SENATE—*Friday, May 18, 1984*

(Legislative day of Monday, May 14, 1984)

The Senate met at 8:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable GORDON J. HUMPHREY, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Father in Heaven, as the end of this busy week nears we remember our families. Grant that these next 2 days, in spite of all the responsibility which Senators bear, may be a time of family unity, strengthening and maturing love. Senators are important people—important to constituents—important to the Nation and the world—but also very important to their families. Grant them grace not to take themselves so seriously in their work that they transmit senatorial importance into their homes. Help them to be loving, thoughtful, caring spouses and parents this weekend.

Help us all Lord, who are privileged to work in this place, never to be carried away by self-importance. May we remember that we are servants of the servants of the people. In the name of the Servant who washed His disciples' feet. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1984.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable GORDON J. HUMPHREY, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HUMPHREY thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the majority leader is recognized for not to exceed 3 minutes.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I first thank the minority leader for agreeing that we could reduce the time for the two leaders under the standing order to 3 minutes each.

May I say that it is the hope of the leadership on this side that we can reach the first concurrent budget resolution early and that we can finish it before noon. There may be other matters that we can deal with after that time. However, the first concurrent budget resolution appears to be the first item of importance, and therefore I urge Senators to consider that there may be votes early today, as early perhaps as 9 a.m.

Mr. President, at 9 o'clock, it is the intention of the leadership on this side to ask the Senate to turn to the consideration of one of two matters, either House Concurrent Resolution 304, which is a resolution of the Senate in respect to Dr. Sakharov on which the yeas and nays have been ordered, or to return to the first concurrent resolution. It is still the hope of the leadership on this side that we can obtain a unanimous-consent agreement on a limitation of time of perhaps 2 hours for the consideration of the first concurrent budget resolution.

Mr. President, what I am about to say is in no way meant to be a challenge and certainly not as a threat but simply a statement of fact.

Given the facts and circumstances, if we cannot obtain unanimous consent, it would be the intention of the leadership on this side to attempt by motion, as provided under the statute, to set a lesser time than that contemplated as the maximum time for the resolution. I will confer further with the minority leader on this point and, of course, the two managers. But I say this so Members will be aware of the fact that we must face this issue, that there will be votes today, and there may be several votes today.

ORDER FOR PERIOD FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the two leaders are recognized under the abbreviated standing order, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business until 9 a.m. in which Senators may speak for not more than 3 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

OMNIBUS DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT OF 1984

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, it is always with a sense of something akin to relief that I greet the conclusion of a legislative item of the magnitude of the deficit reduction measure passed by this body yesterday. Rarely do I remember, however, that feeling being of such a pronounced character as is the case in this instance. I venture that I share that sentiment with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and that is due to the tremendous investment of time and energy made by so many Members of the Senate. There were, as always, honest differences of opinion as to the most effective means of dealing with the budgetary circumstances which face our Nation, and those differences caused much gnashing of teeth among members of both parties, as well as some late night sessions along the way. Yet somehow the Senate always manages to resolve those competing points of view and press ahead with the business at hand. Although it has taken over 100 hours in this instance, we have again conformed to convention.

Yet Mr. President, I would be negligent were I to praise this body's work only in an institutional context for it is only through the considerable efforts of many individuals that we have passed these budgetary matters. I wish to thank and congratulate first and foremost the esteemed chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI. His hard work and direction never go unnoticed though they too often go unpraised. I must rush to point out, however, the important contributions of the chairmen of the other money committees, Senator HATFIELD of Appropriations, Senator DOLE of Finance, and Senator GARN of Banking. All have been instrumental in guiding the deficit reduction package through this body. Possibly of more note than their respective roles here on the floor, however, is their participation in the negotiations conducted with the administration back in March, which led ultimately to the formulation of the rose garden agreement without which we might still be debating. On that point I must also acknowledge the participation and good

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

counsel of Senators LAXALT and TOWER. Yet notwithstanding the efforts of all these aforementioned individuals, it might all have gone for naught but for the cooperation of the ranking members of the several involved committees and I sincerely accord warm praise to those gentlemen, Senator CHILES of Budget, Senator STENNIS of Appropriations, Senator LONG of Finance, and Senator PROXMIRE of Banking. I wish also to note separately the floor activity of Senator DURENBERGER. His assistance on health related issues was certainly helpful and is, I am sure, widely appreciated. Obviously, I have neglected to mention one individual without whose cooperation nothing would ever be accomplished, and that is, of course, my counterpart, the distinguished minority leader, Senator BYRD. My thanks to him knows no bounds.

Six weeks on a single legislative vehicle is an inordinate period for consideration. Yet all the collected efforts of the previous 5 weeks might have dissolved in the last week without the capable cooperation of several Senators. Senators MCCLURE, WEICKER, CHAFEE, and NICKLES were all extremely helpful in ironing out the details of several amendments which paved the way for final passage of the bill. I thank them as should we all.

One might think, Mr. President, that the effusive nature of my remarks in regard to the role of Senators on this bill would indicate that at this point I have thanked all the necessary parties. Nothing could be any further from the truth, for in point of fact, I have yet to mention those individuals who have truly made passage of this legislation possible. I am referring, of course, to the various staff involved. Recognition and thanks are due to a large number of individuals, most of whom will remain, as a matter of necessity, unnamed. I do wish to thank the staff director of the Budget Committee, Steve Bell, for his usual high degree of effective assistance and offer the same to his counterpart on the minority, Rick Brandon. Senators have also benefited again from the able guidance of Finance Committee staff director, Rod DeArment and minority director, Mike Stern in the drafting of the revenue provisions of the bill. And the professional staff of the Appropriations Committee, led by staff director Keith Kennedy, have also played an instrumental role in the Senate's consideration and passage of this bill. Finally, let me thank the many staff members of Senators and committees who have had a hand in the creation and passage of this bill, especially the floor staff who insure that Senate business proceeds in an orderly manner. It often seems to be the fashion of so-called objective observers to decry the usefulness and growth of Senate staff. On that point I wish only to voice an opinion which I believe is unanimously held among Senators, that I truly wonder what little we might accomplish in the Senate without the dedicated assistance of those individuals who choose to serve on the various staffs of the Senate.

Mr. President, I have gone on longer than I intended. It seems that that is often the case when I attempt to thank and congratulate the many individuals who contribute to a job well done. It is a burden which I joyfully bear though, and which I look forward to bearing again, hopefully in the near future.

Mr. President, do I have any time remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty seconds.

Mr. BAKER. I yield it to the minority leader.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the majority leader.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Democratic leader is recognized for not to exceed 3 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

COAL EXPORTS AND THE JAPAN-U.S. COAL MISSION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on Monday of this week I met with the leaders of the Japan-U.S. Coal Mission to discuss coal trade issues. U.S.-Japan trade relations are approaching a crossroads. Last year, the United States' trade deficit with Japan exceeded $20 billion. This is the largest trade deficit between any two nations in history. In the first quarter of this year, our trade deficit with Japan was $7.3 billion. In April of this year our trade deficit was a record $3.03 billion. It is not surprising that there is growing concern among my colleagues with regard to the impact of such deficits on the American economy. Clearly, we cannot sustain that kind of imbalance indefinitely.

Last month Prime Minister Nakasone announced a series of measures designed to improve access for American products to Japanese markets. In conjunction with the recent announcement with regard to increased Japanese imports of beef and citrus products from the United States, I hope this is the beginning of a positive trend. I hope that these gestures represent the beginnings of a more realistic trade policy. I welcome such initiatives.

These rays of hope will not dispell the gathering storm clouds which darken the horizon of future trade relations with Japan. Indeed, legislation imposing steel quotas and domestic content legislation have been introduced in this Congress. These bills have growing support as a result of the tensions between our two nations on trade issues. If adopted, these measures would necessitate significant changes in the economic relationship between Japan and the United States. But without tangible signs of an improvement in U.S.-Japan trade relations, adoption of such legislation is not inconceivable.

I remain guardedly optimistic that the continuing talks between the United States and Japan will be productive, and that we can resolve the trade issues which have been the source of growing dissatisfaction. This is so important because Japan is one of our staunchest allies and most important trading partners, especially in such areas as coal trade. The Japan-U.S. Coal Mission represents an important effort to work together in a cooperative and positive fashion to alleviate the tensions arising from the almost 40-percent reduction of Japanese imports of U.S. metallurgical coal from 1982 to 1983. For many years the United States has provided at least one-third of Japan's metallurgical coal requirements. Today, however, the United States has become the "swing supplier" to Japanese coal markets.

This is a matter of grave concern to me, for the reductions of imports of U.S. coal to Japan have had a disproportionate effect on my State of West Virginia. This is due to the fact that West Virginia accounts for almost 50 percent of this Nation's coal exports.

Much of the coal West Virginia exports is high-grade metallurgical coal, and there had been some optimism about the potential for new markets for our high-quality steam coal. Unfortunately, West Virginia already had the dubious distinction of having a 16-percent unemployment rate, the highest in the Nation. The coal industry in West Virginia continues to suffer the ravages of unemployment. For example, West Virginia coal mining employment has declined about 40 percent since 1979. Thus, I am concerned about the state of U.S.-Japan coal trade because the coal export market is one of the keys to the economic future of West Virginia. A healthy export market for our coal means jobs for West Virginia miners and economic growth.

Today, the outlook for coal exports to Japan seems to be very dim. According to estimates by the National Coal Association, U.S. metallurgical coal exports to Japan are expected to decline about 25 percent in 1990 from 1982 levels. The current state of U.S.-Japanese coal trade is not acceptable. To allow the current state of affairs in the area of coal trade to continue only contributes to the sense of frustration felt by many of my colleagues in

Washington with respect to U.S.-Japan trade relations generally. I have been told that the longer term prospects in the next decade are better. However, the gloomy prospect for the period between now and the end of the decade is the basis for my concern. Therefore, I sincerely hope that the efforts of the Japan-U.S. Coal Mission will result in new agreements and arrangements which will help dispell the gathering storm clouds in the near future.

We want to maintain and increase, to at least historical levels, sales of U.S. metallurgical coal to Japan. We also see the prospect of a growing steam coal market in Japan which many States such as West Virginia, can supply with high quality steam coal.

Long-term contracts between producers in this country and Japanese buyers would promote even greater stability of supply at favorable prices. Such contracts would also help establish a degree of predictability and certainty in U.S.-Japan trade relations.

I feel certain that many of my colleagues from coal-producing States share my hope that the Japan-U.S. Coal Mission will identify innovative and constructive approaches to improve coal trade, and to insure flexibility and stability. The success of these efforts could go a long way to relieving some of the frustration felt by many of my colleagues in Washington with respect to trade relations with Japan.

THE SYNTHETIC FUELS CORPORATION AND THE WIDENING WAR IN THE PERSIAN GULF

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this administration seems determined to hasten the end of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, at the very time when events in the Persian Gulf underscore, once again, the reasons that that agency was established by Congress.

It has been reported that the administration will ask Congress to cut $9.5 billion from the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. This would leave the SFC with about $4.6 billion. It is also reported that the administration will seek to require that any use of the remaining funds would be restricted to projects "whose products will not cost significantly more than the projected market price of competing fuels." This is not acceptable. It would mean that few, if any, projects could qualify for SFC financial assistance. Clearly, such a requirement would gut the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. It would make the Nation's synthetic fuels program meaningless.

The administration has also announced its intention to nominate three new members to the Board of the SFC. However, according to several press accounts, Energy Secretary Hodel is reported to have "insisted that it makes no sense to formally submit the names until there is congressional agreement on paring the agency's funding." In other words, until Congress accepts the administration's proposed $9.5 billion cut for the SFC, the names of the Board nominees will be withheld. Mr. President, I find such an approach to be totally unacceptable and preposterous.

I think it is time for the administration to send a full slate of nominees for the Board of Directors to the Senate without delay. New leadership is urgently needed at the Corporation.

The Senate recently passed an amendment offered by the distinguished majority leader which rescinded $2 billion from the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. I opposed that amendment, in part because I think we should be making every effort to strengthen the SFC, not weaken it. But the administration seems to want to condition its support for any such efforts on cuts in synthetic fuels funding. The Senate has agreed to take $2 billion from the SFC. This may not be the exact amount that the administration wanted, but I think it should be sufficient. I think it is now up to the administration to move quickly to get the SFC back on track.

The Synthetic Fuels Corporation has been battered by, if not scandals, certainly by highly questionable ethics and resignations from the Board of Directors. The resignation of Mr. John B. Carter is the most recent. The Board lost a quorum with the resignation of Mr. Victor Thompson on April 27, and Mr. Carter's resignation leaves the Board with only two members. I think it is clear that there is an urgent need for new leadership at the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, and I think the administration should act to address that need. However, I am concerned that the strategic importance of the SFC's mission is clouded by the allegations of misconduct on the part of SFC Board members. The importance of this mission—to provide an insurance policy against the effects of future oil supply disruptions—has been underscored by recent events in the Persian Gulf.

For the past few days there have been reports of a number of Iraqi attacks on oil supertankers in the Persian Gulf. It now appears that the Iranians are also launching such attacks. The effects of such attacks include an increase in insurance rates for oil tankers shipping oil through the Persian Gulf, and the prospect of a shortage of oil tankers. According to a Washington Post report:

> British experts on shipping, oil and maritime insurance said it should become apparent within the next day or two whether, for the first time, there will be a real shortage of tankers willing to enter the spreading war zone of the gulf.

The war is "clearly widening," and the "shipowners have got to decide who is prepared to let their ships go into the gulf at all."

Mr. President, we are faced with the prospect of another disruption in oil supplies from the Persian Gulf. Such a disruption could be devastating, for about 20 percent of the non-Communist world's oil moves through the Persian Gulf. The economic dislocations from a major disruption in Persian Gulf oil would be especially harsh on our allies in Western Europe and Japan, for they are far more dependent upon Arab-OPEC oil than the United States.

We must keep in mind, however, that we would not be insulated from the economic shocks of such an event. Oil price shocks would affect the United States as severely as any of our allies, perhaps. In addition, the United States is a signatory to the International Energy Agreement which obligates us to reduce domestic oil consumption, and to share our oil with 20 other nations in the event of a severe oil supply disruption.

What would happen in the event of a severe supply disruption? During a recent international test of emergency response procedures—which included the United States and other nations—the administration estimated that, under certain conditions, including a closing of the Persian Gulf, the price of oil in the United States could reach $98 per barrel. It is important to point out that this assumed that our allies effectively restrained their oil consumption. Without such restraints, the price was estimated to reach $130 per barrel.

The situation we see unfolding in the Persian Gulf should remind us of the reason the Congress established the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. Unfortunately, the recent moderation in world oil prices, and the recession-induced dampening of world oil demand, have contributed to a sanguine view, on the part of some, of our energy future. Even the Secretary of Energy recently argued that "conditions have changed dramatically since Congress acted by overwhelming margins to create and fund the SFC. We face a much different outlook for energy supply, demand, and prices." If we have learned anything from our past experiences in the energy area, we should have learned that oil supply, demand, and prices are highly volatile. To suggest that the volatility of energy markets has permanently disappeared since the SFC was established reminds me of the story of the man who was falling from a 100-story building. When he fell as far as the 50th floor, he said, "Well, nothing has happened so far."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two

articles from yesterday's Washington Post, one entitled "Saudi Supertanker Is Attacked in Gulf; Iranians Are Accused," and one entitled "Shipping Insurers Raise Rates," and also an article from yesterday's Wall Street Journal entitled "Attack on Saudi Tanker Near Oil Fields Sparks Fears of a Broader War."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 17, 1984]

SAUDI SUPERTANKER IS ATTACKED IN GULF; IRANIANS ARE ACCUSED

(By Jonathan C. Randal)

CAIRO, May 16.—A Saudi Arabian supertanker was set afire in an air strike off the Saudi coast in the Persian Gulf today, and U.S. officials said the attack almost certainly was carried out by Iranian warplanes.

The 212,000-ton Yanbu Pride, which had loaded a cargo of oil at a Kuwaiti port, was hit about 50 miles off the Saudi port of Jubail as the war against gulf shipping—an outgrowth of the 3½-year-old war between Iran and Iraq—escalated.

Five oil tankers have been attacked in the gulf this week, two by Iraq and three apparently by Iran. The development has significantly broadened the hostilities and raised concerns among the world oil and shipping industries about continued operations in the Persian Gulf, where a large portion of the noncommunist world's oil is produced.

In Washington, the State Department expressed concern that the attacks will draw other nations into the war.

"The United States abhors this continued series of attacks on international shipping," State Department spokesman John Hughes said. "It reiterates its firm belief that attacks on international shipping in the Persian Gulf make a dangerous escalation of the Iran-Iraq war and a growing threat to freedom of navigation in international waters."

Major maritime insurers announced that higher "war-risk" premiums have been imposed for the northern third of the Persian Gulf as a result of the spreading attacks on oil tankers, and the Mobil Oil Corp. announced that it has ceased sending its tankers into that portion of the gulf.

No casualties were reported in the attack today on the Yanbu Pride. After the crew and other vessels extinguished the four-hour fire, set off by the rockets, the tanker limped toward Bahrain for repairs.

U.S. officials said American AWACS (Airborne Warning and Control System) aircraft monitored the attack on radar screens and detected only Iranian warplanes in the vicinity, Washington Post staff writer Fred Hiatt reported from Washington.

The U.S. planes alerted Saudi Arabia, which sent two U.S.-made F15 fighter jets to the tanker but apparently were too late to respond.

Two Iranian F4 fighters, part of the U.S.-supplied Air Force built up during the reign of the late shah, had approached the tanker and circled it before attacking, apparently making a positive identification, U.S. officials said.

The AWACS which cannot pick up ship traffic nor see weapons actually being fired, alerted the Saudi Air Force as the F4s approached. The Saudi F15s—part of the 62 bought from the United States—flew out to the tanker and circled it, but did not give chase to the F4s, which they can outperform, U.S. officials said. They said they did not know whether the Saudis deliberately avoided a confrontation with the Iranian jets or simply arrived too late.

The Saudi-led, six-nation Gulf Cooperation Council scheduled a foreign ministers' meeting Thursday to discuss emergency measures to protect shipping in the gulf. The Kuwaiti Cabinet, after a special meeting, openly blamed Iran for the first time for attacks on two Kuwaiti tankers earlier this week.

The Yanbu Pride was only partially loaded after picking up 128,000 tons of Kuwaiti crude oil at Mina Ahmadi port in Kuwait. It was scheduled to pick up some more bunker fuel at Ras Tanura, about 60 miles south of where it was attacked. The tanker is owned by Arab International Maritime Co. in Jiddah, with Mobil Oil Corp. a minority owner.

If its planes carried out the attack, Iran, according to Middle East analysts, appeared to be sending a clear signal to Iraq and its allies that Baghdad's efforts to choke off Iranian oil exports through air power would not go unchallenged.

Hojatoleslam Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, speaker of the Iranian parliament, was quoted by Tehran radio as warning that "if the Kharg Island route is not safeguarded then no other routes in the Persian Gulf will be secure."

Shipping near Kharg Island, through which passes 90 percent of Iran's estimated 1.7 million barrels of oil exports daily, has come under heightened Iraqi air attack since early this month.

As Iraqi President Saddam Hussein has become more desperate in his efforts to blunt Iran's manpower advantage in the war, he has resorted to his acknowledged air superiority to bomb ships trading with Tehran.

By attacking Kuwaiti and Saudi tankers, especially near the Saudi coast, Iran could be warning Iraq's two biggest financial backers to use their influence to halt Baghdad's escalated air attacks on shipping

But the Iranian air operations do not represent the closing of the Strait of Hormuz—through which a sixth of the noncommunist world's oil passes. President Reagan, and before him president Jimmy Carter, have warned that any such Iranian action would prompt American reaction to keep that vital waterway open and operating.

U.S. military officials were said to be watching the situation with concern, but no immediate action seemed likely. The USS Lasalle, the flagship of the Navy's five-ship Middle East force, was reported headed from Bahrain to Karachi for a port call, although it was thought to still be in the gulf.

Four other U.S. combat ships remain in the gulf, and the carrier USS Kitty Hawk with its battle group and F14 fighter jets is on station nearby in the northern Arabian Sea.

The United States has four AWACS, three KC135 tanker planes to refuel the AWACS in midair and more than 500 personnel based in eastern Saudi Arabia. The AWACS' primary mission is to provide early warning of attacks on the vulnerable oil installations along the western side of the gulf, but they have also been monitoring air traffic at the northern end of the gulf where the shooting between Iraq and Iran has been heaviest.

The Saudis receive information by radio from the AWACS and then control their own F15s, U.S. officials in Washington said. Saudi Arabia is reluctant to be seen as cooperating closely with the United States on military matters and would not cede control of its jets to the AWACS operators.

U.S. officials also said today that Iran was flying cargo planes to an island in the Strait of Hormuz, where Iran is known to have artillery, and was unloading equipment there, Hiatt reported. The officials said they did not yet know the nature of the equipment or the significance of the sighting.

Despite Kuwait's condemnation of Iranian attacks, Saudi Arabia, the most important Arab power in the gulf, today adopted a neutral stance. A statement issued by the official Saudi press agency did not mention Iran but merely expressed Saudi Arabia' determination to "end such excess, in cooperation and consultation with its sisters in the Gulf Cooperation Council."

Since the outbreak of hostilities, the Arab gulf states have been torn between fears of the Iranian revolution spilling over and destroying their governments and the growing danger and cost of supporting an increasingly desperate Iraq.

Ironically, some of the shipping attacked by Iraqi aircraft in Iranian waters belonged to either nationals or government-owned companies of Arab states in the gulf. Thus Iraq's allies were being punished by Iraq for helping finance Iran's war effort through oil exports.

As recently as May 9, Saudi Oil Minister Ahmed Zaki Yamani sought to gloss over Iraq's attacks on two Saudi tankers near Kharg Island, saying that the attacks were not deliberate and "it is difficult for military aircraft to distinguish and identify such targets."

[From the Washington Post, May 17, 1984]

SHIPPING INSURERS RAISE RATES

HIGHER PREMIUMS IMPOSED AFTER ATTACKS IN PERSIAN GULF

(By Michael Getler)

LONDON, May 16.—Major maritime insurers announced today that higher "war-risk" premiums have been imposed for the entire northern third of the Persian Gulf as a result of the spreading attacks on oil tankers in the area.

The announcement, made by Lloyd's underwriters before a Saudi Arabian supertanker was rocketed off the Saudi coast today, came as the Mobil Oil Corp. announced that it has ceased sending its tankers into the northern portion of the gulf and other major petroleum companies said they are considering similar limitations.

The two moves, along with a nervous jump in the price of oil on the European spot market, reflected growing concern in the oil and shipping industry at the sudden escalation of attacks on tankers in the Persian Gulf, where until recently Iran and Iraq had kept their 3½-year-old war largely to themselves.

Some U.S. oil industry officials and analysts said the attacks on three Saudi tankers in the past four days marked the most significant disruption of oil trading since the war began. Until now, they said, the attacks had caused little effect on prices because shipping had not been seriously interrupted.

British experts on shipping, oil and maritime insurance said it should become apparent within the next day or two whether, for the first time, there will be a real shortage of tankers willing to enter the spreading war zone of the gulf.

"In the past," said a member of one of London's largest ship brokerage houses, "there have always been owners ready to take risks." But now, he said, the war be-

tween Iran and Iraq "is clearly widening" to other parts of the gulf and the latest air attacks, reported to have been carried out by Iranian planes, "do not seem to have been random."

"The shipowners have got to decide who is prepared to let their ships go into the gulf at all," another specialist said.

By most estimates, a shutdown of oil shipping from Persian Gulf would reduce the amount of crude oil available to the world market by 3 million to 4 million barrels a day, about one-tenth of the normal daily consumption by the noncommunist countries.

Because of surplus supplies and large strategic reserves built up by many countries, however, such a reduction would not cause a serious crisis for months, analysts said, although several said it could raise prices noticeably.

Lloyd's international insurance underwriters, which had announced major premium increases earlier in the week for tankers operating near Iranian ports, announced today that its War Risks Rating Committee had expanded the area in which the higher rates applied, to include the northern third of the Persian Gulf.

All of the ports of Kuwait, where the Saudi tanker hit today had taken on its cargo, are now inside the high-premium area, as is a portion of the Saudi coast.

Spokesmen for Lloyd's denied rumors that marine underwriters had ceased to insure vessels trading in the gulf. But they expressed "serious concern" about the spreading gulf war and scheduled a news conference for Thursday on the situation, among hints that premiums could rise higher.

On Monday, Lloyd's announced that war-risk insurance covering a ship's hull and machinery—but not cargo, which is insured separately and negotiated on an individual basis—was going up to 3 percent of the vessel's insured value.

The increase was the third this week. Before May 8, the rate for ships entering the war-risk zone had been 1 percent. Rates elsewhere in the gulf, away from the zone, also jumped, from 0.075 percent to 0.25 percent.

The widening attacks in the gulf pushed the spot oil market sharply higher, at least temporarily. The price for Britain's North Sea Brent, Europe's most widely traded crude, jumped briefly from $29.75 a barrel yesterday to $30.70 today, its highest levels since last September. Spot prices dropped from their peaks later today, but still remained above previous levels.

Oil specialists here said the increase was not a result of any shortage and that it appeared mostly to be a "nervous reaction" based on "anxiety over the increased tensions." Nevertheless, they said the implications for the supply of oil were not clear.

Here in London, members of the Merchant Navy Officers Association and the General Council of British Shipping met through the day "to consider under what circumstances they might sail into the gulf," one specialist said. "I think we will start seeing decisions in a day or two and that will tell us if there will be a shortage of ships."

The Japanese, he pointed out, for some time now have been reluctant to allow their vessels into gulf waters "and I think this is going to widen to other countries, and possibly to be major oil companies. At least they are thinking about it."

At least 22 supertankers reportedly are anchored just outside the Strait of Hormuz, unwilling to enter it, although several have been there for some time, waiting for prices on the world market to rise.

(Washington Post staff writer Dale Russakoff reported from Washington:)

Industry analysts cautioned that moves by major oil companies to cease sending their tankers into the northern part of the gulf would not prohibit movement of chartered vessels into the zone where oil tankers have come under increasing attack. But they said prolonged disruptions could have serious repercussions for world prices.

Mobil's ban covers ports north of the Saudi oil export terminal of Ras Tanurah, the largest in the gulf. Mobil officials said they imposed the travel restrictions on May 2, "based on our assessment of the situation," well before today's attack on the Saudi tanker, in which Mobil owned a minority share.

Standard Oil of California and Exxon Corp. said they are monitoring the situation closely. British Petroleum and Standard Oil are not scheduled to send fleets into the northern gulf until later this month. Exxon would not confirm a report that it had also cut shipments north of Ras Tanurah.

"For the time being, we are continuing to operate in the gulf," a spokesman said.

Mobil would not say how much of its oil would be affected by the decision to stay out of Kuwaiti ports.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 17, 1984]

ATTACK ON SAUDI TANKER NEAR OIL FIELDS SPARKS FEARS OF A BROADER WAR

(By David Ignatius and Gerald F. Seib)

WASHINGTON.—The Iran-Iraq war is moving dangerously close to Saudi Arabia's oil fields—raising the risk of a wider war in the Persian Gulf that could trigger U.S. military involvement.

Fears that the war will escalate increased yesterday among U.S. officials and oil-industry executives after an Iranian fighter jet attacked a large Saudi oil tanker. The vessel, the Yanbu Pride, was just 35 miles off the Saudi cost and near the kingdom's major oil-loading port at Ras Tanura. Yesterday's attack followed Iranian raids earlier this week on two Kuwaiti tankers—and previous raids by Iraqi planes on tankers using Iranian oil facilities.

Though the Iranian attacks haven't yet halted oil shipping in the gulf, U.S. officials are sounding alarm bells. "The attacks on international shipping in the Persian Gulf represent a dangerous escalation of the Iran-Iraq war with a growing threat of freedom of navigation," says State Department spokesman John Hughes.

For U.S. officials, this week's Iranian raids are starting to look like a nightmare come true. One senior administration official says he believes the Iranians have adopted a "tit-for-tat strategy" in response to Iraqi raids on Iranian oil traffic. Another senior official warns: "The Iranians will continue to escalate their military actions (against the Saudis and Kuwaitis) . . . until they're stopped" by military force.

READY TO HELP

The latest Iranian attacks apparently have frightened Saudi Arabia as well. The Saudis, who have been implacably opposed to any U.S. intervention, now are understood to be leaning toward acceptance of U.S., British and French escorts in international waters, of tankers serving gulf oil ports. The three countries already have ships in and around the gulf. And, according to a senior U.S. official, if the Saudis request American military help, the U.S. is ready to send a squadron of interceptor aircraft and air-defense ships into the gulf to shoot down attacking Iranian planes.

The Saudis, who aren't noted for taking decisive action in crises, haven't yet asked for U.S. help. The oil kingdom is expected to decide its strategy for responding to the Iranian attacks at an emergency meeting today at the Gulf Cooperation Council, a Saudi-dominated alliance of Persian Gulf oil states.

President Reagan has pledged that the U.S. won't allow Iran to close the Strait of Hormuz, the narrow waterway at the entrance to the gulf. Administration officials say privately that the U.S. is also prepared to use its military power to maintain freedom of navigation in the gulf itself, but that it will do so only in coordination with European and gulf allies.

The Iranians don't show any sign of backing down. The speaker of Iran's Parliament, Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, warned yesterday that Iran's attacks on gulf shipping will continue until Iraq stops attacking Iranian oil traffic. "Either the Persian Gulf will be safe for all or for no one," Mr. Rafsanjani said in a statement released by the official Iranian news agency.

