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives:

That the proposed visit of the said Huey P. Long to the State of South Carolina is wholly without invitation or encouragement on the part of this House.

During debate, Messrs. J.W. Lewis and J.W. Brown proposed the following amendment:

Amend by inserting at the end the following: "Provided that Senator Long is invited to speak within the confines of the State Penitentiary."

The amendment was tabled, but the Resolution was adopted.

The Kingfish Comes to Town

Long reached Columbia on March 23. The controversy over his speaking had spread from the State House to the University. Faculty members at USC were seeking to block his appearance on campus; Long cancelled the "official" speech and met with a large crowd of students in the University dining hall.

Legislative Update, September 1985

Later, according to Long's biographer T. Harry Williams, the Kingfish visited Governor Olin D. Johnston, "who had made it obvious that he did not want to be called on..." Long told the Governor he would like to speak on the capitol grounds. As Williams notes, "The denial of a forum at the university had been well publicized in the local press, and Johnston could hardly deny the request."

So the Huey Long got his chance to speak. Estimates of the crowd ranged from 5,000 to 14,000 persons. The *State* gave the lower estimate, and ran the following headline: "Quiet Crowd Hears Address of Kingfish; Senator Long of Louisiana Fails to Evoke Any Sweeping Enthusiasm."

In his remarks, the Kingfish criticized certain policies of Roosevelt while proclaiming, "I love the man, and but for me, he would not be president." He warmed to his real subject, attacked concentrated riches, and extolled the virtues of his Share Our Wealth Program. After this it was on to a tour of the state, arousing support--and opposition--everywhere he appeared.

Kingfish supporters claimed 60,000 persons in South Carolina enrolled in Share Our Wealth clubs. They also said that a straw poll taken during his visit showed 140,000 persons would vote Long for president. On the other hand, the Democratic party leaders and office holders had kept their distance. It seemed as if a disastrous conflict loomed for the party.

Six months later, Huey Long was dead in Louisiana. Fifty years later, the memories and passions aroused by the Kingfish are still alive.

Prisons For Profit

Editor's Note: First published in Legislative Update last session, this research report is reprinted here at the request of several members who are interested in the topic of privatization of prisons. As you may be aware, the Jail and Prison Overcrowding Project of the State Reorganization Commission recently launched a study on this topic.

Background

There has been a lot of attention directed toward the South Carolina correctional system recently due to the lawsuit filed against the state by an inmate because of overcrowded conditions. The case of Nelson v. Leeke was settled on terms that will require the state to build new prisons. The probable closing of Central Correctional Institution has also helped to focus attention on possible solutions to the problems facing South Carolina's prisons.

More than 432,000 Americans are being held in state and federal prisons--a figure that has increased by 80,000 in the past two years. For the last three years, the number of people held in state and federal prisons has been increasing by about 11 percent a year. California leads the nation with 37,000 inmates, up 74 percent since the beginning of this decade. All told, the combined U.S. prison and jail population exceeds 644,000; a community more populous than St. Louis, Boston, Seattle, Denver, Alaska, Wyoming, Vermont, or Delaware.

Many states are finding they do not have the resources available to build more jails for this ever increasing population. Even when resources are available, often the required procedure for building additional prisons takes years. The nation's prisons are already operating at 110 percent of capacity and at least eight states are under court orders to alleviate overcrowding in their jails.

The problem has inspired some strange solutions. Texas prisoners have been kept in tents. Legislators have proposed sending convicts to penal colonies without walls in Alaska, placing them in comas for the duration of their sentences, and forcing them to shave their heads, don day-glo uniforms and work menial jobs for municipalities.

The problems of overcrowding and substandard living conditions are affecting prisons nationwide, and many states are wondering if the solutions lie within the private sector. Prisons for profit are the newest trend in dealing with the astronomical cost of running a prison. Private companies seem ready to take up where the state and federal government leaves off.

Economic Factors

First, private corporations are able to complete construction of facilities much faster than the state. Because of bidding requirements and other regulations and procedures, some state facilities can take as long as five years to build, whereas a private company can complete a comparable one in as little as seven months. Second, the companies are able to use nonunion labor which is more cost efficient and they gain tax credits for construction. Thus, there is substantial savings in operating costs; in some cases, 30% or more.

Corrections Corporation of America is the owner of a minimum-security jail in Houston, Texas, capable of housing 350 illegal aliens awaiting deportation. CCA is charging the Immigration and Naturalization Service \$24 a day per inmate—one third less than it now costs the agency. Nationwide, keeping an inmate in prison costs about \$75,000 a year. Joseph Fenton, executive vice president of Buckingham Security, says his company can operate its prison for about \$25,000 an inmate.

The federal government alone now spends \$21 million a year housing 3,200 inmates in 300 privately run structures. Many states are following this practice. "Many public officials hate running jails and find it attractive to get the problem off their backs while saving tax money," said Anthony Travisono, director of the American Correctional Association, in a July 1984 U.S News and World Report article.

Who Uses Private Companies?

Most likely to use the private sector are jurisdictions whose voters are reluctant to finance the replacement of archaic prisons. For example, in New Mexico, where many jails are overcrowded or below par, legislators authorized counties to contract out the building or operation of new facilities. CCA is negotiating such contracts with county officials in a half-dozen states.

Federal officials who must deal with the influx of illegal aliens also use private companies, such as the Houston facility owned by CCA.