Despite oil-market jitters, tanker traffic still is moving in the gulf. But at least one major oil company—Standard Oil Co. of California—was debating yesterday whether to send a tanker into the area next week. Mobil Oil Corp. already had instructed its tankers to stay clear of the trouble area in the gulf. Lawrence Goldstein, senior vice president of the Petroleum Industry Research Foundations, says there is reason to be "very, very nervous about what's going on in the gulf."

DANGEROUS NEW PHASE

After nearly four years of fighting, the Iraq-Iran war appears to have entered a dangerous new phase. For the first time, both exhausted combatants seem determined to raise the stakes in the gulf war so high that Western powers such as the U.S. will be forced to try to find some way to end the conflict.

What makes the latest attacks so ominous is that they come from Iran, not Iraq. Because Iraq is an Arab nation, Saudi Arabia and other Arab oil producers in the gulf have never feared that Iraq would escalate from attacking tankers to assaulting Arab oil facilities. But the Saudis and other oil sheikdoms in the gulf are frightened that Iran may now extend the war by striking at major Arab oil facilities.

Apparently Lloyd's, the big London insurance exchange, is fearful too. Underwriters at Lloyd's met yesterday and reportedly decided to again raise rates on tankers servicing Saudi Arabia. Although Lloyd's won't confirm these reports from sources close to the Saudis, Zaki Yamani, the Saudi oil minister, is flying to London today to discuss Lloyd's action. Premiums already have gone up 50 percent for vessels stopping at Kharg Island, Iran's major oil port, and premiums have tripled since Monday for vessels in other parts of the gulf.

Because of the continuing oil glut, the attacks on gulf shipping haven't produced any price explosion. Futures prices went up sharply yesterday morning after the first reports of the attack on the Saudi tanker, but the market calmed somewhat yesterday afternoon. In Europe, the spot market was

active, but less busy than the futures market.

The Persian Gulf, while less important as a source of oil than it was in the 1970s, still provides 20 percent of the noncommunist world's oil supplies. Europe and Japan depend far more on gulf shipments than the U.S., and they would face some difficult adjustments if gulf shipping lanes were closed.

William Brown, an oil analyst at Kidder Peabody & Co., says there always will be a shipper willing to go to the gulf, but it is getting a lot more expensive. He says the cost of shipping oil from the gulf to Europe has gone from about $1.08 a barrel on May 7 to about $2.90 now. This includes the shippers' higher insurance premiums and a "people premium," which is the extra money paid crews to risk their necks.

The wild card in Iran's deck is terrorism. A senior U.S. official says the Iranians "have been training people in seaborne terrorist operations," including the use of small boats to attack oil tankers. American officials also claim that the Iranians are training dissident Shiite Moslems from Bahrain, Saudi Arabia and other gulf states for subversion and sabotage missions.

The U.S. is confident that it can deal with any Iranian effort to close the Strait of Hormuz by mining or a naval blockade. The U.S. aircraft carrier Kitty Hawk and five support ships are currently just outside the strait, and mine sweepers could be moved to the area quickly. A senior U.S. official says he doubts that the Iranians will tangle with these forces.

Instead, Iran's strategy seems to be to attack the weak links in the gulf—Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, Iraq's main financial backers—in an effort to choke their oil exports. But this strategy risks provoking direct American intervention.

The Saudis would prefer to defend themselves without any more U.S. aid. They already have U.S. AWACS radar-surveillance planes, operated by American crews, that have carefully tracked this week's Iranian raids. The Saudis also have F-5 and F-15 fighters stationed near their gulf oil fields, and U.S. sources say the Saudis scrambled several fighters yesterday after an AWACS plane spotted the Iranian attacker.

But U.S. officials believe that if the Iranians escalate their attacks, the Saudis will need direct American assistance. The U.S. is prepared to intervene—with four combat ships in the Persian Gulf and more ships and planes ready to move to the gulf on short notice—but officials say the U.S. won't get involved unless it is asked to do so. "They (the Saudis) have to ask for our help," says one senior official.

American officials began making contingency plans months ago to deal with the sort of crisis that is developing now. The plans call for U.S. British and French warships to escort tankers through the gulf, and for the U.S. to move warplanes to Saudi Arabia or Bahrain. But when an American team headed by assistant Secretary of State Richard Murphy visited Saudi Arabia last month to negotiate details about U.S. access to Saudi bases in the event of a crisis, they didn't make any headway.

U.S. government officials seemed more concerned about the Iranian attacks yesterday than were oil executives. That's partly because the Reagan administration—smarting over recent reversals in the Middle East—is determined to take a strong stand against any Iranian threat to oil shipments.

Some U.S. officials are convinced that the Iranians can only be contained through military force. "Passive strategies aren't enough," says one administration official.

Perhaps the best hope for limiting disruption in the gulf lies in the weaknesses of Iran's military. Iran's arsenal of weapons, acquired largely from the U.S. before the Ayatollah Khomeini took power, has deteriorated during the course of its four-year war with Iraq.

U.S. officials estimate that Iran may have 30 to 50 combat aircraft still capable of flying. And some Pentagon analysts think Iran may lack truly effective air-to-sea missiles. The attacks on tankers so far appear to have been carried out by F-4s, generally equipped with Sidewinder or Sparrow missiles. Those weapons are designed mostly for air-to-air combat, rather than for taking out ships, defense officials said. U.S. officials noted that the tanker hit yesterday by two missiles remained afloat after the strike.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) whatever time I have remaining.

HOW TO REDUCE NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS COSTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, why did the Congress some 40 years ago decide to combine all of our military departments in the Defense Department? Obviously the Congress wanted one coordinated military effort. It recognized that throughout our history the Navy, the Army and, more recently, the Air Force had competed wastefully for missions, for jurisdiction, for power, and especially for funds. The Congress handed the new Secretary of Defense one preeminent goal: to pull the different branches of our military establishment together for the single purpose of providing the military security we need at the most economical cost. No one expects a Secretary of Defense to smother all interservice rivalries. He cannot. If he could, he should not. Those rivalries are natural, predictable, and, within limit, they can be constructive. Unfortunately, however, interservice rivalries can also be immensely expensive. This is especially true if the Secretary of Defense views his prime obligations as representing the services. If the Secretary strives to keep the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force happy, the taxpayer suffers and so does the national defense.

Here is why the most obvious and most universally acclaimed wasteland in our wasteful Federal Government today is the Defense Department. In an editorial on May 15, the New York Times describes the Defense Department as groaning with duplicative weapons. Why? Because all three services insist on fighting for a share of every program. Everybody wants to get into the act. As the New York Times points out:

The Air Force possesses an efficient antitank weapon, the A-10 close support plane. But the Army insists on trying to duplicate the A-10's role with its Apache helicopter.

The Apache cannot do the job. But the Air Force will not let the Army build fixed wing planes.

But duplication is not confined to each service having its own exclusive weapons system. The Air Force works on five different systems for a single purpose, to penetrate Soviet airspace: a new version of the B-52, two kinds of cruise missiles, the B-1B, and the Stealth bomber. The Times highlights these other duplications:

The Air Force's MX missile is designed and will be produced to destroy Soviet MX missile silos. The Navy's D-5 will have the accuracy and power to do precisely the same thing. The Army's Patriot missile comes on to shoot down Soviet bombers. And what does the Air Force's F-16 fighter do? Exactly the same thing.

Even experts in the administration itself recognize how wasteful the Defense Department has become. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, David Stockman, has called the Defense Department a "swamp of waste." William Kauffman, a defense professional has estimated that we could reduce the Defense budget by $45 billion a year without any loss whatsoever in military security.

What Kauffman is talking about is not what the Congress had done for many years and appears on the verge of doing once again this year: the old stretchout. In that futile exercise we keep every last weapon system alive. We offend no one, no Senator or Congressman whose State is a big producer or supplier for the weapon system, no heavily contributing lobbyist representing a defense contractor. We just stretch the program out. Instead of killing the MX or the B-1B, we keep it alive. We "save" money by stretching out procurement over a longer time. We build 5 MX's instead of 21 in the coming year but we do not cut the President's overall requested long-term objective of 100. We stretch out by 3 or 4 years the B-1B acquisition. All this postponement and stretchout to make the 1985 budget look good has two counterproductive effects. First, we do not get the weapon system in a timely way. We do not get it when we need it. Second, by the time we do get the weapon system, because of inflation and other stretchout costs, we have to spend far more than was originally intended or we get far less than we need.

So what do we do to end these wasteful practices? How do we save money and provide the strong defense we require? The New York Times says: "Mock surgery won't defeat the private agendas that have so swollen the defense budget." But a real amputation will be needed sooner or later. Mr.

President, amputation is the right word. If we amputate the MX and the B-1B, and slap a tough and unyielding cap on the price we are willing to pay per copy for tanks and fighter planes, we can begin to make some real progress in bringing the cost of our national defense under control and increasing its efficiency.

But continued progress will require three things of a Secretary of Defense. First, he must bring the kind of tough discipline into his Department that will eliminate duplication. Second, he must ruthlessly cut off procurement programs that cost more than they are worth. Third, he must stand up to the sure and certain pressure he can expect from defense contractors, and from the Army, Navy, and Air Force's powerful bureaucracies buttressed by the Members of Congress who control the purse strings and will fight like tigers for procurement programs that provide big economic benefits to their States and districts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial of May 15, to which I have referred, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE, PRIVATE AGENDAS

Congress intends to cut the defense budget, and the Secretary of Defense could surely help by laying out a rational list of priorities. But he won't. Mr. Weinberger insists, cutely, that every item is equally essential. He intends that Congress seek savings by slowing the general pace of purchases, so that his program will be merely delayed, with nothing eliminated.

Defense depends a lot on perspective, and Mr. Weinberger wants the Pentagon's budget to be growing visibly. That's not a bad strategy, except that it's ruining the economy, the health of which is the true bedrock of security. To hold back on defense spending while preserving real strength requires reshaping the Administration's procurement program decisively.

That's easy, in theory, because the program groans with duplicative weapons. Mr. Weinberger has just stapled together the three services' wishlists without imposing any discipline or coherence on them.

Thus the Air Force is working on as many as five different systems to penetrate Soviet airspace—an upgrade B-52, two kinds of cruise missile, the B-1B and the Stealth bomber. That's excessive.

The Air Force possesses an efficient antitank weapon, the A-10 close support plane. But the Army insists on trying to duplicate the A-10's role with its Apache helicopter. Helicopters are fragile—9 percent of those used in the invasion of Grenada were lost in three days against minimal opposition. Why, then, does the Army rely on them so heavily? One reason is that the Air Force won't let the Army build fixed-wing planes. And you thought war was only for adults.

The Air Force's MX missile, capable of destroying Soviet missile silos, competes with the D5 missile the Navy plans to install on its Trident submarines. The Army's Patriot missile, for shooting down Soviet bombers, usurps the job of the Air Force's F-16 fighters. Each service prepares for its own war.

David Stockman, director of the Administration's budget office, has called the Defense Department a "swamp of waste." Why can no one drain it? Because unless there is rigor and vigor at the top, defense policy is largely set by private agendas. Each service and its favored contractors decide on what weapons they want and lobby for them vigorously within the Pentagon and in Congress.

William Kaufmann, the defense analyst, calculates that spending could be reduced from $305 billion to $260 billion without any loss of military capability. Last month, the House Armed Services Committee got out its rubber knife again and took $20 billion off the Pentagon's request—not by cutting weapons but by stretching out the rate of purchases. Mr. Weinberger then told the Senate he could support lesser stretchouts in the same programs, for a reduction of $14 billion.

This mock surgery won't defeat the private agendas that have so swollen the defense budget. But a real amputation will be needed sooner or later. If Congress buys all the new weapons now being rushed toward production, it will face crushing bills in future years. Come that sure crisis, defense will be cut back as harmfully and indiscriminately as the White House is now building it up.

SUFFOCATING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE AHMADI MUSLIMS IN PAKISTAN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Washington Post on May 17, 1984, ran a lengthy article concerning flagrant abuses of human rights of the Ahmadi Muslim community in Pakistan.

There are about ten million Ahmadi Muslims worldwide in more than 100 countries, with an estimated four million in Pakistan, home of the international center of their community.

The Ahmadi Muslim community in Pakistan has in the past been subject to persecution, but has always responded with strong self-discipline. However, a recent directive issued by the Government of Pakistan prohibits Ahmadi Muslims in Pakistan from: Calling themselves Muslims; designating their places of worship as "mosques"; calling "Azan," the Muslim traditional call to prayer; and using any "Islamic terminology" in their literature or other forms of expression.

Violation of any of these four points could result in a 3-year prison sentence and a fine.

The new decree, it is feared, would unleash a new wave of persecutions and atrocities against the Ahmadi Muslim community in Pakistan. In consequence of the persistent provocation and exhortation of the fanatics, seemingly unchecked by the Government, there have been numerous instances in which Ahmadi Muslims have been killed for no reasons.

This apparent governmental indifference to such terrible crimes obviously encourages lawlessness, killings, and trampling of human rights.

According to the Washington Post article:

The Ahmadis, who have a disproportionately hig literacy rate and traditionally have been influential in the civil service and armed forces, have refused to accept the new ordinance but have avoided confrontations.

They have stopped using the call to prayer, saying that as long as they can continue to pray inside the mosques, the Azan ritual is not necessary. Since the ordinance was adopted, they have also ended open evangelical activities in Pakistan and have found substitute words to denote their mosques.

It is most disconcerting that the peace and stability of Pakistan which is facing many economic and political problems, including the presence of thousands of foreign soldiers across the borders in Afghanistan, should be threatened at this juncture by the outbreak of religious frenzy against a patriotic and law-abiding section of its population.

In the hearts of people worldwide, the United States of America has a long and proud history of defending religious freedom and of upholding human rights. We, however, cannot always be proud of our actions in defending human rights because we continue to fail to make use of all the tools available to denounce these atrocities.

One of these very important and much-needed tools which we have failed to grasp is the Genocide Convention. This treaty would make the act of genocide an internationally condemned crime. Genocide, simply defined, is the attempt to deny the right to live through indiscriminate killings of a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group.

Ratification of the Genocide Convention would reiterate our historical commitment of preserving basic international human rights for the people of this world, and would strengthen our hand in showing the Government of Pakistan our strong concern for the oppressed lives of the Ahmadi Muslims.

Let us continue to be proud to be Americans and champions of human rights by backing our pledges with actions—by ratifying the Genocide Convention this year.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and once again thank the Democratic leader.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I meant to include this in my request previously but perhaps the Senate will forgive me because it is early in the morning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the limitation on time for Senators to speak during morning business shall not apply against the two leaders.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FORTUNE MAGAZINE ACID RAIN ARTICLE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the May 28 issue of Fortune magazine contains an article on acid rain by William M. Brown of the Hudson Institute. Mr. Brown questions some of the popular views regarding the environmental consequences of the phenomenon known as acid rain. As Mr. Brown puts it:

The standard scientific view of acid rain's effects may simply be wrong. It is too soon to state categorically that it's wrong, but some recent evidence suggests that we have at least good reason to pause.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAYBE ACID RAIN ISN'T THE VILLAIN

(By William M. Brown)

The controversy over acid rain has political, economic, and scientific dimensions, but in a presidential election year it was doubtless inevitable that national politics would drive the debate. So most of the disagreements we're reading about these days relate to federal policy. Why is President Reagan resisting an all-out attack on acid rain? (His latest budget proposes only modest amounts for further study of the problem.) Why is William Ruckelshaus, head of the Environmental Protection Agency, defending the President instead of pushing his own more aggressive program to control acid rain? Which of the numerous bills floating around Congress has a chance of passage? How should we deal with the maddening difficulty that the costs associated with many of the bills generally fall most heavily on Midwestern states (whose industry would have to spend huge sums to reduce emissions of sulfur dioxide) while the expected benefits generally accrue to other states, mostly in the East (whose lakes and forests would be less exposed to the acidified rain)?

The emphasis on the politics of the issue is especially unfortunate because the big news may be scientific. The standard scientific view of acid rain's effects may simply be wrong. It is too soon to state categorically that it's wrong, but some recent evidence suggests that we have at least good reason to pause. In a study of acid rain done at the Hudson Institute, my colleagues and I calculated that it could eventually cost Americans about $100 billion in today's dollars to achieve a major reduction in sulfur dioxide emissions. Before committing to any program of this magnitude, we should want to be more certain that acid rain is in fact a major threat to the country's environment.

The standard scientific view is easy enough to understand, intuitively plausible, and manifestly true—up to a point. It tells us that the Midwestern factories are spewing tons of sulfur dioxide into the atmosphere and that some of these and other pollutants combine with water vapor, become oxidized and acidic, are borne east by the prevailing winds, and finally rain down on the lakes and forests of New England, the mid-Atlantic states, and Canada. This is the part that's clearly true. It is based on compelling scientific evidence, much of it marshaled in a 1981 study performed by the National Academy of Sciences.

Since that study, however, we have been learning more about how rainwater filters into lakes and streams. Recent research by soil scientists, especially Edward C. Krug and Charles R. Frink of the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, suggests that the portrait drawn in the National Academy study is incomplete. This is also the conclusion of the Hudson Institute study, which was finished last November. (Its title: *A Perspective on Current Acid Rain Issues.*) In it we reached conclusions substantially different from those of other investigations.

It is not surprising that there should be sharp disagreements about acid rain. The rain has been studied only for about six years, and scientists working in the field have been raising questions about acidified lakes faster than researchers can provide answers. Thus the view propounded in this article—in most respects a minority view—claims only to be a provocative hypothesis, not a proven reality.

Nevertheless, we now have grounds for suspecting that the following propositions are true: First, the pollutants in the rain are only a minor contributor to the high-level acidity found in some Eastern lakes and streams. Second, this acidity, which is indeed hostile to the existence of game fish and other aquatic creatures, is mostly natural rather than industrial in origin. Third, the popular notion that acid rain is threatening forests in the Eastern U.S., and indeed all across the earth's Temperate Zone, is based less on substance than upon ill-informed conjecture and is probably wrong.

Obviously, the perspective afforded by these propositions has different policy implications from the National Academy study (which recommended a major reduction in sulfur dioxide emissions). The new perspective would not deny that industrial emissions should continue to be controlled in a reasonable manner, as required by the Clean Air Act. But it also tells us to focus on the possibility that the threats from these emissions may turn out to be largely illusory.

The most important argument used to justify a heavy spending war on acid rain is that it is entering our aquatic systems and threatening their populations. It has been shown, for example, that over 200 lakes in New York's Adirondack Mountains, along with the streams that feed them, are now devoid of fish, or at least of trout and other desirable game fish. Since the decline of the fish populations clearly derives from acidified water, many scientists have naturally come to view the problem somewhat as follows: (a) acidified precipitation falls onto the watershed, (b) it then runs into the streams and lakes, and (c) it kills the fish—at least, it does so unless the lake waters contain enough alkalies to neutralize the acid.

It is also natural for many scientists to fear that this process could eventually spread far beyond Adirondack lakes and, ultimately, produce a world-wide ecological disaster. If any such threat seemed genuine, then a $100-billion program to forestall it would clearly not be excessive in my judgment. However, the underlying reality appears at once more complex and less threatening.

Rainfall, whether acidic or not, gets into our aquatic systems by circuitous processes. Except for the very small fraction of rain that falls directly onto lakes, the precipitation that ends up in them passes through a series of filters in the watershed. Each of these filters affects the water's acidity in its own way. At least one of these natural filters, the so-called mor humus, can put far more acid into the rainwater than could any anticipated amount of industrial pollution. Indeed this humus may contain as much as 1,000 times the acid that falls from the sky in a year. Regardless of its initial acidity or alkalinity, water percolating through mor humus emerges from it far more acidic than acid rain. In short, the forests of the Temperate Zones—especially coniferous forests—are natural acid creators.

These forests would long since have killed off the desirable games fish in most of the lakes and streams throughout the Temperate Zone but for another natural phenomenon. Other filters through which the rainwater passes are alkaline—that is, acid neutralizing. These deeper filters, mostly porous layers of mineral rock, are often several feet thick and generally contain substantial amounts of limestone and others alkaline substances. They not only neutralize the acid in water seeping into them but often generate natural buffers, such as alkaline bicarbonates, that neutralize any acids that might enter lakes from other sources—for example, from adajcent bogs or from the acid rain that falls directly onto the lakes.

However, these layers of acid-neutralizing rock are not found everywhere. In some parts of the Adirondacks and in a few other areas of the U.S., the deeper soil layers lack enough limestone or other alkaline minerals to neutralize the acidic water emerging from the humus above them. Might this lack explain all by itself why the fish of some Adirondack lakes have been in trouble? It might—except for one bothersome detail. The geology of the region hasn't changed lately, and yet the higher acidity levels of some lakes, and the related problems of their fish populations, are relatively recent events.

The possibility that our acidified lakes got that way naturally is hard for people to accept precisely because of this logical difficulty. If some of the fish are now in a more hostile environment than they were in earlier decades then we must look to something new in the environment. Sulfur dioxide from heavy industry seems to be just the kind of suspect that makes sense. In fact, however, these emissions are not the only change in the forest environment. Another new feature is Smokey the Bear. Or, less metaphorically, the huge success of the United States in preventing forest fires during the past half-century or so.

Forest fires can have a tremendous impact on the acidity of adjacent lakes. The fires can totally destroy the acid-producing humus, replacing it with a layer of alkaline ash. When that happens, a naturally acidified lake within the burned area may become neutralized and temporarily—meaning for several decades—more hospitable to fish. Eventually, of course, the forest would be expected to regrow, the alkaline ash left by the fire would be used up, the acidic humus layer would be regenerated, and the fish would be in trouble again.

The possibility that fire prevention accounts for a major portion of the lakes' acidity still have to be viewed as just that—a possibility. It's another of the many fascinating hypotheses that are still too new to have been tested properly by field researchers undertaking controlled experiments. Meanwhile, all we know for sure is that the fires are far less prevalent than they once were.

Until early in this century they were normal all through the earth's temperate zone. Our ancestors in America, including the Pilgrims, set them deliberately and routinely because they were the simplest way to clear sizable tracts of land. Later, during the 18th and 19th centuries, rough-and-ready logging practices created large areas that were susceptible to forest fires in dry spells. There is essentially no virgin forest in the Eastern U.S. today—only regrown forest.

So it really is possible that one new element in the forest and lake environment of the East is the absence of forest fires. It is clear, in any case, that the forests of the Northeast have expanded remarkably during the past half-century. And, of course, their growth has been accompanied by sizable increases in the amount of humus and natural acidity in the soil.

If this is indeed the process by which the lakes have been acidified and the fish killed, it would appear to follow that the outlook for trout fishing is much less bleak. We can plausibly expect industrialization to keep spreading on the planet, so the acid rain hypothesis predicts that more and more lakes and streams will get in trouble. The forest fire hypothesis predicts that relatively few lakes—those lacking the natural acid neutralizers—will be troubled. It is worth recalling that the acidified lakes in what New York State calls the Adirondack Ecological Zone constitute only a minority (19%, to be exact) of the lakes in the area and represent even less of the lakes' total surface area (4%) and volume (2%).

What about the widespread belief that acid rain represents a threat to the future of the forests? The evidence for this view turns out to be elusive. It is true, to be sure, that we occasionally find damage to clumps of trees in forests and often have no ready explanation of the damage. But it is not established that such damage is new, or growing, or, indeed, that similar damage couldn't have been observed a million years ago. Acid rain is simply not a likely suspect. The acid in Eastern rainfall is usually diluted to about four parts per million or less. Why should we believe that this relatively weak dose is the likely cause of the signs of stress observed in a few forest areas? If it is the cause, how do we explain that vast areas of Temperate Zone forest subject to similar precipitation have not been damaged?

Finally, why are so few forest ecologists, either in the U.S. or Europe, supporting the concept that acid rain is the villain identified in the media? Some of these scientists have publicly scorned the concept. Here, for example, is a summary statement on the subject by the respected British ecologist Kenneth Mellanby, writing last year in Nature: "Reports in the press and on television on the ill effects of acid rain have implied widespread damage to trees, directly caused by sulfur output from industry. But by the end of a recent international meeting . . . at which no less than 50 papers were delivered on the topic of acid precipitation, it was apparent that these simplistic views were neither accurate nor supported by scientific investigation."

All of which suggests that the Administration's much criticized current proposal on acid rain, which is to go slow and spend relatively little—the fiscal 1985 budget includes $55.5 million for study of the problem—makes a lot of sense. I certainly agree that less sulfur dioxide emissions are better than more. But less spending is also better than more, especially when there's a chance we're spending to solve the wrong problem. Before doing any spending, we need to start thinking of acid rain as a scientific rather than a political issue.

PANJSHIR VALLEY UPDATE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to bring my colleagues up to date on events in the Panjshir Valley in Afghanistan. About April 20, the Soviets began a major offensive north of the capital of Kabul in their seventh attempt to defeat the resistance forces under the command of Ahman Shah Massoud. As I reported to the Senate on May 3, that offensive involved the use of Soviet heavy bombers in brutal attacks on civilian targets.

Despite initial reports that the Soviets had destroyed the Massoud forces, we now understand that the Soviets have been unable to engage the Afghan freedom fighters in a major battle. In fact, Afghan resistance forces were able to warn civilians in the area, and have managed to retreat to safety. The Afghan resistance forces themselves have melted into the inner valleys and mountains surrounding the Soviet troops. They wait and watch; picking the moment of attack.

Perhaps the best unclassified account of events in Afghanistan comes to us in a recent report from the Far Eastern Economic Review. That report includes mention of statements issued by every political leader of the various factions of the Afghan resistance in the wake of the Soviet offensive in the Panjshir. In response to the Soviet assault, these diverse groups have committed to fighting together to take a heavy toll on the Soviets elsewhere in the country while the main thrust of Soviet military power is concentrated in the area north of Kabul. As the article says, "The Soviet action in the Panjshir may well be doing more to unify the resistance in Afghanistan than any one Afghan could ever do."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the May 10 issue of the Far Eastern Economic Review entitled "Panjshir Movement" be printed in the RECORD at this point, along with an article from the Christian Science Monitor of May 10, which reflects the desperation of Soviet leadership over the Afghan question.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Far Eastern Economic Review, May 10, 1984]

PANJSHIR MOVEMENT

(By Romey Fullerton in Islamabad)

On 20 April, according to United States officials in Washington, up to 200 Tu16 high-altitude bombers left airbases in Soviet Central Asia. Their target: the narrow Panjshir Valley, an inhospitable wasteland in north-central Afghanistan.

With that massive air attack, the Soviets launched their expected offensive against a strategic resistance stronghold which lies about 80 kms north of Kabul and which threatens the main highway to the Soviet border. The current campaign is Moscow's seventh heavy assault on the valley since its armed forces entered Afghanistan in December 1979.

Reliable details of fighting in Afghanistan are always slow to emerge. But a combination of reports from the Pentagon and State Department in Washington, other Western diplomatic reports and news from sources in the Afghan capital provides a clear picture of events in the first week of the offensive. After three days of continuous high-altitude bombing by the Tu16s, tanks, armoured vehicles and artillery started, armoured vehicles and artillery started moving up the valley.

A State Department release at the end of the first week described the force as "contingents of Soviet airborne, motorised rifle division and security forces, token Afghan army infantry and commando units, and Soviet and Afghan army artillery units. "The release said helicopter gunships and ground-attack jet fighters from bases inside Afghanistan were also being used in support. The progress of the units up the valley, according to the Pentagon, was remarkably slow—approximately 10 kms a day.

A number of sources in Kabul say the Panjshir resistance fighter, led by Ahmad Shah Massoud, are causing rock falls with explosives to slow the approach of Soviet vehicles. In earlier reports, Massoud had mentioned planting mines on the road in preparation for the attack. One high-ranking Pakistani official whose family originates from Afghanistan explained the problems the terrain poses for the Soviet. "There is a single, narrowed road leading up the valley, with a steep mountain on one side and a river on the other: it makes the Soviets slow and vulnerable."

US officials have said paratroopers were landed in the valley. But one Western military observer says he thought they were more likely to be helicopter-borne troops. "If you land paratroopers they become dispersed and it takes time for them to reassemble. Heli-borne troops are ready for action straight away. We believe the Soviets landed heli-borne troops halfway up the valley and that they probably headed back to meet the advancing tanks hoping to trap the resistance. But that does not allow for the fact that the resistance will simply disappear up the mountainside."

As in earlier attacks on the Panjshir, Massoud and his resistance fighters appear to be simply melting away into their hideouts. Massoud is not being trapped into meeting a conventional armoured force head on. Although totals differ, estimates put the total of Soviet and Afghan troops at 12-20,000 and the number of resistance fighters at 5-10,000. The State Department assessment says the guerrillas are following a strategy of allowing the Soviet and regime forces to

spread out, withdrawing to the high ground and to the many caves in the valley—thereby luring small units into mined areas and waiting to begin harassment of small garrisons.

Why then have the Soviets committed their forces to an attack on the Panjshir? One Western military analyst commented: "In conventional warfare an army's objective is to hold ground, but the Soviets must have had enough experience by now to realise this is not a conventional war. They will want to destroy the guerrilla forces, to bring them to battle." A Western diplomat added: "The Soviets could probably occupy the valley but what would they achieve? It is expensive. The Panjshir in itself is not that important and they would stretch their supply lines which would be very vulnerable to resistance attack."

In interviews in the past two years, Massoud has commented on the vulnerability of the Panjshir Valley to major attack. From March 1983 he entered into a highly controversial year-long negotiated ceasefire with the Soviets. He used that year not only to strengthen the defences in the valley but to expand his base of operations beyond the Panjshir. A spokesman and close associate of Massoud explained last year: "We now have safe valley retreats nearby strategic Soviet targets. We no longer need to rely on the Panjshir."

If the Soviet and Afghan forces seem to be committed to shadow-boxing in the Panjshir militarily, commentators agree that the Soviet-backed regime would gain a propaganda victory if the security forces succeeded in occupying the valley. The Panjshir has become a symbol for many of Afghan resistance to the Soviet occupation. Loss of the valley would be a psychological blow for the resistance.

It is probably for this reason rather than for military reasons that the Soviets have launched such a heavy attack. Certainly the government of President Babrak Karmal was quick to try to gain psychological advantage from the offensive. On the first day of the ground attack, when US officials say the ground forces were only 10 kms into the mouth of the valley, state-run Kabul Radio announced that the valley had fallen. As in the early days of almost every other offensive against the Panjshir, Massoud has been reported captured or killed.

But the benefits of the offensive are not all on the Soviet side. On hearing of the Soviets' massive offensive against the Panjshir, the political leader of every major resistance party independently issued a statement calling on guerrillas all over Afghanistan to rise up, to start actions in their own areas to distract the Soviets' attention from the Panjshir. The Soviet action in the Panjshir may well be doing more to unify the resistance in Afghanistan than any one Afghan could ever do.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 10, 1984]

BIG SOVIET DRIVE IN AFGHANISTAN REFLECTS TOUGHER CHERNENKO LINE

SCALE AND TACTICS IN PANJSHIR VALLEY ARE UNPRECEDENTED IN 4½ YEAR WAR

(By Mary Ann Weaver)

Soviet ground forces, assisted by airborne troops, have pushed well over halfway through Afghanistan's strategic Panjshir Valley, Western diplomatic sources confirmed this week.

They conceded, however, that they were receiving highly contradictory accounts on whether additional airborne reinforcements had arrived and secured the crucial Anjuman Pass. Reports from Afghan resistance sources in Peshawar, Pakistan, over the weekend claimed the Soviets had blocked the northern route into the valley by securing the northeastern pass.

According to the Western sources, the Soviets, in their largest offensive in the 4½-year-old war, appear intent on encircling the valley. It is the stronghold of one of Afghanistan's most renowned guerrilla fighters, Ahmed Shah Massoud—the only resistance leader with whom the Soviets ever negotiated. Last January, the two sides entered into a year-long truce.

The scope and intensity of the Soviets' Panjshir offensive and the Soviets' dogged effort to capture Mr. Massoud, add credence to reports of a decided hardening in the Kremlin's Afghanistan line since the accession of Konstantin Chernenko in February of this year.

Yuri Andropov had hinted he was interested in a negotiated solution to what some in the Kremlin have conceded was a vexing foreign war.

All indications from the Kremlin now, however, are that Mr. Chernenko is not.

"In short," said an Eastern diplomatic official, "Andropov gave high priority to the United Nations-sponsored talks. We've seen during the April visit of [the UN mediator, Diego] Cordovez, that Mr. Chernenko is not at all interested in a Soviet withdrawal . . . and he isn't because, despite the conventional wisdom that has coalesced the West, the new Soviet leadership does not believe that its Army is bogged down in Afghanistan. . . ."

"Time and resources are clearly on the Soviet side," he continued. "For a very limited investment, they have made significant geopolitical gains."

Mr. Massoud, a former engineering student—known to his followers as "the Panjshir lion," and to the Soviet Red Army as "the scarlet pimpernel,"—is now safely out of the valley, according to Western accounts. He left on April 18, three days before the beginning of the Soviets' newest drive.

Before he left, he instructed his 5,000 fighters not to engage the Soviets directly, but to break into pockets of resistance, sheltering in peripheral valleys and along the ridges of the precipitous Hindu Kush mountain range, which pose difficult physical obstacles for a Soviet pursuit.

According to one report, Mr. Massoud is meeting with other resistance leaders north of the valley and planning a series of attacks on the Salang Tunnel, a key supply and transport route between the Soviet Union and the Afghan capital, Kabul.

The new Kremlin thinking is said to center around the fact that the 110,000 to 120,000 Soviet troops shoring up the regime of Babrak Karmal can afford to sustain the 1,000 casualties that they have suffered each year. According to Soviet sources, only about 300 are actual combat deaths. The other deaths are attributed to hepatitis, local fevers, alcohol poisoning, and suicide.

Only a small percentage of the conscripts—as few as 15,000 to 20,000 according to one military attaché—are reportedly exposed to the full rigors of war. The others are said to be involved in "education and reorientation" programs, building new airstrips and roads, protecting vital Afghan Army installations and transport and communications sites.

The Soviet Air Force has taken over and expanded military air bases at Kandahar, Shindand, Farah, Kabul, Bagram, Jalalabad, and Herat. Their present air and ground deployment thus gives them the capability for an expeditious thrust into the Indian Ocean, Iran, and the Gulf.

But the lush Panjshir Valley has been a longtime irritant to the Soviet regime, and both the stronghold and symbol of the Afghan mujahideen.

Thus three separate Soviet armored columns are pushing through the valley—15,000 Soviet and 2,000 Afghan forces, along with 400 to 600 tanks. They are supported by unprecedented, high-altitude, saturation bombing raids. As many as 100 Soviet TU-16 Badger bombers and SU-24 Fencer fighters arrived in Afghanistan from the Soviet Union at the end of March. It is a scale and intensity of commitment never sanctioned by Mr. Andropov.

Casualties have been minimal, according to Western diplomatic reports, as virtually no civilians remain in the 70-mile-long valley. Contact between the advancing Soviet forces and the mujahideen has been limited to occasional hit-and-run raids by the resistance.

The Western officials quoted above have also discounted the veracity of Afghan resistance reports that the Soviets used chemical weapons as they have continued their advance, now into its third week.

"It's simply illogical," an official said, "when the valley's been evacuated, and there are virtually no inhabitants left."

According to an Eastern European source, the operation is taking longer than the Soviets had expected when they launched the offensive April 21. They are said, as during previous Panjshir campaigns, to be having difficulty in flushing the mujahideen out of their new deployments in side valleys and along the mountain ridge. Six earlier attempts to take the valley have failed.

The seeming Soviet reluctance to continue pursuing a carrot-and-stick approach in Afghanistan began to appear as early as the February funeral of Mr. Andropov.

Fearing that Pakistan's borders were increasingly vulnerable, and saddled with 3 million increasingly disruptive Afghan refugees. Pakistani President Muhammad Zia ul-Haq went to Moscow for the funeral. He was fully prepared to propose direct Pakistani-Soviet talks on Afghanistan to Mr. Chernenko, a move initiated earlier by the Islamabad government, but which the Kremlin had rebuffed.

There was no such opportunity. Despite two formal requests for an appointment, Mr. Chernenko pointedly ignored the Pakistani leader. Instead, Chernenko met with India's Indira Gandhi, Babrak Karmal, and a relatively unknown admiral from Bangladesh.

AWARD FOR AFGHANISTAN REPORTING

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, last October I placed in the RECORD an excellent series of articles on the situation in Afghanistan. That series was the product of the daring behind-the-scenes reporting of William Branigin of the Washington Post. I have often called upon the press to do what can be done to shed light on the war in Afghanistan, but I appreciate that Soviet censorship and the refusal to allow reporters into the country represent for-

midable barriers to accurate news reporting.

Mr. Branigin traveled into occupied Afghanistan—right into the war zones—to bring us firsthand news that enriched our knowledge of events in that country. Had he been captured, he might have been taken for a spy and shot by the Soviets. He could have been killed at any time as he traveled with the courageous Afghan freedom fighters. Fortunately, he emerged safely with some excellent insights into the situation which he shared with all of us through his articles.

Mr. Branigin has received this year's award for distinguished service in foreign correspondence of the Society of Professional Journalists, Sigma Delta Chi, for his courage and the excellent reporting he has done. I want to add my congratulations to the many others he has received for this accomplishment. He may take great pride in this award. We all benefit from the risks he took.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recent article from the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO POST REPORTERS WIN AWARDS FOR FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE

Dusko Doder, the Moscow bureau chief of the Washington Post, was named a winner of the Edward Weintal Prize for Diplomatic Reporting yesterday.

The award, of $5,000, was shared with Bernard Gwertzman, a Washington-based diplomatic correspondent of the New York Times. Weintal was a Newsweek reporter who died in 1973.

The awards, made annually to recognize and encourage distinguished journalism in the field of American foreign policy and diplomacy, were presented yesterday at Georgetown University's school of foreign service.

Doder, 46, has been the Post's correspondent in Moscow for more than three years. He has written extensively on United States-Soviet relations and on domestic Soviet politics, and he reported the first indication of the death of Soviet leader Yuri Andropov, the day before it was made public.

Earlier, William Branigin, the Southeast Asia correspondent of the Washington Post, was named as the winner of this year's award for Distinguished Service in Foreign Correspondence of the Society of Professional Journalists, Sigma Delta Chi.

Branigin, 31, was cited for a series based on a six-week trek in the Soviet war zone in Afghanistan, which judges said had "greatly illuminated our knowledge of that long-running conflict."

A $120 BILLION TRADE DEFICIT

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, this year the United States will run an astronomical trade deficit of approximately $120 billion. The rule of thumb is that for every $1 billion of trade deficit, we lose 25,000 American jobs. Thus, this year's trade deficit will cost us 3 million jobs.

As far as free trade is concerned, the United States is just about the only open market left in the world.

Take automobiles as an example. This year we will let in 1,900,000 Japanese cars with nothing more than a miniscule 3-percent import duty. That is peanuts compared to what the rest of the world does.

The following countries impose import duties of more than 10 percent: Belgium, Canada, Great Britain, France, Italy, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Sweden, and West Germany.

The following have domestic content, rigid quotas, or restrictive agreements that assure the vast bulk of the cars sold in their countries are built in their countries: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, and Venezuela.

How does Japan handle imports into its country? Some businessmen tell me it is like pushing a camel through the eye of a needle. If it is something the Japanese make or grow themselves, it is virtually no dice. The McDonalds hamburger people tried to bring in a carload of American beef for their chain: no dice. The orangegrowers of California want to ship in oranges: no dice.

Some farm groups in America are worried that Japan might retaliate against American soybeans, for example, if we were to enact a domestic content law. I think most of these threats of retaliation are 99.44 percent pure bluff. Japan has not retaliated against Brazil, Canada, Argentina, and Australia, all of whom ship vital agricultural commodities to Japan and all of whom are very restrictive on importing Japanese cars. The fact is, Japan is dependent on many of the products it imports and cannot afford to jeopardize its supply no matter what other disputes it may have.

A second factor weighing against retaliation is that Japan today enjoys a lopsided advantage in trade balance with the United States and most of the countries it deals with. It is Japan that has the most to lose from any trade battle and it is going to be the last country to risk it.

Japanese auto makers today enjoy an enormous cost advantage over U.S. manufacturers, estimated at about $2,000 per vehicle. In part this reflects lower labor cost in Japan, but even more significant is the tax subsidy provided by the Japanese Government for exported cars and the huge and growing dollar-yen imbalance.

Everyone in Congress likes to talk in terms of free trade. Perhaps historically, there was a day when such a concept had meaning. But no longer. We now live in the world of "free trade, but * * *."

With a $120 billion trade imbalance, with the loss of 3 million jobs, for the U.S. market to remain pristinely "open" while everyone else's market is closed up like a clam is a bit ridiculous. Free trade must also be fair trade. It must be a two-way street. Today, it is a one-way street leading into the United States. It is time we recognize international reality for what it is.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF WORKERS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, many of America's working men and women learned a long time ago that they could best protect their interests on their jobs if they joined together. The history of organized labor in this country is studded with accounts of hard times and poor working conditions made better through collective effort. Collective efforts worked well enough that Congress on many occasions enshrined in law the procedures used in collective bargaining, thereby enshrining many of the protections available to our working people.

These laws do not always work, however. The old saying is that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom, and that applies to many of the smaller parts of our free American system as well. The vigilance necessary to make sure America's laws work well is best practiced, I believe, by America's biggest official watchdog: Congress. For that reason the Labor and Human Resources Committee has conducted a series of watchdog hearings into a variety of topics. We have investigated several different situations involving the rights of working people and allegations that the rights of union members were unjustly abused. The committee's work has not always been well received, so the fact that the committee has stuck to the course is commendable. But looking back over 3 years of these watchdog hearings it becomes clear that our watchdogging, however received at the time, has produced benefits, particularly for the hardworking union members whose rights won vindication.

In 1982, the committee invited the Department of Labor up here to tell why the Department had been so slow in moving to seek reimbursement of $29 million plus interest of some $16 million that had been illegally loaned out of the pension funds of the Southern Nevada Culinary Workers Union. As we feared, there was not a good answer to that question. However, the Labor Department enforcers obtained a jury verdict requiring repayment of $35 million and almost $4 million in other repayments, subsequent to our committee hearings. The men and

women who belong to the Culinary Workers Union are the classic "little guys" in this story—they do not get big paychecks, they sometimes work just above the minimum wage, they do work that many others will not do, and they deserve to have a healthy pension fund. These people now have a court-certified right to get their millions back—a right I believe they would not have today but for the vigilance of the Labor and Human Resources Committee.

Members of the Boilermakers Union came to the committee over 2 years ago with stories of hiring hall abuses. The hiring hall is, to many unions, the home of the working person's rights. Any hint of abuse of those rights in the hiring hall, therefore, should raise the hackles of everyone concerned about working people.

Over several days of hearings the committee listened as these allegations were explained and documented. After that when these workers finally got their fair hearing from the National Labor Relations Board, their charges produced a back pay award of $5 million—the largest such award ever given to union workers in a grievance action against their union. The Labor and Human Resources Committee's efforts on behalf of these working men and women were beneficial in the vindication of their rights.

Recently, committee investigators found allegations of hiring hall abuses and other corrupt actions in Lake Charles, La., in a local of the International Union of Operating Engineers. The stories of these workers were incredible. During 2 days of hearings in February they told of coerced sexual relations in return for job referrals to which they should have been entitled; we heard stories of intimidation, construction sabotage and chicanery so outrageous that it had to be illegal. We also were scheduled to hear from the Justice Department on why their investigations had been closed.

But an interesting thing happened. After hearing the testimony the committee heard, the Justice Department found several instances where new light had been shed on old charges—and Justice promised to reopen its investigation with new vigor. That investigation is proceeding today.

In three watchdog hearings over the past 3 years the results have been gratifying—the ordering of the restoration of $35 million to a workers' pension fund, the award of $5 million in back pay to vindicate the rights of workers in the hiring halls, and a promise of a fair shake for workers who believe their union rights have been unjustly abused.

Next Tuesday, May 22, the committee will sit to hear testimony on new charges regarding the operating engineers in Lake Charles. Workers have told committee investigators of problems during the construction of the Roy S. Nelson Electrical Generating Station, units Nos. 5 and 6, in Westlake, La. Witnesses are scheduled to testify on charges of a widespread pattern of corruption, including the forced hiring of ghost employees, payroll padding, sabotage, theft of materials and equipment, and forced rental of construction equipment that was tantamount to extortion. Our initial investigation has uncovered allegations that this deliberate sabotage effort on an $11 million subcontract for a coal-handling facility more than tripled its ultimate price, with almost $32 million in cost overruns. Fortunately these overruns were not billed to the plant's owner; the problems were discovered.

It begs to be noted here that this coal-fired powerplant is similar to many in several other States—I dare say, in most of the States—and that construction of these plants affects many different parts of our economy. Obviously those benefiting include those who use the electricity generated; but the American coal industry also benefits, especially the miners who get the work. The American railroad and trucking industries which move the coal, reap substantial rewards from the construction of these powerplant. And the whole country benefits from having available a powerplant that operates on American coal instead of imported oil. A tripling of costs on components of a powerplant has the potential to cheat thousands of American union men and women out of their jobs in these industries. Electrical generation, coal mining and railroads are all major industries in my State, Utah—and they are all industries that benefit from efficiency, and could suffer from the type of cost overruns we will hear about Tuesday.

The prospect that these flagrant violations of the rights of union workers could happen almost anywhere is quite a sobering one. It behooves us, as the elected representatives of our States, to be sure U.S. law protects workers, as Congress intends that they should. I intend to continue these full committee hearings as part of the vigilance necessary for this body to exercise to protect the rights of working men and women everywhere. Looking back, through 3 years this type of hearing has produced great benefits for workers, and therefore, for all Americans.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. BAKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURKOWSKI). The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, as I indicated earlier, there may be a vote very soon. Since it is early, it might be appropriate to try to establish a quorum first. I am asking my cloakroom to put out a notice that the quorum which is about to be put will be a live quorum.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 2 Leg.]

Baker	Domenici	Trible
Byrd	Grassley	
Chiles	Murkowski	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Andrews	Evans	Moynihan
Bingaman	Garn	Nunn
Boschwitz	Goldwater	Pressler
Burdick	Gorton	Proxmire
Chafee	Hatch	Randolph
Cohen	Hatfield	Rudman
Cranston	Hawkins	Sasser
D'Amato	Hecht	Specter
Danforth	Helms	Symms
DeConcini	Hollings	Tower
Denton	Huddleston	Wilson
Dixon	Melcher	Zorinsky
East	Metzenbaum	

Mr. BAKER. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. JEPSEN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. LAXALT), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MATTINGLY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER), are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BRADLEY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), are necessarily absent.

Mr. BAKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask that the Sergeant at Arms be instructed to request the attendance of absent

Senators, and I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) to direct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who wish to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 102 Leg.]

YEAS—73

Abdnor	Exon	Mitchell
Andrews	Garn	Moynihan
Armstrong	Glenn	Murkowski
Baker	Gorton	Nickles
Baucus	Grassley	Nunn
Bentsen	Hatch	Packwood
Biden	Hatfield	Pell
Bingaman	Hawkins	Pressler
Boschwitz	Hecht	Randolph
Burdick	Heinz	Roth
Byrd	Helms	Rudman
Chafee	Hollings	Sasser
Chiles	Huddleston	Specter
Cohen	Humphrey	Stafford
Cranston	Kassebaum	Stennis
D'Amato	Kasten	Symms
Danforth	Kennedy	Tower
DeConcini	Lautenberg	Trible
Denton	Leahy	Tsongas
Dixon	Levin	Wallop
Dole	Long	Warner
Domenici	Lugar	Wilson
Eagleton	McClure	Zorinsky
East	Melcher	
Evans	Metzenbaum	

NAYS—3

Goldwater	Proxmire	Quayle

NOT VOTING—24

Boren	Heflin	Percy
Bradley	Inouye	Pryor
Bumpers	Jepsen	Riegle
Cochran	Johnston	Sarbanes
Dodd	Laxalt	Simpson
Durenberger	Mathias	Stevens
Ford	Matsunaga	Thurmond
Hart	Mattingly	Weicker

So the motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With the addition of Senators voting who did not answer the quorum call, a quorum is now present.

FIRST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1985

Mr. BAKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, it is 10 a.m. We are an hour past where I hoped we would be.

I am prepared now to ask the Senate to go to the first concurrent budget resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to consideration of Calendar Order No. 779 (S. Con. Res. 106).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 106) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, and revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal year 1984.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, could I inquire of the minority leader and the managers if it would be useful and productive now to try to establish a time less than the statutory time for a unanimous-consent request for consideration of this measure? What I had hoped to do is get us on the resolution by 9 a.m., and finish it by 11 a.m. But what I would like to do still is finish by 11 a.m., if we can.

I ask the distinguished managers, the minority leader, and, of course, all Senators whether or not it might be possible now to reduce the time to some time less than the statutory time, perhaps even as low as 1 hour.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I have been trying to talk to the Senator from Montana to find out what kind of time he might need. Basically from what I know on our side, I believe there would not be any problem with what the majority leader is suggesting. But I would like to confer with the Senator.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield to the Senator from Montana, if he wishes me to do so.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the majority leader for yielding. Let me observe that as far as I am concerned I think we would do a lot better moving right into the bill so that I may ask some questions rather than talking about time agreements. I can cooperate very much with everybody's wishes to wind this up rapidly. But I do want to ask a series of questions. I think it would save time.

As far as I am concerned, if we just move right into that and ask the questions, hopefully I will get the answers very promptly.

Mr. BAKER. I am encouraged by what the Senator says. Do I infer from what the Senator said that there is a possibility that we might get a vote on final passage by 11 o'clock even without an order?

Mr. MELCHER. Absolutely.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I designate the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee as the Senator to control time on this side.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I make a similar designation on this side yielding the time to the control of Mr. CHILES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MELCHER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield whatever time the Senator from Montana desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, I seek recognition at this time to ask a series of questions on function 150, foreign aid.

It is my understanding that for fiscal year 1984, the concurrent budget year figure for new budget authority is $21 billion. It is made up of $13.6 billion for budget authority for the ordinary foreign aid programs, plus $8.5 billion for the International Monetary Fund which is a one-time budget authority figure.

I ask the distinguished chairman of the Senate budget Commitee if that is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator is correct with regard to the fiscal year 1984 total and the amount for the IMF.

Mr. MELCHER. If that is correct, might the chairman inform me why $13.6 billion and $8.5 billion add up to $22.1 billion.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator is referring to function 150, the numbers on page 70, and page 71 of the first concurrent resolution report. Is that correct?

Mr. MELCHER. I am referring to function 150. It is fiscal year 1984, and it is in Senate Concurrent Resolution 106 on page 7.

Mr. DOMENICI. One reason for the increase in budget authority between fiscal 1984, adjusted for the IMF one-time $8.5 billion and fiscal 1985 is that more loan agreements are coming into the Export-Import Bank. Although the overall cap on Exim loans remains at $3.9 billion more loans are being made, and Eximbank is expected to come closer to its cap. That is for 1985. That is based upon what the CBO expects.

Mr. MELCHER. On page 7, for fiscal year 1984, it says new budget authority, $21 billion. The chairman has just answered that the budget authority for ordinary foreign aid programs in fiscal year 1984 was $13.6 billion, and that there was an $8.5 billion one-time budget authority.

Those two figures add up to $22.1 billion but the figure shown in this document as $21 billion. $13.6 billion and $8.5 billion, which the chairman has said were the key figures for fiscal

year 1984, add up to $22.1. I am asking why does $1.1 billion disappear in budget authority in this resolution.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator is saying $13.6 billion plus $8.5 billion equals more than $21 billion. Is that the question?

Mr. MELCHER. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me look for a minute, if the Senator will indulge me.

I think the answer is this: The fiscal year 1984 total for budget authority in function 150, international affairs, is $21.0 billion, as the Senator stated earlier. That figure included $8.5 billion for the IMF, and there is no request for more IMF funding in fiscal year 1985. The remaining $12.5 billion includes funds for the State Department, the Eximbank, and, as you mentioned, foreign aid. To assume that because in fiscal year 1984 the total without the IMF $8.5 billion is less than the $15.2 billion for fiscal year 1985, and, therefore, there is an increase in foreign aid, is to assume that everything is static in that account. But it is not. There are large areas not controlled by annual appropriations action. The repayment from old loans by the Export-Import Bank and the Departments of Agriculture and Defense are also estimated in this. The actual level of new loans made within the caps established in annual appropriations bills for Eximbank and military trust fund loans may vary.

The foreign military sales trust account is not static. It reflects advance payments by foreign nations and actual payment to U.S. contractors. It is in a state of flux and change, and increases by $0.8 billion between fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985. Eximbank goes up by $1.7 billion, even though the appropriations cap is assumed to remain at $3.8 billion. That is the main reason why we have $15.2 billion in fiscal year 1985 budget authority, not the $12.5 billion in the adjusted fiscal year 1984 figure.

(Mr. DENTON assumed the chair.)

Mr. MELCHER. If I understand the chairman correctly, and I will ask if I do understand him correctly, it is because carried in budget authority part of the components are repayments on arms sales or something similar, and that accrues to lower the budget authority. Is that correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. That is correct. Maybe I can put it this way. This function has both repayments and loans in four or five major areas. That is occurring all the time. We estimate that the repayments and demand for new loans in those two major accounts I mentioned above would change the budget authority because of the activity occurring.

Mr. MELCHER. That $1.2 billion is a gratifying experience if those repayment accounts indeed account for that. I will not pursue that any further, except to note that if those accounts could be reduced that amount by repayment, like people from Missouri, I will have to be shown to really believe it. That is not to cast any aspersions on the chairman's comments. It seems to me to be slightly fantastic.

My next question is, where are the supplemental appropriations in this budget on function 150?

Mr. DOMENICI. The question the Senator from Montana asks is where are the supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1984. There are no discretionary supplementals in this function, if that is the Senator's question. In function 150 there are no discretionary supplementals built into our baseline. If that is what the Senator is asking about, there are none.

Mr. MELCHER. That is exactly what I asked. I am asking if there are none, why are they not there, since we already passed a supplemental that contained a function 150 funds in it for Central America, which is now in conference, now nearing its end? Why is that not in this figure so we know what we are talking about?

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator is correct. There are $67 million and $21 million for Central America that are in the conference on House Joint Resolution 492. The conference is deadlocked on that. That amount, if approved exactly as the Senate passed it, most of which the House has not agreed to, would be $88 million that is not assumed in this resolution. The Senator is correct but I would point out that many of these supplementals are assumed in the fiscal year 1984 totals in the House-passed budget resolution.

Mr. MELCHER. Of course, there are none of the contemplated supplementals that the President contemplates in addition to that for Central America figured in here either, is there?

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MELCHER. Have we not figured in defense in other functions, the supplementals for defense?

Mr. DOMENICI. The one we expect in the national defense function is the pay supplemental, and it is in, although it may turn out to be less than we assumed. Nonetheless, we put in the full amount.

Mr. MELCHER. Might I further ask the chairman about the $67 million and the $21 million in the urgent supplemental now in conference for Central America. That is $88 million. I think there was an item of $90 million in Public Law 480 for Africa passed in a supplemental. Is that in here?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes. The Senator is speaking of the African aid.

Mr. MELCHER. It is in the $21 million of budget authority and the $12 million in outlays. Is that correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator is correct. It would be included in the fiscal year 1984 aggregate totals.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, I want to now go to the comparison of budget authority. After we subtract the one-time shot for the International Monetary Fund of $8.5 billion off the $21 billion, it would leave us with $12.5 billion, subtracting $8.5 billion from $21 billion. Now we find new budget authority for fiscal 1985 at $15.2 billion. Is that correct? Am I correct in subtracting $8.5 from the $21 to show that the budget authority, other than for the one-time International Monetary Fund, the budget authority for fiscal 1984 is at $12.5?

Mr. DOMENICI. That is mathematically correct.

Mr. MELCHER. Realistically, am I correct? Is that the way the committee figures?

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator is correct. It is a one-time thing.

Mr. MELCHER. The $8.5 billion is one time. But what I am asking is, is it realistic for me to think that the new budget authority for fiscal 1984 is $12.5 billion?

Mr. DOMENICI. Without the IMF, which the Senator has taken out in his calculation, the answer is "Yes."

The Senator is correct, and I discussed the reasons for that a few minutes ago.

Mr. MELCHER. Now, might I ask, is the $1 billion that the President has asked for Central America contained in the budget authority?

Mr. DOMENICI. To the extent that it is in the 1984 baseline, the answer is "yes." To the extent that we added more to the fiscal year 1984 level to bring it up to the $1.2 billion, the answer is "No." I do not know exactly the difference between the two. There is some in the baseline but not a full $1.2 billion.

Mr. MELCHER. Is it approximately $1 billion?

Mr. DOMENICI. It is slightly less than $1 billion.

Mr. MELCHER. Approximately $800 million?

Mr. DOMENICI. That is correct.

Mr. MELCHER. Now, might I ask, since we have increased the budget authority rather dramatically, almost 20 percent, between fiscal 1984 and fiscal 1985, has the budget authority for Public Law 480, food for peace, been increased?

Mr. DOMENICI. It has not been increased specifically, except to account for difficult levels of repayments.

Mr. MELCHER. Is it contemplated by the committee that it is increased?

Mr. DOMENICI. The budget for this function does not contemplate any specific increases. I would call to the Senator's attention that with inflation taken into account the baseline of budget authority for 1985 is $15.9 billion, almost $16 billion. That was the amount of budget authority contemplated by CBO to accomplish the same

things, the same program level, as provided in fiscal year 1984. After you take out the IMF, $8.5 billion, the one-time authorization, it would require $15.9 billion to do in fiscal year 1985 what we did in fiscal year 1984. That is $0.7 billion more than the $15.2 billion for fiscal year 1985 in this resolution.

I am not going to say that this committee said there is so much for Public Law 480 or not.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, may I further inquire, it is not true that in adding up these figures for budget authority and for outlay, in both instances, the committee is freezing Public Law 480 in their computations at the 1984 level, which is $1.2 billion?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes, Mr. President; let me just read from page 70 of the first concurrent 1985 budget resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 106, the following sentence with reference to this matter:

> The committee recognizes that such an assumed freeze in this function is only for illustrative purposes and is in no way intended to interfere with the appropriations committees authority to allocate the aggregate totals as they so determine.

Mr. MELCHER. May I translate that, and I ask the chairman to follow my translation and to correct it if it is necessary, may I translate that to say that as far as the committee could figure on how they could stay within the $15.2 of $15.9 billion, whatever we want to call it, for new budget authority and outlays of $13 billion, the committee, in effect, said, "We will give these various component amounts to illustrate how it can be done, though we cannot, in the Budget Act, actually include item by item."

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator is correct. However, I would add one further thing to it. I think we discussed it at length in the discussion of caps. There is a similarity: One is binding and one is a target. The caps would be binding; these are targets with some enforceability. But I think in addition to the use of the word "illustrative" within the function, the language also is trying to reiterate that all of the budget authority, not just in this function but in the entire budget, all of that budget authority, we do not intend in this document to interfere with the appropriations authority to allocate the aggregate totals—which means from other functions also. That is the only reason I clarify it.