Current State of Profit Prisons

The first breakthrough of private industry into the corrections field was in Florida in 1982 when the state signed a contract with the nonprofit Eckerd Foundation to run a state prison for 400 juvenile delinquents. CCA's 350-bed prison in Houston was one of the first big contracts to be made with a for-profit firm. In the works is a 722-bed private institution in Pittsburgh designed to house informants and other inmates who need special protection behind bars. Another firm has signed tentative agreements with eight states to house such prisoners.

Nearly 20 states are negotiating to go private with some of their jails. Behavioral Systems Southwest has already set up detention centers for the Immigration and Naturalization Service in California, Colorado, and Arizona.

How Much Profit is There?

So far, no one is getting rich. RCA Service Co., a unit of Radio Corporation of America, has run a prison for juveniles convicted of serious crimes and has made only "modest" profits. Companies like CCA don't expect to make profits right away. They are using their jails in operation as showplaces to attract clients.

Big money will only come if these companies can crack the market for housing dangerous prisoners. This market will probably remain small however, because most states ban private ownership of maximum-security prisons. For most companies, the financial dangers may also be too great: one riot and the resulting lawsuits could mean bankruptcy.

Corporation Guarantees

Companies like CCA and ACA claim that they are insured to accept full responsibility for any charges of mistreatment of inmates.

Bobby Brantley of CCA stated in a November 1984 segment of 60 Minutes, "...if possible, (we) would even insist that anyone we contract with have someone from that entity who would monitor what we do. We want you looking over our shoulder....But if you are sued, our attorneys will defend you in that suit. If any damages are awarded those damages will be borne by CCA and, thereby, we will reduce the liability exposure of your state."

Arguments Against Private Prisons

A survey for the National Institute of Corrections found that three-fourths of state corrections directors would not consider contracting out an entire prison to a private firm. Some officials feared that they would be legally liable if contract guards mistreated inmates. Others, the study reported, are "doubtful that private-sector firms could actually deliver the service at the cost they quoted."

Public-employee unions maintain that private companies would hire unqualified guards at even less money than the already low pay many prison workers currently earn.

Many critics feel that the government is more qualified to supervise convicts behind bars than profit-making companies. Lee Saunders of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, which represents 40,000 corrections workers, maintained in a U.S. News and World Report article that, "Only government should be limiting people's freedom."

Sandy Rabinowitz, director of the Houston office of the American Civil Liberties Union was quoted in Newsweek as saying, "Food and medical care isn't terrific now. It's easy to see everything going downhill rapidly once money is involved."

There are some civil-rights lawyers among those that do not feel profit-making firms should be allowed to operate prisons. They fear that once strict state supervision is removed, abuses might go unchecked. Local officials fear that they would end up paying for any abuses against prisoners committed by private jailers.

Arguments For Private Prisons

Aside from the economic edge, owners of prison companies feel there are other advantages in using their services.

Flexibility is one advantage. "Government bureaucracy takes a long time to act," says T. Don Hutto of CCA. Some people maintain that injecting a profit motive gives jailers an incentive not only to improve physical surroundings but also to better the lot of prisoners under their charge. Ted Nissen, head of Behavioral Systems Southwest contends, "No one is held accountable now for those who come out of prison, but I work to get jobs for my residents. If I don't, I may lose my contract." In other words, the private prisons are concerned with finding jobs for their prisoners to show that they are doing their job successfully. This is beneficial to the private companies as well as the prisoner.

Conclusion

South Carolina currently faces the decision of what to do about overcrowding in our prisons and whether to renovate CCI or close it down and build a new facility. Corrections officials said up to \$100 million would be needed to build the two 600-bed minimum-to-maximum security facilities that would be needed to replace CCI. The state is also being required to build new prisons as part of the proposed settlement of an inmate's prison overcrowding lawsuit. The state will, of course, be faced with the issue of how to raise the money to build and operate these much needed facilities; CCA and other private correctional services would probably contend they have the solution.

Around the House

"Landmines or Goldmines": NCSL Health Committee Meets in Greenville

The Health and Human Services Committee of the National Conference of State Legislatures will hold a rare, "break-away" meeting in Greenville, September 25-28. The title of the meeting is "Landmines or Goldmines: Health and Human Services in the '80's." Participants from across the United States will discuss a number of health-related issues, and how those issues affect state legislatures.

Representative Thomas Marchant, Vice-Chairman of the NCSL Committee, was instrumental in having the Committee meet away from its usual site in Washington, D.C. According to the preliminary agenda, topics at the meeting will include such issues as:

"Living Better Through Fitness," "Business Coalitions: Successful State Examples," "Organ Transplants: Issues and Answers for State Legislators," "Medical Malpractice," "Emerging Health Care Issues in the 1980's," and "For Profit Hospital Care."

A number of House members are scheduled to take part in the event. Rep. David Wilkins will welcome participants on Thursday; and at the Plenary Luncheon on that date Rep. David Hawkins will introduce James Edwards of MUSC, speaking on "Accessibility to Health Care."

Rep. Robert Helmly will moderate a panel on the subject of "Health Care for the Medically Indigent." Rep. Parker Evatt will moderate another discussion on the topic of "Open Drug Formulary vs. Closed Drug Formulary." On Friday, Rep. Sara Shelton will introduce Rep. Herb Kirsh, who will discuss the Human Services Integration Project successfully operated in York County.

Finally, at the Plenary Luncheon on Friday, Speaker of the House Ramon Schwartz will briefly address the participants.