In other words, if they save money somewhere else, they can move it wherever they want. That has been the history of the interpretation of the budget resolution.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, under the authority that the Budget Committee has and under the practicality of their problem to arrive at the key figures, the new budget authority and outlays for fiscal 1985, I appreciate the candid answers that the chairman has given me. I have asked these questions to clarify in my own mind and also to wave a red flag in the minds of my colleagues in the Senate that indeed, the foreign aid figures in both instances are dramatically increased. We are freezing an awful lot of domestic programs in our actions in this budget resolution. We are doing that to meet the urgent need to restrict Federal spending and to decrease the Federal deficit. So it is a rather stark contrast to find ourselves dramatically increasing the amount of foreign aid while we are freezing or cutting back on domestic programs which are quite urgent for our people.

In addition to that, Mr. President, we are also contemplating freezing the best part of foreign aid and that is Public Law 480, food for peace. At a time when we can demonstrate to the world not only the fine humanitarian feelings of the people in this country on providing food for the hungry and malnourished people in friendly contries abroad and to those facing, in the case of Africa, the stark reality, the very damaging reality of repeated years of drought, we should not, for humanitarian reasons, increase the amount for foreign assistance in terms of armaments or economic development without meeting their most urgent needs. That would be food.

Second, for winning friends and building trust for the United States around the world food indeed does do that job for us better than armaments.

In a few days, we shall be celebrating a very auspicious anniversary, the 30th anniversary of the enactment of Public Law 480, food for peace. I find it very much to our detriment that we would contemplate freezing the amount of food aid while we increase the other spending in foreign aid for armaments.

The decision, however, on the amounts for foreign aid, including food for peace, will be made by the Committee on Appropriations at a later time, with recommendations to the whole Senate. Then by majority vote the whole Senate decided. For that reason, we shall have the opportunity for making adjustments within the budget framework. I hope and I trust that the Senate will make some adjustments with regard to food for peace.

(Mr. DOMENICI assumed the chair.)

Mr. DENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. MELCHER. Yes, I am delighted to yield to my friend from Alabama for a question.

(Mr. KASTEN assumed the chair.)

Mr. DENTON. Mr. President, I do regard Mr. MELCHER as my dear friend. I ask him if he can see a relationship between the domestic economy and the degree of assistance this Nation can provide to its needy, if he can see the relationship between those two and the need to manage our foreign relations in such a manner as to avoid serious losses to the domestic economy as well as strategic and security disadvantages, which have indeed taking place? I appreciate deeply the thrust of the Senator's remarks, but in all brotherhood, from a lifetime of work in that particular field, I am so aware of how much it is costing the domestic economy because of failures in foreign policy, frequently resulting from the inability of the President to obtain from Congress the feeling that that aid to a certain nation is justified or such and such a commitment is justified.

I must ask if it is known, for example, that in Colombia one insurgent Communist group alone which used to receive arms from Castro is now getting $100 million a year that we can put our fingers on in protection money derived from cocaine dealers alone, international cocaine dealers. I daresay that the deleterious effect of what is happening in South Africa with respect to Communist disruption—and this is sincere, I say to the Senator—of the formerly valid African National Congress and SWAPO, now being treated as a valid organizations in the New York Times—is robbing us of access to resources and trade and costing us hundreds of millions, even hundreds of billions of dollars a year in total around the world. There is a relationship between foreign aid and the domestic welfare.

Mr. MELCHER. The Senator from Alabama is, of course, correct. There is a direct relationship and an indirect relationship, and I am not ignoring that. I want to emphasize that the direct relationship which does exist from the ability to supply food to a hungry people around the world is a very good; It shows the success of our agricultural producers and, indeed, has the humanitarian effect of supplying food to those who need it.

Mr. President, I conclude my statement by saying that within this framework that is laid out before us in the budget, I hope every Senator will take note of where we are in the increases in foreign aid, plus the contemplated necessity of either freezing Public Law 480 or even taking away from food-for-peace in order to meet needs for other facets of foreign aid in economic or arms assistance. I hope that that does not occur. I think it would be very bad policy. I want to serve notice that in the appropriations process I will be very vigilant in trying to make sure that does not happen.

I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for his very candid answers.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me say to my friend from Montana, we are most ap-

preciative of the Senator's cooperation today, and obviously his concern in the area he has addressed is well known in this body. We compliment him for his dedication to this issue.

AMENDMENT NO. 3078

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be given immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DENTON). The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) proposes an amendment numbered 3078.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Congress hereby determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1984 is revised, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 is established, and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 are set forth.

(a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1983, October 1, 1984, October 1, 1985, and October 1, 1986:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $665,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $743,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $810,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $882,300,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $2,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $10,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $15,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $18,800,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $39,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $45,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $52,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $57,900,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $166,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $189,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $206,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $223,600,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $914,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $1,012,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $1,106,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $1,209,800,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $855,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $925,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $998,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $1,086,300,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits in the budget which are appropriate in the light of economic conditions and all other relevant factors are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $190,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $181,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $187,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $204,000,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $1,596,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $1,844,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $2,108,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $2,398,500,000,000.

and the amounts by which the statutory limits on such debt should be accordingly increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $106,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $248,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $263,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $290,100,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1983, October 1, 1984, October 1, 1985, and October 1, 1986, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $37,600,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $105,200,000,000.
(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $36,700,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $110,800,000,000.
(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $40,800,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $116,700,000,000.
(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $71,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $41,800,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,300,000,000.
(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $75,100,000,000.

(b) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1984 through 1987 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $265,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $237,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $299,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $266,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $333,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $294,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $372,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $330,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $21,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $15,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $16,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $17,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $10,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $8,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $8,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1984:

(A) New budget authority, $3,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, $4,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, $4,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, $4,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1984:

(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1984:

(A) New budget authority, $4,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $4,700,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, $15,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $15,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $3,200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $14,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $3,200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, $13,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $3,200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1984:

(A) New budget authority, $5,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $4,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $50,000,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, $6,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $52,000,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, $6,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $2,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $54,600,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $71,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, $7,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $57,200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $75,100,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1984:

(A) New budget authority, $29,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $25,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, $28,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $26,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, $30,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $28,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, $31,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $29,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1984:

(A) New budget authority, $7,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $7,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,600,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, $6,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $8,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, $7,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $8,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, $7,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $8,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 1984:

(A) New budget authority, $31,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $28,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,400,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, $30,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $29,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,800,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, $30,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $30,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,000,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $31,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $31,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $33,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $36,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $38,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medical Insurance (570):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $62,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $71,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $84,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $99,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $118,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $144,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $155,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $164,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $175,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $179,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $199,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $215,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $202,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $229,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $217,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $26,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $26,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $22,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $27,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $27,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $28,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $5,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $6,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $6,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $5,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $5,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(18) General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (850):

Fiscal year 1984:

(A) New budget authority, $6,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $6,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, $6,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, $6,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, $6,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $6,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(19) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1984:

(A) New budget authority, $109,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $109,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, $124,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $124,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, $141,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $141,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, $160,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $160,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(20) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1984:

(A) New budget authority, $700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, $800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, $1,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $2,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, $3,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1984:

(A) New budget authority, −$15,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$15,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, −$33,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$33,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, −$37,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$37,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, −$38,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$38,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 2. If the Congress has not completed action by October 1, 1984 on the concurrent resolution on the budget required to be reported under section 310(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for fiscal year 1985, then, for purposes of section 311 of such Act, this concurrent resolution shall be deemed to be the concurrent resolution required to be reported under section 310(a) of such Act.

SEC. 3. No bill or resolution providing new discretionary budget authority or new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for fiscal year 1985, which exceeds the appropriate allocation of new discretionary budget authority or new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be enrolled in the House of Representatives, and no bill or resolution providing new budget authority or new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for fiscal year 1985, which exceeds the appropriate allocation of new budget authority or new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act shall be enrolled in the Senate, until after the Congress has completed action on the second concurrent resolution on the budget required to be reported under section 310 of such Act or until October 1, 1984, whichever comes first.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution, budget authority shall be determined on the basis applicable for fiscal year 1984.

SEC. 5. It is the sense of Congress that FY 1985 appropriations be increased for several non-defense discretionary programs. Priority should be given to education programs, environmental protection and health research activities.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared on both sides. It is basically a full substitute for the committee reported resolution. It incorporates everything the Senate has done in the last 4 or 5 weeks, and adopted last night as the Omnibus Deficit Reduction Act of 1984. The substitute includes new budget authority and outlay estimates for the new revenues estimates, the add-ons and other provisions. It does not include the mandatory cap language in the bill as passed last night. But the rest simply incorporate all those changes and their budget impact, including the $2 billion snythetic fuels amendment. The substitute budget resolution, therefore, generally conforms to the Senate's current actions to date.

Senator CHILES, the distinguished ranking minority member, has looked at it and he approves. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back their time?

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield back any time I have.

Mr. CHILES. All time is yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment (No. 3078) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) is going to offer an amendment on the veterans' function on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming and himself. Because of the way I have handled this amendment, this amendment would be out of order because it addresses the previous resolution, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order and that it be conformed to comply with the substitute which we have just adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT NO. 3079

(Purpose: To provide funding for a 10-percent cost-of-living increase in GI bill education benefits effective October 1, 1984)

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, Senator SIMPSON could not be present today. On his behalf and on behalf of myself, Senators STAFFORD, MURKOWSKI, BOSCHWITZ, RANDOLPH, MATSUNAGA, DECONCINI, DOMENICI, HUDDLESTON, CHILES, and BYRD, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), on behalf of Mr. SIMPSON, for himself, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. CHILES, and Mr. BYRD, proposes an amendment numbered 3079.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On page 27, lines 4 and 5, strike out "$26,800,000,000" and "$26,200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "27,000,000,000" and "$26,400,000,000", respectively.

On page 27, lines 13 and 14, strike out "$27,000,000,000" and "$26,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,200,000,000" and "$26,900,000,000", respectively.

On page 27, lines 22 and 23, strike out "$27,600,000,000" and "$27,300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,800,000,000" and "$27,400,000,000", respectively.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, this is a simple amendment to the budget. Figures for function 700, veterans' benefits and services. It has one purpose—to provide for funding for a 10-percent cost-of-living increase, effective October 1, 1984, in GI bill benefits.

Mr. President, the need for a GI bill cost-of-living increase is undeniable. That need has already been recognized by the entire membership of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, which unanimously recommended, in our budget views and estimates report to the Budget Committee in March, that an increase be provided. Indeed, even the administration has seen the need and is supporting and seeking enactment of an increase. In addition, the veterans' organizations have long urged that a COLA be enacted.

It is important to understand that GI bill benefits are not automatically increased each year. They are not indexed to the Consumer Price Index—CPI—or any other measure of increases in the cost of living or the cost of education. They have, since the enactment, 17 years ago in 1966, of the current, so-called Vietnam-era GI bill been increased only seven times.

The last time that GI bill benefits were increased was the two-step, 10-percent increase made by Public Law 96-466. A 5-percent increase took effect on October 1, 1980, and the second 5-percent increase on January 1, 1981. Since that time, increases in the cost of education—like increases in the cost of living—have been significant.

I call to my colleagues' attention data supplied by the Veterans' Administration. They show that, from the time of the last GI bill increase in 1981 through the 1983-84 school year, the costs of higher education rose by more than 33.3 percent in public 4-year colleges and by 37.9 percent in private schools. And it should be stressed that the 1980-81 increases of 15 percent did not make nearly up for the effects of inflation from the time of the prior increase in October 1977; over that period of time—October 1977 to October 1980—the rise in the CPI was over 37 percent.

Mr. President, we cannot permit the value of the GI bill dollar to continue to be eroded so substantially by increases in the cost of living and the cost of education.

Veterans and other eligible persons—the dependents of veterans with service-connected disabilities rated totally and permanently disabled and the survivors of those who died from service-connected causes—who are struggling to complete schooling must be given some fair assurance that their benefits will not be so greatly deflated.

Those now enrolled in training and receiving assistance from the VA—during this fiscal year, 675,000 individuals are expected to be using GI bill benefits—are primarily veterans of the Vietnam era. The number of Vietnam-era veterans in training or education programs in this fiscal year is 564,300, or about 85 percent of the total number of individuals receiving GI bill assistance. More than 78,200 of the trainees are surviving or dependent children and spouses. Still others—32,500—are service-connected disabled veterans participating in Veterans' Administration programs of vocational rehabilitation.

Mr. President, it is imperative that we take the steps necessary to insure that those veterans of the Vietnam era, those children and spouses of veterans who made enormous sacrifices, and those veterans with disabilities incurred in service receive a fair measure of the assistance they are owed.

Thus, our amendment would provide, as I noted at the outset, sufficient room for a cost-of-living increase in GI bill benefits of 10 percent, effective October 1, 1984. I recognize, Mr. President, that this amount is slightly less than what I proposed in January 1983 when I introduced S. 9, which provided for a 15-percent increase, effective October 1, 1983, and what the President finally proposed over 1 year later to become effective on January 1, 1985. However, it would be effective 3 months earlier than the President's proposal and would, therefore, get the value of this important benefit into the hands of veterans attending schools sooner and at a more opportune time—the beginning of the school year. It would also get more GI bill dollars into the hands of the veteran-student during the upcoming 1984-85 school year than would the President's proposal.

The importance of the earlier effective date is illustrated by the fact that during the 1-year period from October 1, 1983, the effective date I first proposed for an increase, and October 1 of this year, over 500,000 Vietnam-era veterans lost their GI bill eligibility.

Finally, Mr. President, providing for a GI bill COLA of 10 percent, effective October 1, 1984, although slightly more costly—by $25 million—in fiscal year 1985 than the 15-percent increase proposed by the administration does result in a savings to the deficit over the following 4 fiscal years of almost $350 million as compared to the President's proposal.

In short, our amendment is both a fair and prudent approach to a most justified need.

This amendment would provide increases in function 700, veterans' benefits and services, of $160 million in budget authority and $157 in outlays in fiscal year 1985, $209 million in budget authority and $207 million in outlays in fiscal year 1986, and $167 million in budget authority and $169 million in outlays in fiscal year 1987 over the unrounded levels on which the levels in the resolution as reported are based. These unrounded levels are: $26.830 billon in budget authority and $26.227 billion in outlays in fiscal year 1985, $26.962 billion in budget authority and $26.660 billion in outlays in fiscal year 1986, and $27.648 billion in budget authority and $27.276 billion in outlays in fiscal year 1987. The unrounded and rounded figures in function 700, if our amendment is adopted, would be as displayed on a chart that I ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECT OF GI BILL AMENDMENT TO FUNCTION 700

[In billions of dollars; function 700 totals]

	Fiscal year 1985		Fiscal year 1986		Fiscal year 1987	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Unrounded	26.990	26.384	27.171	26.867	27.815	27.445
Rounded	27.0	26.4	27.2	26.9	27.8	27.4

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, our amendment is for the GI bill COLA alone and does not include additional

amounts for the so-called discretionary accounts. As my colleagues are aware, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON) and I, together with Senators RANDOLPH, MATSUNAGA, DECONCINI, and BAUCUS, had planned—during consideration of the so-called "boat safety" bill earlier today—to offer an amendment to the Baker amendment. That planned amendment of ours would have increased the caps on nondefense discretionary appropriations in order specifically to provide for funding for the so-called discretionary accounts of the Veterans' Administration, primarily medical care and construction, at the level proposed in the President's budget and unanimously recommended by the Veterans' Affairs Committee in its fiscal year 1985 budget views and estimates on veterans' programs. However, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), who is the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on HUD-Independent Agencies, which has jurisdiction over VA appropriations, and I discussed with the able chairman of that subcommittee (Mr. GARN), his plans for fiscal year 1985 appropriations for the VA.

As a result, we believe, based on assurances from the subcommittee chairman, that, within the overall levels proposed to be set by the appropriations caps and the budget resolution, there will be room for adequate funding for veterans' programs and that these programs will be very favorably considered in the appropriations bill reported from the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee. On this basis, Senator HUDDLESTON and I decided not to proceed with our amendment.

In this connection, I would also note the reference in the Senate Budget Committee's report accompanying the budget resolution—Senate Report No. 98-399—on page 97, that, to the extent that the function 700 totals reflect the assumed limitations on the discretionary accounts, they are "in no way . . . intended to interfere with the Appropriations Committee's authority to allocate the aggregate totals as they so determine."

However, the issue of a GI bill COLA is an entirely different matter. The GI bill is an entitlement program and thus would not be affected in any way by the discretionary appropriations caps. Thus, we are now pursuing this amendment as an essential step toward enabling our committee to consider and report legislation—that it has already approved in its budget recommendations—to grant a GI bill COLA in fiscal year 1985. If provision for this COLA is not made in the budget resolution—and it is not provided for in the resolution as reported—there obviously cannot be room for it in the crosswalk to the Veterans' Affairs Committee and our committee would, as a practical matter, be foreclosed from acting on legislation to provide this long overdue increase. Accordingly, it is essential, if we are going to have a realistic chance of enacting a GI bill COLA this year, that this amendment prevail.

Mr. President, for these reasons, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment. The question is, quite simply, whether we will do the right thing by the Vietnam-era veterans who are seeking to use their GI bill benefits to pursue education and training. I believe that we have a strong obligation to do so, and I hope that the Senate will reconfirm its commitment to our Nation's Vietnam-era veterans by adopting this amendment.

(By request of Mr. DOMENICI, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD:)

● Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, this amendment I am offering is cosponsored by my highly esteemed colleague from California, the ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Senator CRANSTON and by my other very capable colleagues, Senators RANDOLPH, MATSUNAGA, DECONCINI, BOSCHWITZ, MURKOWSKI, STAFFORD, and DOMENICI. It would add to the fiscal year 1985, 1986, and 1987 function 700 budget levels sufficient money to provide for the enactment of a 10-percent GI bill rate increase to be effective October 1, 1984.

After long and difficult deliberations over the President's proposal to introduce legislation in fiscal year 1985 to enact a GI bill rate increase of 15 percent effective January 1, 1985, I was successful in reaching agreement with my highly regarded friend, ALAN CRANSTON, in offering a compromise acceptable to all 12 members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. On March 15, the Veterans' Committee reported to the Budget Committee in its views and estimates on the fiscal year 1985 budget, explaining its recommendation as follows:

Although this recommended legislation represents an increase over the President's request for fiscal year 1985, it provides a balanced approach to two basic committee concerns. The first is the need to counter in a substantial way the effects of inflation on the purchasing power of VA rehabilitation and GI bill benefit dollars through the enactment of a COLA in fiscal year 1985. In proposing an earlier effective date for the COLA increase than does the administration, the Committee seeks to meet the needs of a large number of veterans who might not otherwise have enough time left before reaching their delimiting date to begin a program of education or rehabilitation. The second is that the Congress must be responsive to the great national need to control future deficits. The approach recommended by the Committee responds to both concerns.

Mr. President, this amendment would provide funds to allow the enactment of a 10 percent rate increase in GI bill benefits effective October 1, 1984 at a cost of $25 million above the President's request in his fiscal year 1985 budget; it would also save $348 million in budget authority from what the President requested for the years after fiscal year 1985.

The $25 million additional cost in the fiscal year 1985 budget is one that would be paid from the general revenues because this benefit is an entitlement. The $25 million it would add to the budget would not come from either of the two caps the Senate has so recently established for discretionary defense and nondefense appropriations.

Therefore, I am fully supportive of this amendment's acceptance by the Senate. It would provide funds for the enactment of a needed cost-of-living increase to veterans using their GI bill education and rehabilitation benefits. Such legislation at the same time, would produce an overall, long-term, future year reduction in the expenditure of Federal dollars, a goal I support in the strongest of terms. I think this approach achieves a good compromise between the two concerns of the committee I have described and is sensitive to both. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.●

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment, which would amend function 700 budget totals to accommodate a 10-percent increase in GI bill education benefits for Vietnam-era veterans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Fiscal Years—			
	1985	1986	1987	Total 1984–87
Budget authority	+160	+209	+167	+536
Outlays	+153	+207	+169	+529

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, GI bill education benefits have been an important aid to wartime veterans in their readjustment to civilian life after military service.

The program is successful. It is reaching its goals. Over two-thirds of Vietnam-era veterans have already used their GI bill benefits.

The program is winding down as Vietnam-era veterans reach their educational goals or reach their ending date of eligibility.

This proposed rate increase, the first since 1980, might encourage veterans to finish their education before their eligibility expires.

The cost-of-living has increased by 20 percent since 1980, and the costs of tuition have increased even more.

The rate increase might also encourage eligible veterans to use their benefits. CBO estimates that as many as 15,000 new trainees may enroll by fiscal year 1985 to take advantage of these benefits.

The Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee unanimously requested this GI bill rate increase. The President's budget request included a similar initiative.

We must insure that our Vietnam veterans have every opportunity to complete their education.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and give our wartime Vietnam-era veterans a chance for a brighter future.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I support the adoption of the amendment, and I am ready to yield back any time that we have.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield back any time that we have on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3079) was agreed to.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I thank Senators DOMENICI and CHILES for their cooperation.

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, I should like to clarify an issue concerning appropriations levels under the budget resolution. As I understand it, the resolution does not eliminate the normal functions of the Appropriations Committee in determining where to set funding levels for individual programs, so long as total appropriations for all nondefense programs in the aggregate remain within the prescribed ceiling. Is this correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Pursuing this point further, while the resolution assumes a freeze on nondefense appropriations in the aggregate, it is my understanding that the resolution does not dictate to the Appropriations Committee that every individual program and account be frozen. The Appropriations Committees would remain free—as they traditionally have been—to fund individual programs at higher levels, so long as other discretionary programs had their appropriations reduced sufficiently so that total spending fit within the ceiling.

Mr. DOMENICI. That is the intention.

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Now yesterday, the Senate Agriculture Committee reported a bill that reauthorizes the WIC program—the special supplemental food program for women, infants and children—for 2 years at current services levels. These levels are, of course, only authorization ceilings. They do not require any specific levels of spending—rather they simply allow the Appropriations Committee to appropriate enough funds to maintain WIC at current services if the Appropriations Committee can squeeze enough funds out of other accounts to remain within the overall ceiling. There is nothing unique in this approach. I understand that there are certain areas of nondefense spending in which the administration, itself, is seeking increases above the freeze level, and once again, these would not be precluded if the Appropriations Committee can find the funds elsewhere.

So it is my understanding that the Agriculture Committee's action to reauthorize WIC at current services levels—and let the Appropriations Committees determine the actual spending level for the program—is not a breach of this resolution.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator is correct. Ultimately, the Appropriations Committee would determine the final funding level for WIC and would have to live within the overall, aggregate spending ceilings we have established. But we are not dictating authorization or apropriations levels for individual program accounts or requiring that every program is to be funded at exactly the freeze level. We are setting the overall ceilings, and the Appropriations Committees will make the decisions on funding levels on a program-by-program basis.

REPLACEMENT OF BUDGET COMMITTEE CONFEREE

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BIDEN be replaced by Senator SASSER as a Budget Committee conferee on H.R. 4170.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A WEAK FIRST STEP

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am going to hold my nose and vote for this resolution. It reduces projected deficits for the period fiscal years 1985-87 by about $86 billion when compared to the Congressional Budget Office baseline.

The sum is inadequate, puny even. But given the administration's adamant stand against cuts in the huge defense budget, it may be the best the Senate can do. We should have done more.

The financial markets are telling us we should have done more. Interest rates are going up and no wonder. Here we are in the middle of an economic recovery yet the Federal Government is borrowing over $200 billion a year. Private industry is now operating at over 80 percent of capacity. At this stage of the recovery, businesses should be investing in new plant and equipment. Such investment should set the stage for a sustained, noninflationary recovery.

What industry, what financial manager, is going to make those investments when risk-free Treasury bonds pay over 13 percent interest. The CBO estimates that deficits will actually increase even if this resolution is passed. Under those conditions, the chances are excellent that interest rates will go still higher—possibly much higher.

The Senate has had numerous opportunities to take tougher action to reduce those deficits. For one reason or another, none of the alternatives offered could attract the support of a majority of Senators.

After the election, the Senate may be willing to take a second look at these alternatives. We are going to have to cut spending much more than this resolution does. We are going to have to raise more revenue than this resolution raises. Here is one Senator who hopes the economy will give us the time we evidently need to take these difficult steps.

We are taking an awful risk by waiting. If that gamble fails, history will judge us harshly. And it should.

● Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I am voting against the first concurrent budget resolution, just as I voted against the Rose Garden deficit reduction plan last evening.

I want to be clear about the reason for these votes. It is not because I oppose deficit reduction, but rather because the resolution and the deficit reduction package is inadequate overall. It is inadequate because, under its provisions, deficits over the next 3 years will total more than $569 billion. By fiscal year 1987 this budget scenario will give us a deficit above $200 billion. That is unacceptable.

Interest rates already are on the rise again, with the prime rate pegged at 12.5 percent. The deficits the Senate is going to condone by its votes on these measures can only exacerbate the situation because they do nothing to restrain the growth in interest rates and, indeed, the mushrooming size of our national debt and the excessive cost of servicing that debt.●

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I will vote against the first concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 1985, which sets forth the overall spending and revenue plan affecting all agencies and departments of the Government. Its defense spending totals are too high, its priorities are skewed, and it projects an increasing deficit over the next 3 years instead of a decreasing one. The deficit would be $180 billion in fiscal year 1985 and $204 billion in fiscal year 1987. That is not the direction we should go in if we want interest rates and the unemployment rate to decline. That is not the direction we

should go in if States like my home State of Michigan which have suffered through the recession are to fully share in national prosperity.

Yesterday, I voted in favor of final passage of the Rose Garden plan deficit reduction package because it will reduce the deficit during the next 3 years below what it would be if we did nothing. Today's resolution, even though it assumes the Rose Garden plan, should not be passed because what it says, in effect, is that we are satisfied with that amount of deficit reduction and we are satisfied with the spending priorities. When it comes to the issue of how to sustain and broaden the current recovery, being satisfied with "better than nothing" is not good enough. We should not be satisfied with a $204 billion deficit in fiscal year 1987, but we should do what we can to make sure that we do not have a $245 billion deficit in that year. We faced a $245 billion deficit in fiscal year 1987 if we did noting. By voting for yesterday's deficit reduction plan, I voted to have a $204 billion deficit than a $245 billion deficit in that year. By voting against the budget resolution today, I am saying that we should not be satisfied with a $204 billion deficit either.

This budget resolution calls for a 7-percent increase in defense spending after taking into account inflation. I would prefer to see that figure reduced to 3-percent real growth and have the remainder used for deficit reduction and more adequately other programs of national need such as health. This 3-percent level of defense spending would be consistent with building our military strength at the same time we reduce the deficit so that the economic recovery can expand. In voting for final passage of the rose garden plan, I indicated that I preferred a 7-percent real increase in defense spending to the 13-percent real increase which the President first proposed. However, I cannot support this budget resolution which sets the level of defense spending at a 7-percent real increase, because I think that even that level is unnecessarily high to meet our military needs for a strong defense.

Likewise, I have difficulty supporting a budget resolution which does not make room in it for strengthening the minimum tax so that everyone in this country who has substantial amounts of income pay at least something in taxes. As a matter of equity and as a matter of reducing the deficit, we should not pass up the opportunity to increase revenues through strengthening the minimum tax and through closing additional tax loopholes, such as those which provide for unnecessary incentives to the oil industry.

For these reasons I cannot support this budget resolution. I hope that the product which emerges from the House-Senate conference committee is more in line with the priorities and goals which I have laid out.●

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I was amazed to read an article in this morning's Washington Post on the White House backing off from its criticism of the Federal Reserve.

What amazes me is that their change has nothing to do with economics, only with the politics of interest rates.

Last week I said that Dr. Feldstein had been saying that the emperor has no clothes, he has no economic policy. He has no plan to reduce the deficits.

I call the Senate's attention to two key paragraphs in the Post article.

First, that the criticism of the Fed was intended to be a "subtle repositioning of the President" in case interest rates continue to rise.

Second, that the President's statements on the desirable rate of money growth have been "deliberately vague."

Mr. President, is that leadership? Is that an economic policy?

Certainly this budget resolution displays neither leadership nor a responsible economic policy.

It lets the deficits rise by $22 billion from $182 billion in 1985 to $204 billion in 1987.

Mr. President, I think we are prepared to vote now on the budget resolution.

I just point out that in 1985 the deficits under this would be $182 billion; in 1986, $187 billion; and in 1987, $204 billion.

So they will increase $22 billion over the 3-years and add $573 million to the national debt.

Defense is a real 7 percent above inflation, so it means $35 billion over 1984. That is a 13-percent growth in the nominal.

In the same time the domestic discretionary is 12.4 percent nominal, minus 3.5 percent real, and only increase of $2 billion over 1984.

I do not think that is a very good balance—$35 billion to $2 billion.

I am going to vote against this resolution. I think it added to the deficit. I think it is the wrong trend. The deficits will be going up rather than going down, and I think that is the worst of all signals that we could send to the financial markets.

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the distinguished ranking member, Senator CHILES, has hit the nail on the head and I want to associate myself with his remarks. This resolution is simply a reprise of the issues we have been grappling with for the last month. I voted against the substance of the Rose Garden plan yesterday. I will vote against this resolution which endorses that plan for increasing deficits and distorted priorities today.●

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 280, Calendar Order No. 780.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 280) to revise the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1984 and setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the text of Senate Concurrent Resolution 106.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will vote against the resolution for the same reasons that Mr. CHILES has stated.

Mr. President, however, I do want to emphasize one point to my colleagues, Mr. President, this is the first budget resolution ever reported by the Senate Budget Committee to propose increasing deficits. Since budget resolutions first started projecting the outyear effects in 1978, all budget resolutions brought before the Senate, and indeed passed by it, have contained a fiscal plan that would result in lower deficits in each succeeding year, and, occasionally, even a budget surplus.

If the Senate passes this budget resolution, it will be sending the wrong signal to the American people, to the financial community, and to our allies around the world. If the Senate passes this resolution, it will set the ignominious precedent of being the first budget resolution ever passed by this body that called for increasing "budget deficits.

Under the resolution the Senate will be throwing in the towel condoning deficits that continue to rise.

I do not believe we should be throwing in the towel.

I supported the amendment by the senior Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES) to the previous bill. That amendment would have set us on a path toward a balanced budget. We must not continue to mortgage our children's future by continuing to pile up ever increasing amounts of Federal debt. Under this resolution, by fiscal year 1987, we will have a public debt of nearly $2.4 trillion, a debt equal to half of our gross national product.

This resolution, as did the so-called deficit reduction plan we passed yes-

terday, seems to say "That's OK." It seems to be saying that it all right to double the national debt in just 5 years.

Well, if we are going to raise the white flag on budget deficits, surrender to the rising tide of red ink, and capitulate to the mounting debt, then we deserve all the scorn that the citizens of this land may heap upon us.

The Democrats have tried to reverse this trend. The Chiles amendment would have given us lower deficits each year. That amendment was not perfect. But it was certainly a major step in the right direction, and certainly much more acceptable to me than then resolution now before us.

Therefore, Mr. President, I oppose this budget resolution, and urge all of my colleagues who are concerned about rising deficits to do likewise.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I think we are waiting for the majority leader now. I think the minority leader had a question he wanted to ask.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, is this not the first time that a budget resolution has been reported from the Senate Budget Committee which projects increasing deficits for each of the next 3 years?

Mr. CHILES. To my knowledge, that is correct. I have tried to check that since the minority leader asked me that this morning.

Mr. BYRD. This will be the first time that the Senate will have voted for such a budget resolution?

Mr. CHILES. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, that is probably correct. On the other hand, the Senate many times has reported budget resolutions that assumed the trend line was going down but as it turned out it was going up.

Mr. President, for all the Senators let me say that the Senator from New Mexico will vote for this resolution.

Basically, we took the last 5 weeks to vote on almost every basic issue that is incorporated in this budget resolution. That is why we are not taking a great deal of time today.

As I indicated, other than the mandatory caps which are replaced with the Budget Act processes for enforcement—since it is a resolution—the rest of it but for the amendment on veterans here this morning is just confirming in the form of a resolution what we adopted last night by a vote of 74 to 23.

I am sure that all 74 Senators will not vote in support of this resolution today, but basically it is almost an identical fiscal and tax policy for the year 1985 and military preparedness policy as we voted on last night.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is the first budget resolution ever reported by the Senate Budget Committee to propose increasing deficits. Since budget resolutions first started projecting the out-year effects in 1978, all budget resolutions brought before the Senate, and indeed passed by it, have contained a fiscal plan that would result in lower deficits in each succeeding year, and, occasionally, even a budget surplus.

If the Senate passes this budget resolution, it will be sending the wrong signal to the American people, to the financial community, and to our allies around the world. If the Senate passes this resolution, it will set the precedent of being the first budget resolution ever passed by this body that called for increasing budget deficits.

Under this resolution the Senate would be throwing in the towel, condoning deficits that continue to rise.

I do not believe we should be throwing in the towel.

I supported the amendment by the senior Senator from Florida, Mr. CHILES, to the bill passed yesterday. The Chiles amendment would have set us on a path toward a balanced budget. We must not continue to mortgage our children's future by continuing to pile up ever increasing amounts of Federal debt. Under this resolution, by fiscal year 1987, we will have a public debt of nearly $2.4 trillion, a debt equal to half of our gross national product.

This resolution, as did the so-called deficit reduction plan we passed yesterday, seems to say "That's OK." It seems to be saying that it is all right to double the national debt in just 5 years.

Well, if we are going to raise the white flag on budget deficits, surrender to the rising tide of red ink, and capitulate to the mounting public debt, then we deserve all the scorn that the citizens of this land may heap upon us.

The Democrats have tried to reverse this trend. The Chiles amendment would have given us lower deficits each year. That amendment was not perfect. But it was certainly a major step in the right direction, and certainly much more acceptable to me than the resolution now before us.

Therefore, Mr. President, I oppose this budget resolution, and urge all of my colleagues who are concerned about rising deficits to do likewise.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for this rollcall be 10 minutes instead of 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after this matter is disposed of a vote occur immediately, without further debate, on the Sakharov resolution on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the time remaining on our side.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BAKER. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. COHEN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. JEPSEN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. LAXALT), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MATTINGLY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) would each vote "yea."

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BRADLEY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Sena-

tor from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON) would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDREWS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 103 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Abdnor	Gorton	Pressler
Andrews	Grassley	Proxmire
Baker	Hatch	Quayle
Boschwitz	Hatfield	Roth
Chafee	Hawkins	Rudman
D'Amato	Hecht	Specter
Danforth	Heinz	Stafford
Denton	Helms	Symms
Dole	Kassebaum	Tower
Domenici	Kasten	Trible
East	Lugar	Wallop
Evans	McClure	Warner
Garn	Murkowski	Wilson
Goldwater	Packwood	

NAYS—34

Armstrong	Eagleton	Mitchell
Baucus	Glenn	Moynihan
Bentsen	Hollings	Nickles
Biden	Huddleston	Nunn
Bingaman	Humphrey	Pell
Burdick	Kennedy	Randolph
Byrd	Lautenberg	Sasser
Chiles	Leahy	Stennis
Cranston	Levin	Tsongas
DeConcini	Long	Zorinsky
Dixon	Melcher	
Dodd	Metzenbaum	

NOT VOTING—25

Boren	Heflin	Pryor
Bradley	Inouye	Riegle
Bumpers	Jepsen	Sarbanes
Cochran	Johnston	Simpson
Cohen	Laxalt	Stevens
Durenberger	Mathias	Thurmond
Exon	Matsunaga	Weicker
Ford	Mattingly	
Hart	Percy	

So the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 280), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, after 2 months of floor debate, the Senate today voted on final passage of the first congressional budget resolution for 1985 through 1987, which is better known as the President's Rose Garden plan. I wish that I could say the hours and hours we have spent on this legislation had improved it. Unfortunately the policies of the Rose Garden plan remain as inadequate as the day it was first announced.

First, and foremost, this plan is not a deficit reducer, but rather a deficit increaser. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO), the annual deficit will increase to $204 billion by 1987.

This deficit increase will just continue the trend of record deficits under this administration. Annual Federal deficits have increased threefold since President Reagan took office. In 1981, the Federal deficit stood at $58 billion. In 1982, it exceeded $100 billion for the first time in our history. In 1983, it almost doubled again to $195 billion. The total combined deficit of the first 3 years of the Reagan administration exceeds the total deficits of the previous 33 years of both Republican and Democratic administrations.

The CBO estimates continued deficits in the $190 billion range for 1984 and 1985. Federal spending is now equal to 23.9 percent of the gross national product (GNP). Never before, except when the Nation has been at war, has Federal spending equaled such a large percentage of our Nation's output.

Three years ago when the President's economic program was first presented to the Congress, I warned that his tax and budget policies would lead to record deficits that would present us with a painful choice. A choice between a new round of devastating budget cuts larger than the first or the acceptance of even greater budget deficits.

Well the choice fell upon us and the Senate has chosen even greater deficits. This budget plan will increase the deficit to over $200 billion in 1987. We are not making a downpayment on the deficit, but rather are falling farther behind on our payments.

I for one do not like the idea of my children and grandchildren paying off the debts we are running up today. More importantly, their economic future is being jeopardized by these record deficits. I agree with the vast majority of economists that continued high deficits will mean increased interest rates and the possibility of renewed inflation. Today the prime rate stands at 12.5 percent. I shudder to think what it might be in 2 years under present policies.

The crisis situation we are in today demands dramatic action. The alternative is to put off that painful choice to another year when even more drastic action will have to be taken or we will have to absorb even greater deficits. That is why I supported, for the second year in a row, the budget freeze proposal put forth by Senator HOLLINGS. This budget freeze proposal would have reduced the deficit by $735 billion over the next 5 years. It was the only budget proposal receiving serious consideration that would reduce the deficit below $100 billion in 1987.

Under this proposal, the only programs to be exempted from a freeze are defense spending, which would be limited to 3 percent real growth, and programs specifically targeted to the needy—supplemental security income, food stamps, medicare, and medicaid.

Hundreds of programs I have long supported would have been affected. But I felt that the deficit situation this administration has gotten us into is so serious that we need real and dramatic action now to bring the budget under control. And this was the fairest and most across-the-board way to impose restraint on the budget process.

I also voted for the budget plan proposed by Senator CHILES. This proposal would have provided for a real growth rate in defense of 4 percent, partial inflation adjustment for nondefense discretionary programs, and additional tax revenues by delaying tax indexing for 2 years, while protecting low and moderate income families. This proposal, while still not sufficient in its deficit impact, would have reduced the deficit by $35 billion more than the Rose Garden plan over the next 3 years.

And I voted for the plan proposed by Senators CHAFEE, MATHIAS, STAFFORD, WEICKER, and ANDREWS that would have put one cap on all spending, rather than the separate caps for defense and nondefense discretionary spending in the Rose Garden plan. This proposal would have reduced the deficit by $17 billion more than the rose garden plan over 3 years. It also would have left it up to Appropriations Committee to determine how much is spent for defense and how much is spent for nondefense discretionary. The presumption of the proposal's sponsors, which I endorsed, was that the committee would provide for 4-percent defense growth and modest increase for nondefense.

None of the budget plans I supported were perfect plans. All of them would have adversely affected programs I have long supported. But at least they would have made a real downpayment on the deficit.

I could not, in good conscience, vote for the Rose Garden plan that will increase the deficit to a record $204 billion in 1987. And I also could not support the 7-percent real increase in defense spending contained in the rose garden plan.

A 7-percent after inflation increase in the defense budget, which would come to about a 13-percent increase cannot be justified on military or economic terms. The Reagan administration continues to pour money into exotic and superfluous weapons systems, the full cost of which will no doubt mushroom in the coming years. Instead of a steady, consistent increase that emphasizes conventional force readiness and the need to continue to attract high quality men and women into the uniformed services, the President is looking for a quick and exorbitantly costly technological fix to our defense requirements.

I supported the budget freeze proposal of Senator HOLLINGS that would have allowed a 3-percent increase in

defense spending. I also supported a proposal by Senator CHILES and unitary cap proposal by Senator CHAFEE which assumed a 4-percent real growth in defense, or about a 10-percent increase including inflation.

We need some semblance of moderation and consistency in our defense budget process. Without it, I fear that when the Congress really gets serious about the deficit, defense cuts will once again be aimed—not at the headline grabbing big-ticket items now under production—but rather at the less glamorous, but critically important, area of keeping our General Purpose Forces combat ready.

The Rose Garden plan also assumes $48.3 billion in revenue increases in fiscal years 1984-87 from enactment of the Finance Committee's deficit reduction package contained in the Dole-Long amendment. Although I had problems with some aspect of this tax package and thought that more could be done to close loopholes and make the Tax Code more fair, I supported the increase in revenues as necessary to make some progress on the deficit.

I did not agree, however, with the medicare-medicaid cuts contained in the Dole-Long amendment.

In my State of Vermont these cuts will amount to over $16 million. This does not take into account those changes which can be computed—the delay in age eligibility and the freeze on physicians fees. Elderly people in Vermont will pay over $12 million in increased medicare premiums. They will pay another $2 million in increased deductible costs. And I fear for those who become ill in the 1-month period between their 65th birthday and the date of eligibility. Many will be without health insurance and may not have the resources to obtain necessary care. Others will use up savings.

A freeze on physician fees may reduce Federal spending, but it does nothing to bring down rising health care costs. These costs will be passed on to the elderly who have trusted us to protect them in their later years. I do not know about elderly people in other States, but many older Vermonters simply cannot come up with the money to help with this down payment on the deficit.

My State will lose over $2 million in medicaid Federal reimbursement payments, due to the extension of the reduction in Federal matching payments in medicaid. States will have a choice of replacing the Federal funds with State moneys or cutting back in services. I know that many States have already cut back services to low income, handicapped, families, and children and others. And I am told by State administrators that more and more people are being forced into poverty through cutbacks over the last few years. The demand for assistance is growing at the same as the States ability to respond is weakening.

That is why I supported amendments to repeal these cuts offered by Senators KENNEDY, BUMPERS, and BAUCUS. I voted for these amendments because I believe the elderly and the poor are paying too great a price for the fiscal mess the economic policies of this administration have placed us in.

In summary, Mr. President, I could not support the Rose Garden plan because it is a deficit increaser, it spends too much on defense, and it unfairly burdens the elderly and the poor. I look forward to the recommendations of the conference committee and hope that they will more effectively and fairly address the critical economic and social issues before us today.●

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there is an order for another vote to follow immediately. There will be no more record votes after this vote which is upcoming. I remind Senators that there is an order for the Senate to meet on Monday, and we will have votes on Monday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Budget Committee may proceed for 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDREWS). The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment to the concurrent resolution, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. TOWER, Mr. CHILES, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. SASSER, conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANDREI SAKHAROV AND YELENA BONNER

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 304.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 304) expressing the sense of the Congress that Yelena Bonner should be allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union for the purpose of seeking medical treatment, urging that the President protest the continued violation of human rights in the Soviet Union, including the rights of Andrei Sakharov and Elena Bonner, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, half-a-world away, the Soviet city of Gorky, a brilliant scientist and his wife are prime players in a drama which graphically illustrates the choices for this generation.

The scientist is Andrei Sakharov, exiled to Gorky in 1980 because he dared to question his government—a "crime" which is a way of life for us in America.

Now the Soviet regime has gone after his wife as well. Yelena Bonner has been charged with "defaming the Soviet system" under a treason statute. The maximum penalty confronting Miss Bonner is death.

Yelena's real crime is her quest for health. Ill with a serious heart ailment as well as eye disease, she desperately seeks government approval for surgery in Italy. But life, limb, and personal security are not sacred in Soviet Russia. Her request has been denied and has led to charges of treason.

Hollywood could not possibly produce a more gripping tale of good versus evil, of noble, courageous souls standing firm against a state which seems to hate life itself.

But this is not fiction.

And we cannot stand silent in our own secure, free slice of the world as such horrors snuff life and dignity from our own contemporaries.

I have helped organize the International Parliamentary Group for Human Rights in the Soviet Union (IPG)—as a broadbased coalition to combat Soviet oppression.

The IPG now has over 300 members—we are from legislative bodies in more than a dozen Western countries. We are liberal and conservative. We are from diverse parties.

But we share a love for freedom, a love for our own generation, a love for the Russian people. In the name of all that is decent and humane, we lift our voices today on behalf of Andrei Sakharov and Yelena Bonner, along with millions of their countrymen.

We appeal to Soviet officials to let their people go. For a nation so desperate to stir positive world opinion, so desperate for a civilized image, this would be, in fact, a savvy move.

If for no other reason, we say to Soviet officials, liberate Sakharov and Bonner for your own image. Human dignity and preservation of life are the marks of a civilized society.

At this time I would like to submit on behalf of IPG a status report on the health of Drs. Bonner and Sakharov.

The report follows:

STATEMENT ON MEDICAL STATUS OF DRS. YELENA BONNER-SAKHAROV AND ANDREI SAKHAROV

The medical problems of Drs. Yelena Bonner-Sakharov and Andrei Sakharov are multiple, complex, and extremely grave. Dr. Bonner is critically ill. The fast begun by Dr. Sakharov on May 2 and by Dr. Bonner on May 12, puts both of them in jeopardy.

The medical facts brought to the West are troubling. Dr. Bonner is 61 years old. During World War II, she sustained some injury to her eyes, subsequently resulting in an increase in the pressure of the fluid within the eye (glaucoma). This was successfully treated by surgery three times. This surgical treatment (establishment of a path for the escape of fluid) must be repeated periodically. In 1982, Dr. Bonner developed symptoms indicating the need for additional eye surgery, but was denied permission to leave Russia for treatment in Italy, where she had been previously cared for. The high fluid pressure within her eyes has resulted in injury to vital eye structures, leading to considerable loss of sight. She has a large blind spot in her left eye (a central scotoma) and the field of vision of each eye is greatly reduced. Much of her vision has been irreversibly lost and her residual eyesight is progressively deteriorating.

In April 1983, Dr. Bonner suffered a heart attack (myocardial infarction). She subsequently experienced two additional myocardial infarcts (October 1983 and January 1984). While we are missing the full details of these important events, we do know something of the present condition of her heart. She has frequent episodes of substernal chest pain (angina). These episodes are brought on by trivial exertion and are relieved by nitroglycerine. She requires 20-30 nitroglycerine tables each day. In addition, she has shortness of breath. These symptoms suggest that the arteries bringing blood to her heart are blocked. It is also possible that her prior heart attacks have damaged the heart muscle so severely that it is not pumping blood properly. This possibility is made more likely by the recent news that Dr. Bonner has been noted to have dark blue lips and fingernails, probably since her first myocardial infarct.

These symptoms collectively constitute a medical emergency. In the West, Dr. Bonner might be given newly developed drugs that would protect her heart from the kind of injury it is now sustaining. She might be a candidate for coronary artery bypass surgery. The nature and extent of her heart disease and consequently, the optimum treatment cannot be precisely determined with the present paucity of information. We can say with some confidence, however, that given her symptoms and deteriorating state, her life is in immediate danger.

Because of the precarious state of his wife's health, Dr. Sakharov wishes her to seek medical treatment from a physician of her choice. In hopes of influencing the Soviet authorities to permit her to obtain medical treatment abroad, he began a hunger strike on May 2, taking water, but no nourishment. On May 12, Dr. Bonner joined him in this fast.

The hunger strike will exact a heavy toll. We can assume that Dr. Sakharov has already lost 10 to 14 pounds and is considerably weakened. Persons who starve lose a considerable amount of fluid. This results in a reduction of the blood volume. Consequently, when Dr. Sakharov stands up, his circulatory system cannot easily readjust, so his blood pressure falls (postural hypertension). The result is dizziness or fainting. Since Dr. Sakharov has heart disease, the severity of his postural hypertension is greater. In addition, an early consequence of his starvation is progressive weakness. His hands and feet will become cold, dry, and numb. If Dr. Sakharov prolongs his hunger strike, he will experience persistent muscle wasting and protein loss. Vitamin deficiency will then complicate his compromised health. With time, his body temperature, pulse rate, and blood pressure will fall.

If Drs. Bonner and Sakharov were initially in excellent health, they would probably not survive through June 1984. Given their underlying ill health and self-imposed starvation, they are in immediate danger. Furthermore, if one of them dies, and this could happen any day, the stress might well prove lethal to the other.●

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BAKER. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. COHEN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. JEPSEN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. LAXALT), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MATTINGLY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND,) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) would each vote "yea."

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BRADLEY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE), would each vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 104 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Abdnor	Goldwater	Murkowski
Andrews	Gorton	Nickles
Armstrong	Grassley	Nunn
Baker	Hatch	Packwood
Baucus	Hatfield	Pell
Bentsen	Hawkins	Pressler
Biden	Hecht	Proxmire
Bingaman	Heinz	Pryor
Boschwitz	Helms	Quayle
Burdick	Hollings	Randolph
Byrd	Huddleston	Roth
Chafee	Humphrey	Rudman
Cranston	Kassebaum	Sasser
D'Amato	Kasten	Specter
Danforth	Kennedy	Stafford
DeConcini	Lautenberg	Stennis
Denton	Leahy	Symms
Dixon	Levin	Tower
Dodd	Long	Trible
Dole	Lugar	Tsongas
Domenici	Matsunaga	Wallop
Eagleton	McClure	Warner
East	Melcher	Wilson
Evans	Metzenbaum	Zorinsky
Garn	Mitchell	
Glenn	Moynihan	

NOT VOTING—24

Boren	Ford	Mattingly
Bradley	Hart	Percy
Bumpers	Heflin	Riegle
Chiles	Inouye	Sarbanes
Cochran	Jepsen	Simpson
Cohen	Johnston	Stevens
Durenberger	Laxalt	Thurmond
Exon	Mathias	Weicker

So the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 304) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. McCLURE. I move to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business until 12 noon, in which Senators may speak for not more than 5 minutes each, with the exception of the two leaders, against whom no time limitation will apply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUDGET ACT WAIVER

Mr. BAKER. Now, Mr. President, there is a bill that has been cleared, I believe, on both sides. The minority leader has indicated to me that he has no objection to proceeding under the terms which were previously discussed, which contemplate a colloquy before the disposition of this matter. I refer, Mr. President, to S. 1027, which must be accompanied by a budget waiver, which is S. 370, Calendar No. 854.

Mr. President, I now ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the budget waiver, which is Calendar No. 854.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 370) waiving section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to the consideration of S. 1027.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the budget resolution waiver.

The resolution (S. Res. 370) was agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 370

Resolved, That pursuant to section 402(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the provisions of section 402(a) of such Act are waived with respect to the consideration of S. 1027, a bill to amend Public Law 96-162. S. 1027, as reported, authorizes the enactment of new budget authority which would first become available in fiscal year 1984.

The waiver of section 402(a) of such Act is necessary to permit congressional consideration of S. 1027. Such bill was not reported on or before May 23, 1983, as required by section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for such authorizations.

AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC LAW 96-162 RELATING TO YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT FEASIBILITY STUDY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I now ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1027, which is Calendar Order No. 774.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1027) to amend public law 96-162, reported with an amendment, relating to Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project Feasibility Study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

That Public Law 96-162 (relating to the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement project-feasibility study) (93 Stat. 1241) is amended by adding the following new sections at the end thereof:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, acting pursuant to Federal reclamation law (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto) and in accordance with the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act (94 Stat. 2697) (hereafter, the Northwest Power Act) is authorized to accept funds from any entity, public or private, to design, construct, operate, and maintain fish facilities within the Yakima River Basin, and thereafter to design, construct, operate, and maintain such facilities.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of Energy, acting by and through the Bonneville Power Administration (hereinafter, Bonneville) is authorized to transfer funds, not to exceed $13,500,000, in the manner and amount determined by Bonneville to the Secretary of the Interior to design and construct the fish facilities authorized under section 2 of this Act, in accordance with the Northwest Power Act. For the purposes of this Act, Bonneville's transfer of funds to the Secretary of the Interior shall be treated as an expenditure from the Bonneville fund and shall be included in the Bonneville budget in the same manner as other Bonneville expenditures submitted to Congress pursuant to the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act (16 U.S.C. 838): Provided, That expenditures for ordering screens and constructing fish ladders at Sunnyside and Wapato Diversion Dams are hereby approved.

"SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated beginning October 1, 1983, to the Secretary of the Interior for planning, design, and construction of fish facilities in the Yakima River Basin, $17,000,000, plus or minus such amounts as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations of construction costs indexes applicable to the type of construction involved herein. There are also authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior such additional sums as may be required for the operation and maintenance of the fish facilities authorized by this Act: *Provided*, That operation and maintenance costs related to anadromous fish which are in excess of present obligations, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

"SEC. 5. The fish facilities authorized by this Act at Federal and non-Federal works shall become features of the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project (hereinafter, Yakima Enhancement Project), if such project is authorized, and their operation and maintenance shall be integrated and coordinated with other features of the existing Yakima Project. The Secretary of the Interior, as he deems appropriate, shall enter into agreements to provide for the operation and maintenance of such fish facilities.

"SEC. 6. If the State of Washington, the Yakima Indian Nation, or any other entity, public or private, prior to an authorization or the providing of an appropriation of funds to the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Yakima Enhancement Project, shares in the costs of or constructs any physical element of that project, including fish facilities or any reregulating dam, and conveys the same to the United States, the costs incurred by the State, the Yakima Indian Nation, or other entity in the construction of such elements shall be credited to the total amount of any costs to be borne by the State, the Yakima Indian Nation, or any other entity as contributions toward payment of the cost of the Yakima Enhancement Project; except that no such credit shall be given to any element constructed by the State, the Yakima Indian Nation, or any other entity unless the element has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior prior to its construction. The Secretary shall grant such approval, when requested by the State of Washington, the Yakima Indian Nation, or other entity, if the Secretary determines that the element proposed for construction would be an integral part of the Yakima Enhancement Project. All approved elements constructed by the State, the Yakima Indian Nation, or other entity, as provided in this section, shall be operated and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept title to any reregulating dam or fish passage facility constructed by the State of Washington, the Yakima Indian Nation, or any other entity, pursuant to section 6 of this Act, without giving compensation therefor, and thereafter to operate and maintain such facilities. Any such facility shall be operated by the Secretary in a manner consistent with the treaty rights of the Yakima Indian Nation, Federal reclamation law, and water rights established pursuant to State law, including the valid contract rights of irrigation users. The Secretary of the Interior shall negotiate and enter into agreements for the payment of operation and maintenance costs allocated to irrigation pursuant to Federal reclamation law. Operation and maintenance costs for any reregulating dam or fish passage facility allocated to fish shall be paid for in accordance with the Act of July 9, 1965 (79 Stat. 213).

"SEC. 8. Notwithstanding the authorization provided in this Act, the feasibility study authorized by Public Law 96-162 shall continue to include fish facilities as elements of that study.

"SEC. 9. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect or modify any treaty or other right of an Indian tribe.

"(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the appropriation of water by any Federal, State, or local agency, Indian tribe, or any other entity or individual. Nor shall any provision of this Act (1) affect the rights or jurisdictions of the United States, the States, Indian tribes, or other entities over waters of any river or stream or over any groundwater resource, (2) alter, amend, repeal, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any interstate compact made by the States, or (3) otherwise be construed to alter or establish the respective rights of States, the United States, Indian tribes, or any person with respect to any water or water-related right.

"(c) Except as specifically provided in this Act, nothing in this Act shall alter, diminish, or abridge the rights and obligations of any Federal, State, or local agency, Indian tribe, or any other entity, public or private.".

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, may I outline for my colleagues what the leadership on this side has discussed with the minority leader and with other Senators.

It is my understanding that there will be colloquies and remarks on this bill and the amendment. It is the intention of the leadership on this side then to ask that the Energy Committee be discharged from further consideration of the companion House measure, which is H.R. 653, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

At that point, Mr. President, it will be the intention of the leadership on this side to strike all after the enacting clause in the House bill and substitute the text of the Senate bill, as amended. That is for the guidance of Senators so they will understand how we wish to proceed.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

Mr. METZENBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I think first I ought to yield to the Senator from Washington, who is the prime sponsor of the bill. I wish to address myself to the matter of a possible amendment in connection with this measure, but I yield first to the prime sponsor of this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 1027, a bill to help restore anadromous fish runs in the Yakima River basin in Washington State. The bill would aid cooperative efforts by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the State of Washington, the Yakima Indian Nation, and others to restore the fish runs. S. 1027 would provide for construction of many of the fish passage facilities recommended for the Yakima River recommended in the Columbia River basin fish and wildlife program adopted by the Pacific Northwest Power Planning Council. I served as chairman of the Northwest Power Planning Council when the recommendations for the Yakima River basin were adopted and share the council's enthusiasm for the project.

Currently, there are 18 diversion dams in the Yakima River basin owned by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the city of Yakima, and various irrigation districts. These projects are utilized to maximize the benefits of water in the Yakima River basin. The Yakima basin is one of the most productive agricultural areas in the United States. The Yakima River was once one of the most productive rivers in the country as well. Historically, the Yakima River supported an estimated 500,000 to 600,000 returning adult salmon annually. By 1920, the number of returning salmon had declined to about 11,000 each year as a result of a number of factors including the construction of water diversion dams and canals without fish ladders or protective screens, partial or total blockage of migratory routes, and dewatering of spawning and rearing habitats. By 1982, the runs declined to an estimated 2,000 fish.

S. 1027 would provide for installation of fish passage facilities at the various dams on the Yakima River. The bill would result in a tremendous benefit to the Pacific Northwest and to the Nation as a whole, and would go far in rectifying the damage to the region's anadromous fishery resource caused by the construction of hydroelectric and irrigation dams on the Columbia River system by the Federal Government. I strongly urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Ohio will yield for a moment for a statement?

Mr. METZENBAUM. I yield.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, as reported by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, S. 1027 clearly demonstrates the commitment on the part of the committee for the continued prudent development of our water resources while at the same time providing for our fish and wildlife resources. S. 1027 authorizes a program of design, construction, operation, and maintenance of fish facilities in the Yakima River basin in the State of Washington. The bill also includes authority for Federal as well as non-Federal financing of the program.

Passage of S. 1132 will make a significant contribution toward fishery programs in the Yakima River basin and benefits will accrue to the Pacific Northwest and the Nation at large.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the "Background and Need" section of the committee report (98-394) which accompanied S. 1132 when reported by the committee be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND AND NEED

The history of irrigated agriculture in the Yakima River Basin traces its origins back to the late 1860's when water was first diverted to irrigate crops. Federal involvement in the development of the water resources of the basin began in 1905 under the Reclamation Service, predecessor of the Bureau of Reclamation. The irrigable lands served by the Yakima Project consist of approximately 464,000 acres on both sides of a 175-mile reach of the Yakima River in south central Washington. In addition to irrigation water supplies, the project also provides hydroelectric power with an installed generation capacity of 23 megawatts, incidental flood control, and recreation and fish and wildlife benefits.

In 1977, drought conditions focused attention on the need for further efforts to both expand and assure existing water supplies in the basin. As a result of this heightened interest, the Secretary of the Interior was authorized, by Public Law 96-162 (Act of Dec. 28, 1979), to conduct a feasibility investigation of the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project. The primary objectives of the proposed project are to provide supplemental water to presently irrigated land, provide water to newly irrigated lands of the Yakima Indian Reservation, provide water for increased instream flows for aquatic life, and develop a comprehensive plan for the basin to enable efficient management of existing water supplies. The completion date for the study is 1986.

Historically, the Yakima River supported an estimate 500,000 to 600,000 returning adult salmon annually. By 1920, the number of returning salmon had declined to about 11,000 each year as a result of a number of factors including the construction of water diversion dams and canals without fish ladders or protective screens, partial or total blockage of migratory routes and dewatering of spawning and rearing habitats. Beginning in 1920, efforts were taken to correct the most serious fish passage problems through construction of fish ladders and screens at some diversion dams. As a result, the runs slowly increased between 1920 and 1960, reaching a peak of 19,000 fish. Since then, they have declined to an estimated 2,000 fish.

The first phase of the Bureau of Reclamation's feasibility study has been completed and has identified possible elements of a final plan for the project. Among these is the construction of a reregulating reservoir and fish passage and protective facilities in the Yakima River Basin.

The State of Washington has appropriated $14 million to do advance design and construct the reregulating reservoir. However, this appropriation is contingent upon being able to secure a credit of such funding toward any future costs the State may be required to bear in the event Congress authorizes the Yakima Enhancement Project. Passage of S. 1027 would encourage construction of the reregulating reservoir and facilitate a cooperative Federal/non-Federal program to provide for fish passage facilities in the basin.

The Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act of 1980, commonly referred to as the "Northwest Power Act," Public Law 96-501 (Act of Dec. 5, 1980), provided in part for the preparation by the Northwest Power Planning Council of a program to protect, mitigate, and enhance the fish and wildlife resources affected by hydroelectric development in the Columbia River Basin. The "Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program" was adopted by the Northwest Power Planning Council on November 15, 1982. Noteworthy is the recognition in the program of the potential for at least partial restoration of fish runs in the Yakima River Basin. Passage of S. 1027 would provide for implementation of many of the fish facilities for the Yakima River Basin included in the program. Consideration of S. 1027 by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is the first action taken by Congress after passage of the Northwest Power Act which implements elements of the program proposed by the Council.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, this is an important measure in that it is the first action taken by Congress after passage of the Northwest Power Act which implements elements of the Columbia River Basin fish and wildlife program prepared by the Northwest Power Planning Council as directed by the Northwest Act. I must also say that the measure has been carefully drafted so that nothing in the act shall be construed to authorize appropriation of water or affect the rights and jurisdictions of the United States, the States, Indian tribes, or other entities over waters of any river or stream or ground water resource, or any interstate compact made by the States, or otherwise alter or establish the rights of the United States, the States, Indian tribes, or any person with respect to any water or water-related right.

I congratulate the junior Senator from Washington for his efforts in regard to this legislation and thank the subcommittee chairman, Mr. NICKLES, for his concern and assistance in bringing S. 1027 before the Senate. I know that a great deal of staff effort went into the successful

pursuit of this bill and I cite in particular the efforts of Mr. Joe Mentor of Senator EVANS' office for his great assistance to the committee staff.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. METZENBAUM. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to support S. 1027, a bill that will go a long way toward helping to restore anadromous fish runs in the Yakima River Basin in Washington State.

Hydroelectric development in the Northwest and the construction of irrigation diversion dams and canals without fish ladders or protective screens reduced significantly the anadromous fishery resource in the Yakima River. At one time, the Yakima River supported an estimated 500,000 to 600,000 returning adult salmon annually. By 1920, the number of salmon had declined to approximately 11,000 each year. Over the years, the number of fish returning to the Yakima has continued to decline. This legislation will help to restore the fish runs and it is one important element of the overall Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project which is currently under study by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The bill helps to promote the cooperative efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the State of Washington, the Yakima Indian Nation and other groups to restore anadromous fish runs in the Yakima River. There are three significant elements to the legislation: First, it establishes a program for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of fish facilities in the Yakima River Basin; second, it provides authority for Federal as well as non-Federal funding of the program; and third, it provides that costs incurred by non-Federal entities for features of the proposed Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project shall be credited toward the non-Federal share of the costs of such project.

The Northwest Power Act, Public Law 96-501, directed the Northwest Power Planning Council to prepare a program to protect, mitigate, and enhance the fish and wildlife resources affected by hydroelectric development in the Columbia River Basin. In 1982, the Council adopted a plan which included recommendations for restoring fish runs in the Yakima River Basin. S. 1027 will provide for the implementation of many of the Council's recommendations.

This legislation takes a major step in helping to accomplish the overall goal of restoring and protecting the important anadromous fishery resource in the Columbia River system. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I also compliment and congratulate Senator EVANS for all of his efforts on behalf of this legislation. It is an accomplishment of which he should be very proud.

I thank the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I have indicated some concern about this measure, not by reason of the substantive aspects of the measure itself but because when I find myself getting up in the Northwest, what immediately comes to mind is the whole issue of the Bonneville Power Authority and the fact that the Bonneville Power Authority owes $8 billion to the United States; that they are presently $1.2 billion in arrears; that only $40 million has been paid in the last 10 years. I think it is high time that this Government operate as any other business—if you lend somebody money, you ought to pay the money back.

As the matter has come up before in committee, I find there is general agreement that the point the Senator from Ohio has made is not at issue but not that much is being done about it.

Mr. President, I do have in my hand a letter addressed to the distinguished author of this legislation, the prime sponsor, in which the Administrator, Peter Johnson, writes to Senator EVANS on October 3, 1983, and talks about the fact that during the period of these new rates, November 1983 through June 1985, BPA intends to repay the estimated $236 million of interest deferrals and to pay amortization of $225 million to the U.S. Treasury.

It goes on to say that these acts should enable BPA to overcome the problems citied in recent critical reports by FERC, Department of the Treasury, the General Accounting Office, and the President's private sector survey on cost control. As a matter of fact, as of the writing of that letter, BPA had deferred interest payments to the U.S. Treasury in fiscal year 1979, 1980, 1982, 1983, and the BPA's deferrals presently total $236 million.

Now, it is my feeling that when the Congress of the United States legislates, it ought to have legislation strong enough and effective enough to cause its policies as enunciated by these congressional enactments to be realized. But in the case of BPA we have not.

So it has been my thought, and I know the thoughts of some others actually on both sides of the aisle, that we should go forward with the legislative approach to be certain that the amoritization of the $8 billion be handled in a more businesslike way than it has been handled in the past.

I had originally intended to offer an amendment to this particular legislation to achieve that objective. The Senator from Washington and the Senator from Idaho have been very persuasive and have indicated they prefer that I not do so, but I wish some assurance that we will move on the legislative front to see to it that the $8 billion that is owed to our Govenment be repaid in a fair and equitable manner and a timely fashion and that we not have that which I consider to be a collection problem with the BPA.

I very much appreciate hearing from the chairman of the Energy Committee as well as the prime sponsor as to their thoughts on this subject.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Ohio, and I do not disagree with the thrust of what he is suggesting.

I would not want the RECORD to indicate that we are unconcerned about that matter. We have been very concerned about that matter for a long while. As a matter of fact, in my own personal experience the system that was adopted many years ago of refinancing the debt every time there was an addition to the debt, what became known as rolling maturities, was something that was never legislated by Congress. It was adopted by the administrations in the past and approved in the appropriations acts over the years. That has been the traditional manner in which the oversight has been conducted in the Appropriations Committee and the subcommittee now chaired by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, Senator HATFIELD.

That issue of the rolling maturities is a matter which is embedded in their practice. Whether or not we might agree with it or not agree with it is something else.

I think it is well to note that at the time the letter was written, the letter to which the Senator from Ohio has referred, there was a pending rate case before FERC for increases in the rates by Bonneville and that rate case has since been concluded, and the rates have been increased and I am told by the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration that the rates now in effect in the Northwest will be sufficient by 1985 to catch up on the past due interest and get us current on the principal payments according to the schedule of repayments now in effect for Bonneville.

Whether that is a fact may well be subject to scrutiny. Whether or not the schedule of repayments is a proper schedule of repayments is also something we might well wish to look at further.

But I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Ohio recognizes that it is a legislative matter of some importance and therefore one which we should look at with some care in the committee rather than trying to legis-

late on the floor by way of an amendment.

I think that is perfectly appropriate, but I do not want to overstate what I might be able to accomplish because it is a very difficult, complex, sensitive issue in the Northwest.

But I will say to the Senator from Ohio I have no reluctance at all in saying that the committee will do what we can within reasonable bounds to look at that question.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Will the distinguished chairman of the Energy Committee be willing to give the Senator from Ohio some assurances without it being a commitment that on this whole question of rolling maturities, which is an absurdity on its face—I mean no one else in the whole world does business on the basis that you keep changing the date when it is to be paid off, except maybe in the international market when banks lend money to Argentina, Brazil, or Mexico, or someone of the kind, and then the U.S. Government comes along and bails them out—but other than that, normal people do business on the basis that you have a date in which your obligation is due and you make payments toward that date—sometimes you have a balloon at the end of the period—but at least you do not change in the maturities on a constant basis. I am wondering whether or not the Senator from Idaho would not agree with the Senator from Ohio that is really not the way the Government should do business and that Congress should at least enunciate some policy in connection with that subject.

Mr. McCLURE. If the Senator would permit me, certainly I do not disagree that that is a very unique way of carrying the accounts on the books. I have been critical of it for years. I was critical of it long before I came to Congress, and I remain critical of it today.

But I would also want to be very candid that rates in the Northwest on the power that is being marketed by Bonneville Power Administration have escalated very rapidly over the last 2 years, and there is a great deal of consumer reaction to the increased rates which they are paying. In order to change the system of accounting that is now in effect and has been in effect for many years would require legislative action, and in the face of that economic situation in the Northwest that legislative action might be difficult to achieve.

Mr. METZENBAUM. As the Senator from Idaho knows, it is a fact that rates have gone up in the Northwest, but I am advised that it is also a fact that those rates are still about half of what the national average is, and what we, therefore, have in effect is a subsidization of those rates. I have no fault to find with the people of the Northwest except that in these days when we are spending our time trying to balance budgets, I think it is all the more important that we try to collect the obligations that are due us and I am not sure if I understood exactly what the chairman is saying. Let me first ask can we be assured that there will be some legislative involvement, which means legislative hearings, which would possibly involve, although not necessarily, a markup; and second, can the chairman of the Energy Committee other than indicating his concern indicate his position with respect to putting a halt to the matter of rolling maturities?

Mr. McCLURE. I tried to say this is clearly as I could. Perhaps let me go back and try to answer that question this way: As I indicated earlier the oversight of Bonneville has customarily and traditionally in this body in their operating budgets been before the Energy and Power Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, now chaired by Senator HATFIELD. That is a circumstance that evolved over the years when Senator Magnuson and Senator Jackson presided over what is now the Energy Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and that was an arrangement which the State of Washington found suitable for their purposes and was embedded in the practice before this body.

I certainly would feel constrained to consult with the Senator from Oregon before I undertook to make drastic changes with respect to the legislative framework under which we do business here with relation to Bonneville, and I do not mean to overstate that because obviously we also have oversight responsibility and have exercised that in the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The second point I want to make is that because it is a practice that has been followed for at least 20 years, and I am not exactly certain in my mind when it first started, but still in the late 1950's or early 1960's, if my memory serves me correctly, and has been followed consistently since that time, to change it will probably require affirmative legislative action. And affirmative legislative action may be difficult to achieve when you have the kind of economic problems and the kind of consumer reaction that we now have in the Pacific Northwest.

Within the constraints of those limits I am perfectly willing to look at this issue and, as a matter of fact, I think we should. We should also be very much aware of the fact that Bonneville, under its current administration, has done a great deal to correct some of what some people might call financial abuses that may have occurred, but let me rephrase that to say, has done much to make the management of Bonneville much more responsive to the concerns that the Senator from Ohio has expressed and I think the Senator from Ohio would want to look at not only where we have been over the last 20 years but where we are now.

With respect to the comparison in rates, the Pacific Northwest is blessed by many resources, one of which is hydropower. We have lots of mighty rivers and the Federal Government made major investments in power producing facilities on the Columbia River system starting back in the 1930's and so have other entities other than the Federal Government, and the result is that we have a hydro-based system both public and private for most of the Pacific Northwest. That power, because it is based upon falling water, upon investments that were made many years ago, is very, very attractive as compared to other rates throughout the United States.

I also point out that we do not have any natural gas and we import our natural gas from Canada or from some of the other States, and where we have low hydroelectricity rates, we have very high natural gas rates.

You have to look at the entire energy market not just at Bonneville. I would say to the Senator from Ohio what we now see is federally subsidized power; that is power that was produced from dams built by Federal agencies, is now almost on a par with other investors-owned utility power rates in the same region and that they are very much the same, very nearly the same, as the natural gas rates that compete in the same energy market. So there is some parity which exists in the markets today which certainly was not the case 2 or 3 or 4 years ago and for the 20 or 30 years before that time. But there has been a dramatic and drastic change in the last 2 years.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I see the Senator from Washington on his feet. Would the Senator from Washington be willing to adress himself to the subject of whether he would be willing to join the Senator from Ohio and, hopefully, the Senator from Idaho toward the development of a piece of legislation that would not do harm to the Northwest and to his constituents, but at the same time would recognize the business equities and the budgetary responsibilities of all of us as a total body and try to put Bonneville Power Authority on a fixed repayment schedule and also would eliminate the rollover maturities that have been the practice in the past?

Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, I would be pleased to respond to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Let me say first that perhaps the rolling maturity concept is virtually unique but not totally unique. I know that a good many of the public pension programs of the country, in an attempt to refinance or to reduce the unfunded liabilities, have embarked on precisely that kind of a rolling 40-year

or some other period of time attempt to bring those unfunded liabilities down. So perhaps a rolling maturity is not totally unique.

I am not suggesting that it is appropriate here.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Would the Senator from Washington recognize there is a distinction in connection with the pensions where there are not always fixed and definite contractual obligations, as in many instances they are not contractual at all but they are indications of what a plan proposes to do, whereas in this case we have fixed contractual borrowings under an original contract that has now been changed and the terms of which have been changed over a period of many times?

Mr. EVANS. Yes; I suppose we could get into a discussion of the validity even of some of the activities on the pension scene. Usually, the unfunded liabilities do represent already-accrued liabilities which must be paid at some future date so that they are relatively fixed and definable.

But let me just talk for a few minutes about some of the difficulties, while at the same time assuring the Senator from Ohio that I join with him and the chairman of the committee in my concern over past practices and in my devotion to try to find a better way. I am already in the process of trying to understand better, by accumulating the information on current liabilities, precisely what the result would be of alternative methods of repayment—a fixed schedule. A fixed schedule of varying time limits, of course, would have different consequences in terms of current payments. I think all of those things ought to be looked at, while keeping in mind some events of the last few years that radically changed the nature of electric power in the Pacific Northwest.

Power rates in the Northwest in the last 4 years have gone up 700 percent. They certainly are still lower than most areas of the country, but that very significant increase has had the effect of enhancing conservation, of causing people to use less electricity. And you simply must recognize the fact that people in the Northwest, because of the high cost of alternative fuels, as was pointed out by the Senator from Idaho, use more electricity and are dependent more on it and as a result are affected more by price increases than would be the case in other parts of the country.

The direct service industries, particularly the aluminum companies, make up 20 percent of the current load in the Pacific Northwest. If we were to change even modestly the average rates now paid by those aluminum companies, we would not only shift them from being marginal plants but would make them uneconomic plants. And it is of little value to the Government and certainly would be disastrous to the economy of the Northwest to drop that percentage of a total load. We would be totally incapable of producing any kind of reasonable payback scheme if there were to be a decline of 20 percent in the amount of electricity sold because we had driven the aluminum companies out of business through price.

In the next few years, we are going to have to face up to something we probably should have faced up to a long time ago; that is the fact that for every beneficial resource, in this case hydroelectric power, there are some environmental hazards. There has been a rapid and radical decline in the fisheries resources of the Pacific Northwest. And we now have a plan in effect which will, over the years, begin to restore those resources.

This bill is a first step in that effort. The ratepayers of the Northwest will assume that burden over the coming years and it will add to other burdens they have, including, as a primary burden, the repayment of their debt to the Federal Government.

Let me read from a statement I made just 1 week after coming to the Senate on September 19, 1983, two very brief passages because they reflected my feeling then and my feeling now. I said:

> Under no circumstances, as past chairman of the Power Council or as Senator, do I believe that the taxpayers of this Nation should bail out the ratepayers of the Pacific Northwest, nor is that intended in this proposal.

I went on to say:

> One of the enormous difficulties Bonneville has in each rate case, especially now when rates are rising so rapidly, is to predict with any accuracy the revenues to be achieved during the next 20 month period. They are hopeful and, I believe, the rates will be sufficient to bring in revenues to both pay back on schedule the payments to the Federal Government and also to begin to catch up on some past payments.

Now 6 months has gone on since that date. In a conversation with the administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration yesterday, I find that they are not only on target but somewhat ahead of target in repaying. And he is confident they will repay in fact all of those past interest charges and will be at rates sufficient so that we very likely can accumulate and utilize future revenues if we do not destroy the economic base of the Northwest through radical and further price increases, use current rates or rates that slowly escalate to embark on a well thoughtout and regularized repayment schedule to the Federal Government.

I can express to the Senator from Ohio that this will be and is now one of my highest priority interests, and I would be glad to work with him on the kind of legislation necessary if in fact legislation is required to get us to that common goal.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I appreciate the assurances given me by the distinguished chairman of the Energy Committee, as well as from a member of that committee, the Senator from Washington. I am hopeful that we can proceed forward together to achieve a mutually satisfactory solution that is fair to the constituencies that each of them represent, as well as to the people of this country and the Federal Treasury.

Having said that, Mr. President, I see no reason to debate in connection with this matter. I know the Senator from Washington plans to leave to meet the people of Yakima yet this afternoon and I wish him well on his trip. Bon voyage.

Mr. EVANS. I thank the Senator from Ohio. I fully appreciate his thoughts.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Energy Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 653, a bill to amend Public Law 96-162.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill will be stated by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

> A bill (H.R. 653) to amend Public Law 96-162 to provide a credit to the State of Washington or the Yakima Indian Nation for certain construction costs associated with the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I move to strike all after the enacting clause, and insert the text of S. 1027, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed, as amended.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. EVANS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 774, S. 1027, be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the transaction of routine morning business be extended for not more than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have one item—maybe two—that has been cleared for action by unanimous consent. I first say to the minority leader that we are cleared on this side to take up S. 2418, if the minority leader is agreeable.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, we are cleared on this side.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS MASS BOOK DEACIDIFICATION FACILITY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 845, S. 2418.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senate proceed to consider the bill (S. 2418) to authorize and direct the Librarian of Congress, subject to the supervision and authority of a Federal, civilian, or military agency, to proceed with the construction of the Library of Congress Mass Book Deacidification Facility, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, as follows:

On page 2, line 19, strike "1984" and insert "1983".

So as to make the bill read:

S. 2418

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed, subject to the supervision and construction authority of a Federal, civilian, or military agency, to construct the Library of Congress Mass Deacidification Facility in accordance with the general design developed by the Library of Congress and reviewed by the Architect of the Capitol. Such facility shall be constructed on Federal property within seventy-five miles of Capitol Hill.

SEC. 2. The Library of Congress Mass Book Deacidification Facility shall be operated and maintained by the Librarian of Congress, whose authority under the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to abolish the office of Superintent of the Library Building and Grounds and to transfer the duties thereof to the Architect of the Capitol and the Librarian of Congress", approved June 29, 1922 (42 Stat. 715; 2 U.S.C. 141), shall be exercised to equip, furnish, and maintain the facility.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1983, sums not to exceed $11,500,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 3081

(Purpose: Technical amendment)

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), for Mr. MATHIAS, proposes an amendment numbered 3081.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 18, strike out all of line 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated for a

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3081) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

So the bill (S. 2418), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 2418

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed, subject to the supervision and construction authority of a Federal, civilian, or military agency, to construct the Library of Congress Mass Deacidification Facility in accordance with the general design developed by the Library of Congress and reviewed by the Architect of the Capitol. Such facility shall be constructed on Federal property within seventy-five miles of Capitol Hill.

SEC. 2. The Library of Congress Mass Book Deacidification Facility shall be operated and maintained by the Librarian of Congress, whose authority under the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to abolish the office of Superintendent of the Library Building and Grounds and to transfer the duties thereof to the Architect of the Capitol and the Librarian of Congress", approved June 29, 1922 (42 Stat. 715; 2 U.S.C. 141), shall be exercised to equip, furnish, and maintain the facility.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated for a fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1983, sums not to exceed $11,500,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF THE EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, may I say we are also cleared to consider calendar order No. 879, S. 2678, by unanimous consent, if the minority leader is agreeable.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this same clearance has been obtained on this side.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate Calendar Order No. 879.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2678) to extend the authorities under the Export Administration Act of 1979 until June 28, 1984.

The bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2678

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 20 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 is amended by striking out "March 30, 1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 28, 1984."

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I would say to the minority leader that I perhaps do not have as much of my Executive Calendar cleared as he does. May I identify the items that are fully cleared on this side and ask the minority leader if he is prepared to consider all or any portion of them.

The items that I am prepared to proceed with at this time are beginning on page 3, the last item, Calendar No. 598, the nomination of James W. Fuller, and all those nominations on page 4. Those items have been cleared on this side, Mr. President, and I ask if the minority leader is prepared to consider all or any portion of them.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this side is ready to proceed with the nominations beginning with Calendar No. 598 on page 3 and going through page 4 on the Executive Calendar.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of considering those nominations to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James W. Fuller, of California, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination is considered and confirmed.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HANDICAPPED

The legislative clerk read the nomination of H. Latham Breunig, of New York, to be a member of the National Council on the Handicapped.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination is considered and confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael Marge, of New York, to be a member of the National Council on the Handicapped.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination is considered and confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sandra Swift Parrino, of New York, to be a member of the National Council on the Handicapped.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination is considered and confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alvis Kent Waldrep, Jr., of Texas, to be a member of the National Council on the Handicapped.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination is considered and confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carol E. Dinkins, of Texas, to be Deputy Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination is considered and confirmed.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Patricia A. Goldman, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the National Transportation Safety Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination is considered and confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Eugene Burnett, Jr., of Arkansas, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I wish to express my support for the nomination of Jim Burnett as Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board.

Two and one-half years ago, I had the pleasure of presenting Jim Burnett to the Senate.

Today, his name is before the Senate not only as the name of an experienced public official and a familiar witness before congressional hearings, but also as a respected leader in the field of transportation safety.

All of us from Arkansas are proud of Jim Burnett's record as a Federal official. We have watched with special pride his handling of crisis after crisis and listened to the praise he has earned for his agency's careful, objective analysis of transport accidents and dangers.

In 1981, I told the Senate Jim Burnett could handle this challenge. I am glad he has proven me correct, and I am proud to urge the Senate to give favorable consideration to his nomination today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the votes by which the nominations were confirmed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified that the Senate has given its consent to these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2614: A bill to amend the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (Rept. No. 98-459).

By Mr. McCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 416: A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating a segment of the Illinois River in Oregon and the Owyhee River in Oregon as components of the National Wild and Scenic River System (Rept. No. 98-460).

By Mr. McCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 837: A bill to designate certain National Forest System lands in the State of Washington for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-461).

By Mr. McCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments and an amendment to the title:

S. 2125: A bill entitled the "Arkansas Wilderness Act of 1983" (Rept. No. 98-462).

By Mr. McCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2242: A bill to designate certain national forest lands in the State of Arizona as wilderness, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-463).

By Mr. McCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 2457: A bill to designate certain national forest systems lands in the State of Idaho for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System and to release other forest lands for multiple use management, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-464).

By Mr. McCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 1149: A bill to designate certain National Forest System and other lands in the State of Oregon for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-465).

By Mr. DOLE, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 476: A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to require a finding of medical improvement when disability benefits are terminated, to provide for a review and right to personal appearance prior to termination of disability benefits, to provide for uniform standards in determining disability, to provide continued payment of disability benefits during the appeals process, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-466).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2603: A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for, and to revise the Older Americans Act of 1965 (Rept. No. 98-467).

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I am filing S. 2603 as amended, a bill which would reauthorize and improve the Older Americans Act. This legislation will assure the continuation of a program which has effectively provided essential social services for the elderly of our country. Since it was passed originally in 1965, this act has provided money for programs that provide senior citizens with nutritious meals, for information and referral systems that help our elderly find senior citizen centers that provide both services and companionship, and for programs that furnish transportation to help our aged senior citizens get from their homes to the services and opportunities mandated by this bill.

Three years ago, I actively participated in the passage of Public Law 97-115, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1981. We made changes in the structure of the law then to give State agencies on aging more flexibility in the management of the grants that pay for supportive services, senior citizen centers, and nutrition programs. We found that many senior citizen centers were forced to leave money unspent in one account while other accounts had resources remaining. In Utah, for example, many centers had to close their doors—turning away older people who needed nutritional hot meals—because no money remained to pay for the bus or car that brought the people to centers to eat, although money remained to pay for the actual food.

Even though Public Law 97-115 largely corrected this inequity, the bill we propose today will expand this provision and allow for even greater transferability of funds by increasing the amounts allowed to be transferred between title III, parts B and C, from 20 to 35 percent. It also would allow a 9-percent increase in authorization levels. This increase is important since congregate meals provide an integral part of the services offered by our senior citizen centers. In 1982, 140.3 million meals were served nationally, with 694,944 of these provided in Utah. For those senior citizens not able to leave their residences, an additional 50.5 million meals were home delivered, such as the 489,967 meals delivered as part of Utah's Meals On Wheels program.

I am also keenly interested in the community services employment program—title V of the Older Americans Act. Designed to promote useful part-time opportunities for low-income persons aged 55 and older, title V provided 62,560 positions in 1983. For example, under the Green Thumb program of the U.S. Forest Service and the Utah State Division of Aging, 375 jobs were available in my State. Workers were placed in schools, libraries, congregate meal sites, park services, city halls, tourist information centers and other public service sites.

The proposed Older Americans Act also provides new help and new hope for the families of victims of Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimer's is a tragic disease which causes the victim to lose mental capacity and, eventually, physical capabilities. Up to a million people may be affected by Alzheimer's, with a cost to this Nation of $30 billion a year, according to the Alzheimer's Disease and Related Disorders Association (ADRDA). New and urgent emphasis will be given to demonstration projects and training of personnel needed to help the families of Alzheimer's disease sufferers. Money is provided for health and respite services for the families of Alzheimer's and other neurological disease victims.

Although it is estimated that one-fourth of all nursing home patients may have Alzheimer's, most Alzheimer's victims are being cared for by family members. Currently there are limited custodial care and respite services to help the Alzheimer's disease sufferers or their families. I have found in 5 years of study of home health programs that family care for an aged or ailing relative or friend often keeps the patient healthier and happier; so I am pleased that such a large share of Alzheimer's victims are in the care of their families. But families pay a steep price for this concern and love.

Often families find they must alter work schedules, that they must cancel or change much needed recreation, and that they must curtail other parts of everyday activity that most of us enjoy and take for granted. Too often there is no help available for the family, no custodial care to properly help the victim outside the home, and no respite care to help the family care for the victim. Our legislation proposes to address this problem and provide relief for the affected families.

I hope my colleagues in the Senate and our counterparts in the House will support this legislation and assist its rapid passing into law. America's 38 million aged citizens comprise one of the Nation's greatest resources. We cannot afford to postpone action on legislation which meets their needs. They deserve prompt action on this bill.

I would like to commend Senator GRASSLEY for his diligence and hard work in developing this legislation, hard work that has included extensive public hearings into each component of the law. I personally appreciate Senator GRASSLEY's strong leadership as chairman of the Aging Subcommittee. His oversight hearings on the various issues of the current law have been very informative and well conducted. His fine organizational abilities are a real asset to the Labor and Human Resources Committee and to the whole Congress.

FOREIGN CURRENCY REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following report(s) of standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY, FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Melcher:									
Mexico	Peso	25,600	450.00					25,600	450.00
United States	Dollar				458.00				458.00
David K. Voight:									
Mexico	Peso	25,600	450.00					25,600	450.00
United States	Dollar				458.00				458.00
Isabelita C. Sison:									
Mexico	Peso	25,600	450.00					25,600	450.00
United States	Dollar				458.00				458.00
Ira H. Goldman:									
Hong Kong	Dollar	2,074.60	267.00					2,074.60	267.00
Taiwan	Dollar				158.00				158.00
George S. Dunlop:									
United States	Dollar				1,600.00				1,600.00
Denmark	Dollar		102.00				13.88		115.88

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY, FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1984—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Germany	Dollar		378.00				55.55		433.55
Ireland	Dollar		194.00				27.80		221.80
United Kingdom	Dollar		194.00				27.77		221.77
Total			2,485.00		3,132.00		125.00		5,742.00

JESSE HELMS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry,
May 14, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY, FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1, TO DEC. 31, 1983.

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Melcher:									
Philippines	Peso	6,300	450.00					6,300	450.00
United States	Dollar				1,800.00				1,800.00
David K. Voight:									
Philippines	Peso	6,300	450.00					6,300	450.00
United States	Dollar				1,800.00				1,800.00
Isabelita C. Sison:									
Philippines	Peso	21,007.5	1,500.00					21,007.5	1,500.00
United States	Dollar				1,053.00				1,053.00
Total			2,400.00		4,653.00				7,053.00

JESSE HELMS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry,
May 11, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1, TO MAR. 31, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Francis Sullivan:									
Belgium	Franc	9,121	158.00					9,121	158.00
Austria	Schilling	5472.3	273.00					5472.3	273.00
Jane McGhee:									
United States	Dollar				1,771.00				1,771.00
Senegal	Dollar		457.50						457.50
Senegal	CFA			348,766	840.40			348,766	840.40
Richard L. Spees:									
Greece	Drachma	14,949	150.00					14,949	150.00
Egypt	Pound	209.588	252.00					209.588	252.00
Israel	Shekel	47,084.45	415.28					47,084.45	415.28
Greece	Drachma					7,362.50	72.99	7,362.50	72.99
Jordan	Dinar	67.320	180.00					67,320	180.00
Saudi Arabia	Riyal	570.70	163.62					570.70	163.62
Kuwait	Dinar	66.530	226.87	320.700	1,099.45			387.23	1,326.32
England	Pound	69.85	99.00					69.85	99.00
	Dollar				4,583.00				4,583.00
Warren W. Kane:									
Greece	Drachma	14,949	150.00					14,949	150.00
Egypt	Pound	109.588	252.00					209.588	252.00
Israel	Shekel	47,084.45	415.28					47,084.45	415.28
Greece	Drachma					7,362.5	72.99	7,362.5	72.99
Jordan	Dinar	67.320	180.00					67.320	180.00
Saudi Arabia	Riyal	333.50	95.83					333.50	95.83
Kuwait	Dinar	68.530	233.69					68.530	233.69
England	Pound	69.85	99.00					69.85	99.00
	Dollar				4,583.00				4,583.00
Senator Robert W. Kasten:									
Honduras	Dollar		559.00						559.00
Germany	Mark	819	300.00					819	300.00
Switzerland	Franc	1143	150.00					1,143	150.00
Total			4,810.07		12,876.85		145.98		17,832.90

MARK O. HATFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Apr. 30, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James F. McGovern:									
Egypt	Pound	98.28	84.00					98.28	84.00
Israel	Shecel	43,268	400.00					43,268	400.00
Jordan	Dinar	33,615	90.00					33,615	90.00
Senator Sam Nunn:									
Austria	Schilling	5,472.3	273.00					5,472.3	273.00
Arnold Punaro:									
Austria	Schilling	5,472.3	273.00					5,472.3	273.00
Belgium	Franc	9,121.0	158.00					9,121.0	158.00
James F. McGovern:									
Federal Republic of Germany	Deutsche mark	409.50	150.00					409.50	150.00
Saudi Arabia	Riyal	563.76	486.00					563.76	486.00
Pakistan	Rupee	3,080.30	228.00					3,080.30	228.00
Syria	Pound	606.00	101.00					606.00	101.00
Patrick Tucker:									
Federal Republic of Germany	Deutsche mark	1,449	525.00					1,449	525.00
Richard Finn:									
Federal Republic of Germany	Deutsche mark	1,449	525.00					1,449	525.00
Total			3,293.00						3,293.00

JOHN TOWER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Apr. 24, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1, TO DEC. 31, 1983

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Carl Levin:									
Switzerland	Franc	357.60	164.00	690.00	312.43			1,047.60	476.43
Federal Republic of Germany	Deutsche mark	494.96	184.00					494.96	184.00
United States	Dollar		107.00						107.00
Drew Harker:									
Israel	Dollar		500.00						500.00
Robert Savitt:									
Switzerland	Franc	895.85	410.00	2,282.50	1,031.17			3,178.35	1,441.17
Senator Jeff Bingaman:									
El Salvador	Colone	28.25	7.28					28.25	7.28
Honduras	Lempira	400.00	200.00					400.00	200.00
Costa Rica	Colone	3,437.50	70.97					3,427.50	70.97
Jon Beard:									
El Salvador	Colone	888.75	225.00					888.75	225.00
Honduras	Lempira	400.00	200.00					400.00	200.00
Costa Rica	Colone	6,472.50	150.00					6,472.50	150.00
Senator Jeff Bingaman:									
United States	Dollar				512.00				512.00
Doug Graham:									
Federal Republic of Germany	Deutsche mark	1,031.26	375.00					1,031.25	375.00
Total			2,593.25		1,855.60				4,448.85

JOHN TOWER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Apr. 24, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1983

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John Campbell:									
Luxembourg	Franc	16,383	300.00					16,383	300.00
Federal Republic of Germany	Deutsche mark	1,537.29	586.75					1,537.29	586.75
United Kingdom	Pound	258.10	391.97					258.10	391.97
James Roche:									
Federal Republic of Germany	Deutsche mark	1,289.28	474.00					1,289.28	474.00
United Kingdom	Pound	192.09	294.00					192.09	294.00
Bruce Porter:									
Federal Republic of Germany	Deutsche mark	1,501.44	552.00					1,501.44	552.00
United States	Dollar				1,717.00				1,717.00
Beglium	Franc		166.00						166.00
Senator John Tower:									
United Kingdom	Pound	527.93	808.00	1,168.00	1,787.60			1,695.93	2,595.60
James Locker:									
United Kingdom	Pound	329.96	505.00					329.96	505.00
Delegation expenses:									
United Kingdom	Pound			780.13	1,194.31			780.13	1,194.31
Total			4,077.72		4,698.91				8,776.63

JOHN TOWER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Apr. 24, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS, FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Paul Freedenberg:									
Uruguay	Peso	13,161	246.00					13,161	246.00
Brazil	Crucero	211,248	162.00					211,248	162.00
United States	Dollar				1,505.00				1,505.00
Total			408.00		1,505.00				1,913.00

JAKE GARN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,
Apr. 17, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION, FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thomas W. Cohen:									
Canada	Dollar		12.05		302.00				314.05
Total			12.05		302.00				314.05

BOB PACKWOOD,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation,
Apr. 23, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ira S. Shapiro:									
Japan	Yen	136,188	582.00					136,188	582.00
Senator William V. Roth, Jr.:									
South Africa	Rand	907.20	720.00	749.35	614.22			1,656.55	1,334.22
Dr. Ian Butterfield:									
South Africa	Rand	907.20	720.00	749.35	614,22			1,656,.55	1,334.22
Total			2,022.00		1,228.44				3,250.44

WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on Governmental Affairs, Apr. 12, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1983

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator William V. Roth, Jr.:									
England	Pound	216	309.00					216	309.00
Total			309.00						309.00

WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on Governmental Affairs, Apr. 12, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Frank Murkowski:									
Korea	Won	77,328	97.00					77,328	97.00
Robert G. Bell:									
United Kingdom	Pound	138.40	99.00					138.40	99.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	839	276.00					839	276.00
United States	Dollar				1,586.00				1,586.00
Hans Binnendiji:									
Israel	Dollar		200.00						200.00
Egypt	Pound	292	252.00					292	252.00
Nertherland	Gulden	247	78.00					247	78.00
France	Franc	831	96.00					831	96.00
United States	Dollar				2,211.00				2,211.00
Gerald E. Connolly:									
Israel	Dollar		800.00						800.00
Egypt	Pound	920.85	793.84	14.85	12.80			935.70	806.64
United States	Dollar				1,468.76				1,468.76
Senator Joseph R. Biden:									
Russia	Dollar		300.00						300.00
United States	Dollar				1,631.00				1,631.00
Janice M. O'Connell:									
Pakistan	Rupee	5,439.15	405.00	1,450	107.96			6,889.15	512.96
India	Rupee	3,698	344.00					3,698	344.00
Nepal	Dollar		225.00						225.00
Saudi Arabia	Dollar		136.00						136.00
Egypt	Pound	499.8	420.00					499.8	420.00
United States	Dollar				3,239.00				3,239.00
John B. Ritch:									
Pakistan	Rupee	11,203.5	825.00					11,203.5	825.00
United States	Dollar				2,825.00				2,825.00
France	Franc	2,491	288.00					2,491	288.00
Belgium	Franc	9,151	158.00					9,151	158.00
West Germany	Deutsche mark	511	184.00					511	184.00
United States	Dollar				1,354.30				1,354.30
Alison Rosenberg:									
Senegal	CFA franc	116,085	272.50					116,085	272.50
Sudan	Dollar		140.00						140.00
Somalia	Shilling	3,584.60	206.25					3,584.60	206.25
Kenya	Shilling	1,041.90	75.00					1,041.90	75.00
Mozambique	Dollar		100.00						100.00
South Africa	Rand	108.36	86.00					108.36	86.00
United States	Dollar				1,647.13				1,647.13
Nancy H. Stetson:									
England	Pound	70.80	99.00					70.80	99.00
Sudan	Dollar		420.00						420.00
Kenya	Shilling	2,085	150.00					2,085	150.00
Zimbabwe	Dollar	180.80	160.00					180.80	160.00
South Africa	Rand	740.54	607.00	469.53	384.86			1,210.07	991.86
United States	Dollar				3,214.90				3,214.90
Casimir Yost:									
Pakistan	Rupee	5,439.15	405.00	1,450	107.96			6,889.15	512.96
India	Rupee	3,698	344.00					3,698	344.00
Nepal	Dollar		225.00						225.00
Saudi Arabia	Dollar		136.00						136.00
Egypt	Pound	499.8	420.00					499.8	420.00
United States	Dollar				3,239.00				3,239.00
Kevin B. Coyner:									
Korea	Won	154,656	194.00					154,656	194.00
Carl W. Ford, Jr.:									
Taiwan	NT	22,201.40	552.00	5,225.30	129.97			27,426.70	681.97
United States	Dollar				2,355.00				2,355.00
Michael Kraft:									
Egypt	Pound	634.52	588.00	29,250	25.22			682.08	613.22
Israel	Dollar		720.00						720.00
United States	Dollar				1,324.40				1,324.40
Kenneth A. Myers:									
United States	Dollar				2,035.00				2,035.00
Italy	Lira	487,584	288.00					487,584	288.00
France	Franc	2,491	288.00					2,491	288.00
Great Britain	Pound	212.44	297.00					212.44	297.00
West Germany	Deutsche mark	1,023	368.00					1,023	368.00
Amendment 1st quarter 1983:									
Senator Edward Zorinsky:									
Peru	Sale		75.00						75.00
Mexico	Peso		150.00		75.14				225.14
Brazil	Crayero		69.00						69.00
Amendments to 2nd quarter 1983:									
Senator Frank Murkowski:									
China	Yuan	969.69	487.50						487.50
Japan	Yen	114.240	476.00		135.05				611.05
United States	Dollar				3,343.16				3,343.16
Kevin B. Coyner:									
Hong Kong	Dollar	648.90	97.00						97.00
China	Yuan	969.69	487.50						487.50
Japan	Yen	225.616	944.00		135.05				1,079.05
United States	Dollar				2,230.00				2,230.00
Carl W. Ford, Jr.:									
Switzerland	Franc		86.00						86.00
Russia	Dollar		178.00		35.00				213.00
Russia	Dollar		89.00						89.00
Austria	Schilling		298.00						298.00
United States	Dollar				1,734.00				1,734.00
Amendments to 3d quarter 1983:									
Senator Edward Zorinsky:									
Egypt	Pound		84.00						84.00
Bahrain	Dollar		50.00						50.00
Jordan	Dinar		79.00						79.00
Korea	Won		97.00						97.00
Taiwan			368.00						368.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		42.50						42.50

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1984—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Christopher Chamberlin:									
Costa Rica	Colone	2,492	63.00						63.00
Nicaragua	Cordoba	1,640	164.00						164.00
United States	Dollar				851.00				851.00
Total			17,502.09		37,437.66				54,939.75

CHARLES H. PERCY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Apr. 12, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Richard W. Day:									
United States	Dollar				469.00				469.00
Dominican Republic	Peso	285	285.00					285	285.00
Haiti	Gourde	1,500	300.00					1,500	300.00
Total			585.00		469.00				1,054.00

STROM THURMOND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Mar. 31, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1983

Name and country	Name of currency	Per Diem		Transportation		Miscellaneouw		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Edward Zorinsky:									
England	Pound	64.64	98.00					64.64	98.00
France	Franc	792	100.00					792	100.00
Israel	Shekel		537.33						537.33
UAE	DHS	275.47	75.00					275.47	75.00
Jordan	Dinar		79.00						79.00
Bahrain	Dinar		50.00						50.00
Japan	Yen	28,899	117.00					28,899	117.00
China	Yuan	1,433.70	243.75					1,433.70	243.75
Taiwan	NT dollar	14,766	368.00					14,766	368.00
Korea	Won	76,533	97.00					76,533	97.00
Senator Orrin G. Hatch:									
England	Pound	64.64	98.00					64.64	98.00
France	Franc	792	100.00					792	100.00
Israel	Shekel		537.33						537.33
UAE	DHS	275.47	75.00					275.47	75.00
Jordan	Dinar		79.00						79.00
Bahrain	Dinar		50.00						50.00
Japan	Yen	28,899	117.00					28,899	117.00
China	Yuan	1,433.70	243.75					1,433.70	243.75
Taiwan	NT dollar	14,766	368.00					14,766	368.00
Korea	Won	76,533	97.00					76,533	97.00
	Dollar				4,028.90				4,028.90
Michael Pillsbury:									
England	Pound	64.64	98.00					64.64	98.00
France	Franc	792	100.00					792	100.00
Israel	Shekel		537.33						537.33
UAE	DHS	275.47	75.00					275.47	75.00
Jordan	Dinar		79.00						79.00
Bahrain	Dinar		50.00						50.00
Japan	Yen	28,899	117.00					28,899	117.00
China	Yuan	1,433.70	243.75					1,433.70	243.75
Taiwan	NT dollar	14,766	368.00					14,766	368.00
Korea	Won	76,533	97.00					76,533	97.00
Total			5,295.24		4,028.90				9,324.14

ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Apr. 6, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan			890.00		4,670.30				5,560.30
Thomas Blau			1,015.00		4,670.30				5,685.30
Total			1,905.00		9,340.60				11,245.60

BARRY GOLDWATER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Intelligence, Apr. 2, 1984.

AMENDED CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MINORITY LEADER, FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1983

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Lloyd Bentsen:									
South Africa	Rand	719.40	660.00	507.15	461.05			1,226.55	1,121.05
Italy	Lira	314,280	194.00					314,280	194.00
Total			854.00		461.05				1,315.05

ROBERT C. BYRD,
Minority Leader, May 1984.

AMENDED [1] CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES, FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1983

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael Pillsbury:									
Lebanon	Pounds	1,001.30	190.00					1,001.30	190.00
Austria	Shilling	7,101.50	372.00					7,101.50	372.00
Turkey	Lira	54,840	206.00					54,840	206.00
Pakistan	Rupee	2,842.55	216.00					2,842.55	216.00
Thailand	Baht	9,664	422.00					9,664	422.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,900.80	244.00					1,900.80	244.00
United States	Dollar				1,511.00				1,511.00
Total			1,650.00		1,511.00				3,161.00

[1] Addition of Transportation (Codel Hawkins).

ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Mar. 20, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), CODEL BAKER FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 12 TO JAN. 19, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Howard Baker:									
Brazil	Cruzeiro	59,480.70	59.90					59,480.70	59.90
Argentina	Peso	4,828	170.00					4,828	170.00
Peru	Sol	532,125	225.00					532,125	225.00
Panama	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Senator Charles McC. Mathias:									
Brazil	Cruzeiro	42,977.04	43.28					42,977.04	43.28
Argentina	Peso	4,430.40	156.00					4,430.40	156.00
Peru	Sol	532,125	225.00					532,125	225.00
Panama	Dollar		75.00						75.00
William Hildenbrand:									
Brazil	Cruzeiro	74,475	75.00					74,475	75.00
Argentina	Peso	4,828	170.00					4,828	170.00
Peru	Sol	532,125	225.00					532,125	225.00
Panama	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Tom Griscom:									
Brazil	Cruzeiro	74,475	75.00					74,475	75.00
Argentina	Peso	4,828	170.00					4,828	170.00
Peru	Sol	532,125	225.00					532,125	225.00
Panama	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Cran Montgomery:									
Brazil	Cruzeiro	74,475	75.00					74,475	75.00
Argentina	Peso	4,828	170.00					4,828	170.00
Peru	Sol	532,125	110.00					532,125	110.00
Panama	Dollar		75.00						75.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), CODEL BAKER FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 12 TO JAN. 19, 1984—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Sheldon Himelfarb:									
Brazil	Cruzeiro	74,475	75.00					74,475	75.00
Argentina	Peso	4,828	170.00					4,828	170.00
Peru	Sol	248,325	105.00					248,325	105.00
Panama	Dollar		75.00						75.00
George F. Murphy, Jr:									
Brazil	Cruzeiro	74,475	75.00					74,475	75.00
Argentina	Peso	4,828	170.00					4,828	170
Peru	Sol	260,150	110.00					260,150	110.00
Panama	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Lura Nell Triplett:									
Brazil	Cruzeiro	74,475	75.00					74,475	75.00
Argentina	Peso	4,828	170.00					4,828	170.00
Peru	Sol	532,125	225.00					532,125	225.00
Panama	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Yvonne Hopkins:									
Brazil	Cruzeiro	74,475	75.00					74,475	75.00
Argentina	Peso	4,828	170.00					4,828	170
Peru	Sol	532,125	225.00					532,125	225.00
Panama	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Lynne Grant:									
Brazil	Cruzeiro	74,475	75.00					74,475	75.00
Argentina	Peso	4,828	170.00					4,828	170
Peru	Sol	532,125	225.00					532,125	225.00
Panama	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Delegation expenses: [1]									
Brazil							621.46		621.46
Argentina							2,220.49		2,220.49
Peru							2,411.57		2,411.57
Panama							584.43		584.43
Total			5,039.18				5,837.95		10,877.13

[1] Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to State Department and Defense Department under authority of sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179, agreed to May 25, 1977.

HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.,
Majority Leader, May 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), CODEL GARN FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS FROM NOV. 26, 1983, TO DEC. 10, 1983

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Jake Garn:									
New Zealand	Dollar	562.20	375.00					562.20	375.00
Australia	Dollar	386.10	351.00					386.20	351.00
Singapore	Dollar	249.92	118.00					249.92	118.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,386.60	178.00					1,386.60	178.00
Senator Patrick Leahy:									
New Zealand	Dollar	562.20	375.00					562.20	375.00
Australia	Dollar	386.10	351.00					386.10	351.00
Singapore	Dollar	249.92	118.00					249.92	118.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,386.60	178.00					1,386.60	178.00
Senator Chic Hecht:									
New Zealand	Dollar	562.20	375.00					562.20	375.00
Australia	Dollar	386.10	351.00					386.10	351.00
Singapore	Dollar	249.92	118.00					249.92	118.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,386.60	178.00					1,386.60	178.00
William F. Hildenbrand:									
New Zealand	Dollar	562.20	375.00					562.20	375.00
Australia	Dollar	386.10	351.00					386.10	351.00
Singapore	Dollar	249.92	118.00					249.92	118.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,386.60	178.00					1,386.60	178.00
Danny Wall:									
New Zealand	Dollar	562.20	375.00					562.20	375.00
Australia	Dollar	386.10	351.00					386.10	351.00
Singapore	Dollar	249.92	118.00					249.92	118.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,386.60	178.00					1,386.60	178.00
Wallace Berger:									
New Zealand	Dollar	562.20	375.00					562.20	375.00
Australia	Dollar	386.10	351.00					386.10	351.00
Singapore	Dollar	249.92	118.00					249.92	118.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,386.60	178.00					1,386.60	178.00
Jeff Bingham:									
New Zealand	Dollar	562.20	375.00					562.20	375.00
Australia	Dollar	386.10	351.00					386.10	351.00
Singapore	Dollar	249.92	118.00					249.92	118.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,386.60	178.00					1,386.60	178.00
John Collins:									
New Zealand	Dollar	562.20	375.00					562.20	375.00
Australia	Dollar	386.10	351.00					386.10	351.00
Singapore	Dollar	249.92	118.00					249.92	118.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,386.60	178.00					1,386.60	178.00
Martin Reiss:									
New Zealand	Dollar	562.20	375.00					562.20	375.00
Australia	Dollar	386.10	351.00					386.10	351.00
Singapore	Dollar	249.92	118.00					249.92	118.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,386.60	178.00					1,386.60	178.00
Suzanne Bingham:									
New Zealand	Dollar	562.20	375.00					562.20	375.00
Australia	Dollar	386.10	351.00					386.10	351.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), CODEL GARN FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS FROM NOV. 26, 1983, TO DEC. 10, 1983—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Singapore	Dollar	249.92	118.00					249.92	118.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,386.60	178.00					1,386.60	178.00
Yvonne L. Hopkins:									
New Zealand	Dollar	562.20	375.00					562.20	375.00
Australia	Dollar	386.10	351.00					386.10	351.00
Singapore	Dollar	249.92	118.00					249.92	118.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,386.60	178.00					1,386.60	178,00
Alvina Wall:									
New Zealand	Dollar	562.20	375.00					562.20	375.00
Australia	Dollar	386.10	351.00					386.10	351.00
Singapore	Dollar	249.92	118.00					249.92	118.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,386.60	178.00					1,386,60	178.00
Patricia Smith:									
New Zealand	Dollar	562.20	375.00					562.20	375.00
Australia	Dollar	386.10	351.00					386.10	351.00
Singapore	Dollar	249.92	118.00					249.92	118.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,386.60	178.00					1,386.60	178.00
Sharon Hale:									
New Zealand	Dollar	562.20	375.00					562.20	375.00
Australia	Dollar	386.10	351.00					386.10	351.00
Singapore	Dollar	249.92	118.00					249.92	118.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,386.60	178.00					1,386.60	178.00
Delegation expenses: [1]									
New Zealand							2,734.14		2,734.14
Australia							2,730.70		2,730.70
Singapore							1,155.41		1,155.41
Hong Kong							1,756.77		1,756.77
Total			14,308.00				8,377.02		22,685.02

[1] Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to State Department and Defense Department under authority of sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179, agreed to May 25, 1977.

JAKE GARN,
Delegation Chairman, Mar. 28, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), CODEL GARN, FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS FROM AUG. 6 to AUG. 19, 1983

Name and country	Name of currency	Per Diem		Transportation		Miscellaneouw		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Jake Garn:									
Japan	Yen	113,925	465.00					113,925	465.00
Korea	Won	228,435	291.00					228,435	291.00
Singapore	Dollar	755.26	354.00					755.26	354.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,301.50	176.00					1,301.50	196.00
Senator Paula Hawkins:									
Japan	Yen	113,925	465.00					113,925	465.00
Korea	Won	228,435	291.00					228,435	291.00
Singapore	Dollar	755.26	354.00					755.26	354.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,301.50	176.00					1,301.50	176.00
Senator Frank Lautenberg:									
Japan	Yen	113,925	465.00					113,925	465.00
Korea	Won	228,435	291.00					228,435	291.00
Singapore	Dollar	755.26	354.00					755.26	354.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,301.50	176.00					1,301.50	176.00
William F. Hildenbrand:									
Japan	Yen	113,925	465.00					113,925	465.00
Korea	Won	214,535	273.29					214,535	273.29
Singapore	Dollar	755.26	354.00					755.26	354.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,301.50	176.00					1,301.50	176.00
Howard S. Liebengood:									
Japan	Yen	113,925	465.00					113,925	465.00
Korea	Won	228,435	291.00					228,435	291.00
Singapore	Dollar	755.26	354.00					755.26	354.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,301.50	176.00					1,301.50	176.00
M. Danny Wall:									
Japan	Yen	113,925	465.00					113,925	465.00
Korea	Won	228,435	291.00					228,435	291.00
Singapore	Dollar	755.26	354.00					755.26	354.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,301.50	176.00					1,301.50	176.00
Suzanne Bingham:									
Japan	Yen	113,925	465.00					113,925	465.00
Korea	Won	228,435	291.00					228,435	291.00
Singapore	Dollar	755.26	354.00					755.26	354.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,301.50	176.00					1,301.50	176.00
Jerry Bonham:									
Japan	Yen	113,925	465.00					113,925	465.00
Korea	Won	228,435	291.00					228,435	291.00
Singapore	Dollar	755.26	354.00					755.26	354.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,301.50	176.00					1,301.50	176.00
Yvonne L. Hopkins:									
Japan	Yen	113,925	465.00					113,925	465.00
Korea	Won	228,435	291.00					228,435	291.00
Singapore	Dollar	755.26	354.00					755.26	354.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,301.50	176.00					1,301.50	176.00
Vivian Dubreuil:									
Japan	Yen	113,925	465.00					113,925	465.00
Korea	Won	228,435	291.00					228,435	291.00
Singapore	Dollar	755.26	354.00					755.26	354.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,301.50	176.00					1,301.50	176.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), CODEL GARN, FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS FROM AUG. 6 to AUG. 19, 1983—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per Diem		Transportation		Miscellaneouw		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Alvina Wall:									
Japan	Yen	113,925	465.00					113,925	465.00
Korea	Won	228,435	291.00					228,435	291.00
Singapore	Dollar	755.26	354.00					755.26	354.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,301.50	176.00					1,301.50	176.00
Delegation expenses:									
[1] Japan								4,439.61	4,439.61
Korea								927.97	927.97
Singapore								2,712.04	2,712.04
Hong Kong								1,782.40	1,782.40
Total		14,128.29						9,862.02	23,990.31

[1] Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to State Department and Defense Department under authority of sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384 and S. Res. 179, agreed to May 25, 1977.

JAKE GARN,
Delegation Chairman, May 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), CODEL HATFIELD FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS FROM JAN. 4 TO JAN. 20, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per Diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Mark Hatfield:									
Hong Kong	Dollar	2,847.5	366.00					2,847.5	366.00
Taiwan	Dollar	7,398.6	184.00					7,398.6	184.00
Indonesia	Rupiah	222,660	224.00					222,660	224.00
Singapore	Dollar	499.85	236.00					499.85	236.00
Thailand	Baht	5,083.75	222.00					5,083.75	222.00
Hungary	Forint	6,894.9	152.00					6,894.9	152.00
England	Pound	186.53	264.00					186.53	264.00
Senator Thomas Eagleton:									
Hong Kong	Dollar	2,847.5	366.00					2,847.5	366.00
Taiwan	Taiwan dollar	7,398.6	184.00					7,398.6	184.00
Indonesia	Rupiah	222,660	224.00					222,660	224.00
Singapore	Dollar	499.85	236.00					499.85	236.00
Thailand	Baht	5,083.75	222.00					5,083.75	222.00
Hungary	Forint	6,894.9	152.00					6,894.9	152.00
England	Pound	186.53	264.00					186.53	264.00
Gerald Frank:									
Hong Kong	Dollar	2,847.5	366.00					2,847.5	366.00
Taiwan	Dollar	7,398.6	184.00					7,398.6	184.00
Indonesia	Rupiah	222,660	224.00					222,660	224.00
Singapore	Dollar	499.85	236.00					499.85	236.00
Thailand	Baht	5,083.75	222.00					5,083.75	222.00
Hungary	Forint	6,894.9	152.00					6,894.9	152.00
England	Pound	186.53	264.00					186.53	264.00
Jan Novins:									
Hong Kong	Dollar	2,847.5	366.00					2,847.5	366.00
Taiwan	Dollar	7,398.6	184.00					7,398.6	184.00
Indonesia	Rupiah	222,660	224.00					222,660	224.00
Singapore	Dollar	499.85	236.00					499.85	236.00
Thailand	Baht	5,083.75	222.00					5,083.75	222.00
Hungary	Forint	6,894.9	152.00					6,894.9	152.00
England	Pound	186.53	264.00					186.53	264.00
Barbara Westhoven:									
Hong Kong	Dollar	2,847.5	366.00					2,847.5	366.00
Taiwan	Dollar	7,398.6	184.00					7,398.6	184.00
Indonesia	Rupiah	222,660	224.00					222,660	224.00
Singapore	Dollar	499.85	236.00					499.85	236.00
Thailand	Baht	5,083.75	222.00					5,083.75	222.00
Hungary	Forint	6,894.9	152.00					6,894.9	152.00
England	Pound	186.53	264.00					186.53	264.00
Janet Lamos:									
Hong Kong	Dollar	2,847.5	366.00					2,847.5	366.00
Taiwan	Dollar	7,398.6	184.00					7,398.6	184.00
Indonesia	Rupiah	222,660	224.00					222,660	224.00
Singapore	Dollar	499.85	236.00					499.85	236.00
Thailand	Baht	5,083.75	222.00					5,083.75	222.00
Hungary	Forint	6,894.9	152.00					6,894.9	152.00
England	Pound	186.53	264.00					186.53	264.00
Delegation expenses: [1]									
Hong Kong							2,395.07		2,395.07
Taiwan							3,233.63		3,233.63
Indonesia							1,354.61		1,354.61
Singapore							1,853.77		1,853.77
Thailand							2,115.36		2,115.36
Hungary							937.01		937.01
United Kingdom							1,980.48		1,980.48
Total			9,888.00				13,869.93		23,757.93

[1] Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and to the Department of Defense under authority of sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by sec. 22 of P. L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179, agreed to May 25, 1977.

MARK O. HATFIELD,
Delegation Chairman, Feb. 18, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MINORITY LEADER FROM JAN. 1, TO MAR. 31, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Dennis DeConcini:									
El Salvador	Colone	288.75	75.00					288.75	75.00
Guatemala	Quetzal	150	150.00	97.81	97.81	94.35	94.35	342.16	342.16
Panama	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Robert W. Maynes:									
El Salvador	Colone	288.75	75.00					288.75	75.00
Guatemala	Quetzal	150	150.00	97.81	97.81	94.35	94.35	342.16	342.16
Panama	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Bob Fiedler:									
El Salvador	Colone	288.75	75.00					288.75	75.00
Guatemala	Quetzal	150	150.00	97.81	97.81	94.35	94.35	342.16	342.16
Panama	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Total			900.00		293.43		283.05		1,476.48

ROBERT C. BYRD,
Minority Leader, May 1984.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GARN, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

Charles L. Marinaccio, of Maryland, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1985.

Aulana L. Peters, of California, for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1984; and

Aulana L. Peters of California, for the term expiring June 5, 1989 (reappointment).

The above nominations were reported from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs with the recommendation that they be confirmed subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2691. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to reserves for refunds of beverage container deposits; to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2691. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to reserves for refunds of beverage container deposits; to the Committee on Finance.

RESERVES FOR REFUNDS OF BEVERAGE CONTAINER DEPOSITS

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation along with Senator GRASSLEY to change the current tax treatment of refundable deposits on beverage containers received by wholesale beverage distributors in States with mandatory beverage container deposit laws. The effect of this legislation would be to eliminate an unfair tax liability now imposed on wholesale distributors in those States.

At present, nine States have enacted laws requiring deposits on beverage containers in order to reduce the litter resulting from the discard of those containers. Oregon was the first State to enact such a law. Michigan, Iowa, Massachusetts, Vermont, Maine, Connecticut, Delaware, and New York also have mandatory deposit laws.

Because of the experience of these States and the success of the mandatory deposit laws in reducing litter, several additional States are now considering adoption of similar laws.

It is obvious that the success of these laws is derived from the financial incentive of consumers to return the beverage containers to obtain their deposits. The refundable deposits were never intended to be a source of taxable income to wholesale distributors. However, the Internal Revenue Service, in Revenue Ruling 78-273, is interpreting the Tax Code in a manner that treats deposits as taxable income and thereby increases the tax liability of the distributor.

Under the IRS interpretation, deposits are taxable income when received; that is, when the consumer purchases beverages in the returnable container. The deposits refunded are a deductible expense when those containers are returned by the consumer. During most of the year, there is "matching" of deposits collected on beverage containers with deposits refunded on the return of those same beverage containers. Consequently, there is no tax liability associated with the deposits—until the last 6 weeks of the year. Beverage containers sold during this period will generally not be returned until the following year. However, deposits collected on these beverage containers become fully taxable because the IRS requires that wholesale distributors record the deposits to be refunded on these containers as an expense only in the year the containers are returned. This requirement places wholesale distributors in the position of having to report a substantial amount of income even though the deposits are soon to be refunded in the following year.

The position of the IRS is unreasonable. Wholesale distributors are legally obligated to refund these deposits upon the return of the beverage containers. To tax deposits as income even though these same deposits must by law be refunded violates the matching concept and creates, in many cases, a significant income tax liability.

Moreover, the IRS position is inconsistent with existing provisions of IRS regulations that have made provision for other industries facing the same tax accounting problem as wholesale distributors. It is also inconsistent with past congressional efforts placing incentives in the Tax Code to help businesses comply with environmental laws.

The legislation we are introducing today would allow wholesale distributors a current tax deduction for the deposits which must be refunded, even though the refund occurs in the following year. This would serve to offset the fully taxable deposits. The legislation would also properly require that distributors pay taxes on that portion of the deposits collected during the year from beverage containers that will never be returned because of loss or destruction.

During consideration of the revenue portion of the Deficit Reduction Act,

Senator GRASSLEY and I brought the issue of the tax treatment of State-mandated beverage container deposits to the attention of the chairman of the Finance Committee, who agreed to hold hearings on this matter. It is my hope this legislation will provide the vehicle for expedited hearings by the committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2691

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RESERVE FOR REFUNDS OF BEVERAGE CONTAINER DEPOSITS.

Section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses) is amended by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k) and by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

"(j) RESERVE FOR REFUNDS OF BEVERAGE CONTAINER DEPOSITS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If—

"(A) all deposits received by a wholesale distributor of beverages with respect to any type of beverage container are included in the gross income of such distributor for the taxable year in which such deposits are received by such distributor, and

"(B) such distributor elects the application of this subsection,

there shall be allowed as a deduction a reasonable addition to a reserve for refunds of such deposits. Such deduction shall be in lieu of any deduction allowable to such distributor under subsection (a) with respect to such refunds.

"(2) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF DEDUCTION ALLOWABLE FOR INITIAL TAXABLE YEAR.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations which—

"(A) limit the amount of the deduction allowable to the taxpayer under paragraph (1) for the first taxable year for which the taxpayer elects the application of this subsection, and

"(B) allow the excesss of—

"(i) the amount of the deduction which would have been allowed the taxpayer under paragraph (1) for such taxable year if the limitation described in subparagraph (A) did not apply, over

"(ii) the amount allowed the taxpayer under paragraph (1) for such taxable year,

to be carried forward to each of the 9 taxable years succeeding such taxable year and, to the extent provided in such regulations, be allowed as a deduction under paragraph (1) for each of the taxable years to which such excess is carried.

"(3) ELECTION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—An election under this subsection shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulations. Once a distributor elects the application of this subsection for a taxable year, such election shall apply to all subsequent taxable years unless the Secretary consents to the revocation of such election.

"(B) METHOD OF ACCOUNTING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, an election may be made under this subsection by any wholesale distributor of beverages without regard to the general method of accounting under which such distributor computes his taxable income.".

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1984.●

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to join Senator LEVIN in introducing this legislation. As you know, Senator LEVIN and I tried to raise this issue on the Deficit Reduction Tax Act recently considered by the full Senate. The chairman of the Finance Committee assured both of us he would be happy to hold a hearing on our measure. To facilitate the hearing process, my colleague from Michigan and I have decided to introduce this bill.

This provision permits accrual-basis taxpayers who are forced to collect State-mandated beverage deposits to deduct this accrued liability. In my view, this is the only fair tax treatment of these State-minded deposits. The accrual system requires a taxpayer to include an amount in income when the right to the liability is fixed and the amount of liability can be determined with reasonable accuracy. Here, the beverage wholesaler has no right to the State-mandated money, yet he or she is still forced to take the entire amount into income. The IRS permits them to deduct the amount of the deposits returned to retailer the following year. Meanwhile, the wholesaler has lost the use of the amount of money he paid in tax for an entire year.

It seems to Senator LEVIN and I that a more logical approach to this problem would permit a depositor to include in taxable income only those deposits which will not be refunded based on business experience. This deposit refund obligation for anticipated refunds would be treated as a liability under the accrual method.

I ask my colleagues from States with mandatory beverage deposits to join me in the sponsorship of this important measure.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1841

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS), and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1841, a bill to promote research and development, encourage innovation, stimulate trade, and make necessary and appropriate amendments to the antitrust, patent, and copyright laws.

S. 2489

At the request of Mr. WEICKER, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. ZORINSKY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. BOSCHWITZ), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MATTINGLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2489, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to enhance competition in Government procurement.

S. 2568

At the request of Mr. PACKWOOD, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON), was added as a cosponsor of S. 2568, a bill to clarify the application of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, and title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

S. 2636

At the request of Mr. SASSER, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), was added as a cosponsor of S. 2636, a bill to require the Administrator of General Services to notify State and local governments and agencies thereof prior to the disposal of surplus real property.

S.J. RES. 272

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BRADLEY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. BOSCHWITZ) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 272, a joint resolution recognizing the anniversaries of the Warsaw uprising and the Polish resistance to the invasion of Poland during World War II.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 289

At the request of Mrs. HAWKINS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER) was added as a consponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 289, a joint resolution to designate June 18, 1984, as "National Child Passenger Safety Awareness Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 296

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 296, a joint resolution to designate June 14, 1984, as "Baltic Freedom Day."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 115

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. DANFORTH), the Senator from Kansas (Mrs. KASSEBAUM), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. RUDMAN), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 115, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the International Olympic Committee should establish a permanent facility

for the Olympic games, to insulate the games from international politics.

AMENDMENT NO. 3053

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3053 intended to be proposed to S. 2537, a bill to amend the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

FIRST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

DOMENICI AMENDMENT NO. 3078

Mr. DOMENICI proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 106) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, and revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1984; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Congress hereby determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1984 is revised, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 is established, and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 are set forth.

(a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1983, October 1, 1984, October 1, 1985, and October 1, 1986:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $665,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $743,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $810,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $882,300,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $2,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $10,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $15,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $18,800,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $39,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $45,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $52,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $57,900,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $166,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $189,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $206,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $223,600,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $914,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $1,012,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $1,106,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $1,209,800,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $855,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $925,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $998,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $1,086,300,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits in the budget which are appropriate in the light of economic conditions and all other relevant factors are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $190,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $181,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $187,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $204,000,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $1,596,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $1,844,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $2,108,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $2,398,500,000,000.

and the amounts by which the statutory limits on such debt should be accordingly increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984: $106,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985: $248,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $263,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $290,100,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1983, October 1, 1984, October 1, 1985, and October 1, 1986, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $37,600,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $105,200,000,000.
(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $36,700,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $110,800,000,000.
(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $40,800,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $116,700,000,000.
(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $71,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $41,800,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,300,000,000.
(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $75,100,000,000.

(b) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1984 through 1987 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $265,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $237,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $299,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $266,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $333,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $294,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $372,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $330,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $21,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $15,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $16,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $17,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $10,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $8,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $8,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $3,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $4,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $4,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $4,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $4,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $4,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $15,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $3,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $3,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $13,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $3,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $5,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $50,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $6,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $52,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $6,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $54,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $71,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $7,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $57,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $75,100,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $29,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $28,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $30,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $31,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $7,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $6,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $7,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $7,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $31,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $30,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $30,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $31,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $31,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $33,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $36,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $38,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medical Insurance (570):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $62,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $71,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $84,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $99,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $118,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $144,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $155,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $164,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $175,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $179,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $199,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $215,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $202,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $229,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $217,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $26,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $26,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $22,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $27,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $27,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $28,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $5,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $6,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $6,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $5,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $5,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (850):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $6,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $6,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $6,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $6,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $109,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $124,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $141,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $141,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $160,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, $700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $1,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $3,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1984:
(A) New budget authority, −$15,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$15,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 2. If the Congress has not completed action by October 1, 1984 on the concurrent resolution on the budget required to be reported under section 310(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for fiscal year 1985, then, for purposes of section 311 of such Act, this concurrent resolution shall be deemed to be the concurrent resolution required to be reported under section 310(a) of such Act.

SEC. 3. No bill or resolution providing new discretionary budget authority or new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for fiscal year 1985, which exceeds the appropriate allocation of new discretionary budget authority or new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be enrolled in the House of Representatives, and no bill or resolution providing new budget authority or new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for fiscal year 1985, which exceeds the appropriate allocation of new budget authority or new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act shall be enrolled in the Senate, until after the Congress has completed action on the second concurrent resolution on the budget required to be reported under section 310 of such Act or until October 1, 1984, whichever comes first.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution, budget authority shall be determined on the basis applicable for fiscal year 1984.

SEC. 5. It is the sense of Congress that FY 1985 appropriations be increased for several non-defense discretionary programs. Priority should be given to education programs, environmental protection and health research activities.

SIMPSON (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3079

Mr. CRANSTON (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. CHILES, and Mr. BYRD) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 106), supra; follows:

On page 27, lines 4 and 5, strike out "$26,800,000,000" and "$26,200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,000,000,000" and "$26,400,000,000", respectively.

On page 27, lines 13 and 14, strike out "$27,000,000,000" and "$26,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,200,000,000" and "$26,900,000,000", respectively.

On page 27, lines 22 and 23, strike out "$27,600,000,000" and "$27,300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,800,000,000" and "$27,400,000,000", respectively.

SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON YTTRIUM ORES AND MATERIALS

GOLDWATER AMENDMENT NO. 3080

(Ordered referred to the Committee on Finance).

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2642) to suspend until July 1, 1989, the duty on yttrium bearing ores, materials, and compounds containing by weight more than 19 per centum but less than 85 per centum yttrium oxide equivalent; as follows:

Strike out all matter after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That subpart B of part 1 of the Appendix to the Tariff Schedule of the United States (19

U.S.C. 1202) is amended by inserting in unmerical sequence the following new item:

"907.21	All yttrium bearing ores, materials, and compounds containing by weight more than 19% but less than 85% yttrium oxide equivalent (provided for in items 423.00 or 423.96, part 2C, schedule 4, or item 603.70, part 1, schedule 6)	Free	No change	On or before 6/30/89".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the fifteenth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

MASS BOOK DEACIDIFICATION FACILITY

MATHIAS AMENDMENT NO. 3081

Mr. BAKER (for Mr. MATHIAS) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 2418) to authorize and direct the Librarian of Congress, subject to the supervision and authority of a Federal, civilian, or military agency, to proceed with the construction of the Library of Congress Mass Book Deacidification Facility, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 2, line 18, strike out all of line 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated for a

COMPREHENSIVE SMOKING EDUCATION ACT

HATCH AMENDMENT NO. 3082

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 772) to promote public health by improving public awareness of the health consequences of smoking and to increase the effectiveness of Federal health officials in investigating and communicating to the public necessary health information, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Comprehensive Smoking Education Act".

FINDING AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Surgeon General has found that—

(1) cigarette smoking is the largest preventable cause of illness and premature death in the United States and is associated with the unnecessary deaths of over three hundred thousand Americans annually;

(2) cigarette smoking in the United States is a major cause of cancer of the lung, larynx, oral cavity, and esophagus and is a contributory factor in cancer of the urinary bladder, kidney, and pancreas;

(3) cigarette smoking is a major cause of chronic bronchitis and emphysema in the United States;

(4) cardiovascular disease accounts for nearly one-half of the deaths in the United States and it is estimated that one-third of the deaths attributed to cardiovascular disease are associated with smoking;

(5) pregnant women who smoke have an elevated risk of miscarriages, stillbirths, and premature births, and giving birth to infants with low birth weight;

(6) quitting or never starting cigarette smoking will reduce an individual's risk of illness or premature death; and

(7) Federal, State and private initiatives should be encouraged to convey to the American people information on any adverse health effects of smoking.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to provide a new strategy for making Americans more aware of any adverse health effects of smoking, to assure the timely and widespread dissemination of research findings, and to enable individuals to make informed decisions about smoking.

SMOKING RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND INFORMATION

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Health and Human Services (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") shall establish and carry out a program to inform the public of any dangers to human health presented by cigarette smoking. In carrying out such program, the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct and support research on the effect of cigarette smoking on human health and develop materials for informing the public of such effect;

(2) coordinate all research and educational programs and other activities within the Department of Health and Human Services (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Department") which relate to the effect of cigarette smoking on human health and coordinate, through the Interagency Committee on Smoking and Health (established under subsection (b)), such activities with similar activities of other Federal agencies and of private agencies;

(3) establish and maintain a liaison with appropriate private entities, other Federal agencies, and State and local public agencies respecting activities relating to the effect of cigarette smoking on human health;

(4) collect, analyze, and disseminate (through publications, bibliographies, and otherwise) information, studies, and other data relating to the effect of cigarette smoking on human health, and develop standards, criteria, and methodologies for improved information programs related to smoking and health;

(5) compile and make available information on State and local laws relating to the sale, distribution, use, and consumption of cigarettes; and

(6) undertake any other additional information and research activities which the Secretary determines necessary and appropriate to carry out this section.

(b)(1) To carry out the activities described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a) there is established an Interagency Committee on Smoking and Health. The Committee shall be composed of—

(A) members appointed by the Secretary from appropriate institutes and agencies of the Department, which may include the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the National Institute on Drug Abuse, the Health Resources and Services Administration, and the Centers for Disease Control;

(B) at least one member appointed from the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Education, the Department of Labor, and any other Federal agency designated by the Secretary, the appointment of whom shall be made by the head of the entity from which the member is appointed; and

(C) five members appointed by the Secretary from physicians and scientists who represent private entities involved in informing the public about the health effects of smoking.

The Secretary shall designate the chairman of the Committee.

(2) While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Committee, members of the Committee shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the manner provided by sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(3) The Secretary shall make available to the Committee such staff, information, and other assistance as it may require to carry out its activities effectively.

(c) The Secretary shall transmit a report to Congress not later than January 1, 1985, and biennially thereafter which shall contain—

(1) an overview and assessment of Federal activities undertaken to inform the public of the health consequences of smoking and the extent of public knowledge of such consequences,

(2) a description of the Secretary's and Committee's activities under subsection (a),

(3) information regarding the activities of the private sector taken in response to the effects of smoking on health, and

(4) such recommendations as the Secretary may consider appropriate.

LABELS FOR CIGARETTES AND CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

SEC. 4. (a) Section 4 of the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 U.S.C. 1333) is amended to read as follows:

"LABELING

"SEC. 4. (a)(1) It shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture, package, or import for sale or distribution within the United States any cigarettes the packages of which fails to bear, in accordance with the requirements of this section, one of the following labels:

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Smoking Causes Lung Cancer, Heart Disease, Emphysema, And May Complicate Pregnancy.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Quitting Smoking Now Greatly Reduces Serious Risks to Your Health.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Smoking by Pregnant Women May Result in Fetal Injury, Premature Birth, and Low Birth Weight.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Cigarette Smoke Contains Carbon Monoxide.

"(2) It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or importer of cigarettes to advertise or cause to be advertised (other than through the use of outdoor billboards) within the United States any cigarette unless the advertising bears, in accordance with the requirements of this section, one of the following labels:

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Smoking Causes Lung Cancer, Heart Dis-

ease, Emphysema, And May Complicate Pregnancy.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Quitting Smoking Now Greatly Reduces Serious Risks to Your Health.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Smoking by Pregnant Women May Result in Fetal Injury, Premature Birth, And Low Birth Weight.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Pregnant Women Who Smoke Risk Fetal Injury and Premature Birth.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Cigarette Smoke Contains Carbon Monoxide.

"(3) It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or importer of cigarettes to advertise or cause to be advertised within the United States through the use of outdoor billboards any cigarette unless the advertising bears, in accordance with the requirements of this section, one of the following labels:

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Smoking Causes Lung Cancer, Heart Disease, and Emphysema.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Quitting Smoking Now Greatly Reduces Serious Health Risks.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Cigarette Smoke Contains Carbon Monoxide.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Pregnant Women Who Smoke Risk Fetal Injury and Premature Birth.

"(b)(1) Each label statement required by paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be located in the place label statements were placed on cigarette packages as of the date of the enactment of this subsection. The phrase 'Surgeon General's Warning' shall appear in capital letters and the size of all other letters in the label shall be the same as the size of such letters as of such date of enactment. All the letters in the label shall appear in conspicuous and legible type in contrast by typography, layout, or color with all other printed material on the package.

"(2) The format of each label statement required by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) shall be the format required under this section for label statements in cigarette advertising as of the date of the enactment of this subsection, except that the phrase 'Surgeon General's Warning' shall appear in capital letters, the area of the rectangle enclosing the label shall be 50 percent larger in size with a corresponding increase in the size of the type in the label, the width of the rule forming the border around the label shall be twice that in effect on such date, and the label may be placed at a distance from the outer edge of the advertisement which is one-half the distance permitted on such date. Each label statement shall appear in conspicuous and legible type in contrast by typography, layout, or color with all other printed material in the advertisement.

"(3) The format and type style of each label statement required by paragraph (3) of subsection (a) shall be the format and type style required in outdoor billboard advertising as of the date of the enactment of this subsection. Each such label statement shall be printed in capital letters of the height of the tallest letter in a label statement on outdoor advertising of the same dimension on such date of enactment. Each such label statement shall be enclosed by a black border which is located within the perimeter of the format required in outdoor billboard advertising of the same dimension on such date of enactment and the width of which is twice the width of the vertical element of any letter in the label statement within the border.

"(c) The label statements specified in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) shall be rotated by each manufacturer or importer of cigarettes quarterly in alternating sequence on packages of each brand of cigarettes manufactured by the manufacturer or importer and in the advertisements for each such brand of cigarettes in accordance with a plan submitted by the manufacturer or importer and approved by the Federal Trade Commission. The Federal Trade Commission shall approve a plan submitted by a manufacturer or importer of cigarettes which will provide the rotation required by this subsection and which assures that all of the labels required by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) will be displayed by the manufacturer or importer at the same time.".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect upon the expiration of a one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

CIGARETTE INGREDIENTS

SEC. 5. (a) The Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act is amended by redesignating sections 7 through 12 as sections 8 through 13, respectively, and by inserting after section 6 the following new section:

"CIGARETTE INGREDIENTS

"SEC. 7. (a) Each person who manufactures, packages, or imports cigarettes shall annually provide the Secretary with a list of the ingredients added to tobacco in the manufacture of cigarettes which does not identify the company which uses the ingredients or the brand of cigarettes which contain the ingredients. A person or group of persons required to provide a list by this subsection may designate an individual or entity to provide the list required by this subsection.

"(b)(1) At such times as the Secretary considers appropriate, the Secretary shall transmit to the Congress a report, based on the information provided under subsection (a), respecting—

"(A) a summary of research activities and proposed research activities on the health effects of ingredients added to tobacco in the manufacture of cigarettes and the findings of such research;

"(B) information pertaining to any such ingredient which in the judgement of the Secretary poses a health risk to cigarette smokers; and

"(C) any other information which the Secretary determines to be in the public interest.

"(2)(A) Any information provided to the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be treated as trade secret or confidential information subject to section 552(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code and section 1905 of title 18, United States Code and shall not be revealed, except as provided in paragraph (1), to any person other than those authorized by the Secretary in carrying out their official duties under this section.

"(B) Subparagraph (A) does not authorize the withholding of a list provided under subsection (a) from any duly authorized subcommittee or committee of the Congress. If a subcommittee or committee of the Congress requests the Secretary to provide it such a list, the Secretary shall make the list available to the subcommittee or committee and shall, at the same time, notify in writing the person who provided the list of such request.

"(C) The Secretary shall establish written procedures to assure the confidentiality of information provided under subsection (a). Such procedures shall include the designation of a duly authorized agent to serve as custodian of such information. The agent—

"(i) shall take physical possession of the information and, when not in use by a person authorized to have access to such information, shall store it in a locked cabinet or file, and

"(ii) shall maintain a complete record of any person who inspects or uses the information.

Such procedures shall require that any person permitted access to the information shall be instructed in writing not to disclose the information to anyone who is not entitled to have access to the information.".

(b) Section 7 of the Federal Cigarette labeling and Advertising Act added by subsection (a) shall take effect upon the expiration of the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

SEC. 6. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 U.S.C. 1331) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) the public may be adequately informed about any adverse health effects of cigarette smoking by inclusion of warning notices on each package of cigarettes and in each advertisement of cigarettes.".

(b) Section 3 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1332) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(8) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.".

(c) Section 8 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1336) (as so redesignated) is amended to read as follows:

"FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

"SEC. 8. Nothing in this Act (other than the requirements of section 4(b)) shall be construed to limit, restrict, expand, or otherwise affect the authority of the Federal Trade Commission with respect to unfair or deceptive acts or practices in the advertising of cigarettes.".

(d) Section 9 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1337) (as so redesignated) is amended—

(1) by striking out "of Health, Education, and Welfare" in subsection (a),

(2) by redesignating clauses (A) and (B) in such subsection as clauses (1) and (2), respectively,

(3) by striking out clause (A) in subsection (b) and by redesignating clauses (B) and (C) as clauses (1) and (2), respectively.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I am submitting an amendment in the form of a substitute for S. 772, the Smoking Prevention Health and Education Act, and urge that floor debate be scheduled as soon as possible to consider this important legislation. As amended, the bill is similar to S. 772 as reported out of the Labor and Human Resources Committee on July 13, 1983, and continues its important mission of educating our citizens about the hazards of smoking.

The bill, as amended, will require four rotating health warning labels on cigarette packages. The warning labels begin with "SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING" and are followed by one of four phrases: "Smoking Causes Lung Cancer, Heart Disease, Emphysema And May Complicate Pregnancy";

"Quitting Smoking Now Greatly Reduces Serious Risks To Your Health"; "Smoking By Pregnant Women May Result In Fetal Injury, Premature Birth, And Low Birth Weight"; and "Cigarette Smoke Contains Carbon Monoxide."

The "Smoking Prevention Health and Education Act" represents a national public education effort designed to improve our citizens awareness about what the Surgeon has said is the No. 1 preventable cause of death—cigarette smoking. The issue at stake is not whether the Government should tell people how to live their lives. I am not in favor of Government regulations just for the sake of regulating. This does not prevent any citizen from using tobacco products. It will, however, allow them to make a more informed choice.

Mr. President, I want to extend my thanks to my distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives, Congressman DINGELL, chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee and Congressman WAXMAN, chairman of the Health and Environment Subcommittee for their valiant efforts in bringing about a compromise between the tobacco industry and many national health groups represented by the Coalition on Smoking or Health. Without their help, we would not be moving forward on this landmark legislation. It is my understanding that the House of Representatives is eager for quick passage of the Senate bill, and I strongly recommend we send this legislation to them as soon as possible.

Also, I understand that following intense negotiations, the tobacco industry has said they will not oppose this bill if it remains in its present form. This has taken great courage on their part and I want to extend my appreciation to the Tobacco Institute and its member companies for their cooperation and willingness to compromise.

This is a bill whose time has come. The American public is asking for more information so they can make a more informed decision on smoking. It is our responsibility to give the American people that information.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment to S. 772, and my remarks be printed in the RECORD and that consideration of this bill be scheduled as soon as possible.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY CONSERVATION AND SUPPLY

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public the scheduling of public hearings before the Subcommittee on Energy Conservation and Supply.

On Thursday, June 14, beginning at 10 a.m., the subcommittee will receive testimony on S. 2370, to provide for the distribution to the States of certain amounts resulting from enforcement of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973, and for other purposes; and to oversee existing weatherization programs.

On Tuesday, June 26, beginning at 10 a.m., the subcommittee will hold an oversight hearing to receive testimony on the Outer Continental Shelf leasing activities.

Both hearings will be held in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

Those wishing to testify or who wish to submit written statements for the hearing record should write to the Subcommittee on Energy Conservation and Supply, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510.

Witnesses are requested to provide the subcommittee with 25 copies of their testimony 24 hours in advance of the hearing, as required by the rules of the committee, and 100 copies on the day of the hearing.

For further information regarding these hearings, please contact Mr. Allen Stayman of the subcommittee staff at 224-2366.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Small Business Committee and the House Small Business Committee will hold a joint conference on May 22, 1984, at 2 p.m. in room S. 146 of the Capitol, on the SBA authorization bills, S. 1323 and H.R. 3020. For further information, please contact Bob Dotchin, staff director, of the committee at 224-5175.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Friday, May 18, to continue markup of the fiscal year 1985 intelligence budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

MRS. EUNICE KENNEDY SHRIVER ON ADOLESCENT PREGNANCY

● Mr. DENTON. Mr. President, I should like to insert in the RECORD a very thoughtful and useful speech on adolescent pregnancy given by Mrs. Eunice Kennedy Shriver at the "Partnership for Action Conference" sponsored by the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs of the Department of Health and Human Services. The conference was held in Tampa, Fla. on April 30. The participants included representatives from Adolescent Family Life Act projects, as well as other community groups and leaders from the southeastern part of the country who are concerned about problems of adolescent pregnancy. The keynnote speaker for the conference was Mrs. Shriver.

Mrs. Shriver is a friend and respected colleague of mine. We have worked together over the past 4 years in concert on many areas of common interest concerning the well-being and happiness of our Nation's young people and their families. Mrs. Shriver and the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation have been strong advocates for the Adolescent, Family Life Act. Not only has Mrs. Shriver testifed in support of the law, but through the efforts of the Kennedy Foundation, she has also worked to develop over 200 "community of caring" adolescent pregnancy programs throughout the United States.

These programs embrace many of the goals and purposes of the adolescent family life law while at the same time striving even further to assist adolescents and their families by challenging parents as well as the professionals involved in the programs to become "moral educators." Teens, parents and adult counselors are taught how to share their values and in the process the "community of caring" programs are finding that adolescents and adults agree on many values such as: "Having sex with love is better than sexual promiscuity. Raising a child in a family with a mother and father is better than raising a child alone."

I could not agree with Mrs. Shriver more than when she stated: "These (values) are not religious dogmas or the property of any one group or value system. They are truths within the everyday life experience of adults and adolescents alike—not only in our culture, but in every culture." I believe that truths such as these when imparted to our young people will help us all to develop a happier society and a more productive nation.

Finally, I want to take this opportunity to publicly congratulate Mrs. Shriver for her receipt of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian award of our Government, from President Reagan. This award was presented to Mrs. Shriver for the more than 20 years of her labors on behalf of the mentally retarded. As the founder of the Special Olympics and the supporter of research centers and excellent programs for the mentally retarded, Eunice Kennedy Shriver has touched the lives of many American families. For this work, as

well as for her work in the area of adolescent pregnancy, I want to thank Mrs. Shriver today.

I ask that Mrs. Shriver's speech be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The speech follows:

ADOLESCENT PREGNANCY: PARTNERSHIPS FOR ACTION

Marjorie Mecklenburg, ladies and gentlemen.

Thank you for inviting me to speak to you at this partnerships for action conference. As we all work in adolescent pregnancy programs, I feel we are joined together in a great undertaking.

The idea that "all men and women are brothers and sisters is not a transient cultural notion," said Nobel prize winner Dr. Lewis Thomas, "not a slogan to make us feel warm and comfortable inside. It is a biological imperative."

Our biology then, is moral. And out of our biology has come the most moral of our human institutions—the family.

Today, I would like to talk to you briefly about the changing values and mores in our society regarding the family. I see that we are in the infancy stages of a great moral awakening by our young people, as well as by our adults.

Now more than ever before, it's being found that college-age students are postponing sex. According to a recent NBC report, one college found that the percentage of their new students who reported they had engaged in pre-marital sex, had dropped from a high of over eighty percent ten years ago to fifty-three percent today.

Recent studies by Professor Carol Gilligan of the Harvard School of Education reveal adolescence—certainly among girls—is the age at which values emerge on their own. You should not assess girls' values from the categories derived from studies of males, says Professor Gilligan. But, instead, see how you would describe identity, and moral development, and the adolescent transformation of relationships by beginning with the girl.

When Carol asked girls what "dependence" meant, the response was: "It means that someone will be there when you need them to talk to—to listen to—to try to help—and to understand."

In these girls minds, the implied opposite of dependence was not independence but undependability. Yet, all the sociological assessment scales place dependency on one end, to signify childhood, and independence or autonomy on the other end, to signify maturity. Here, in their definition of the dependent person, the girls were identifying a different dimension. The dependent person was being defined in the context of their ability to develop relationships—relationships of caring, of communication and of commitment—and to engage with others.

We need to encourage women to see and speak, in their own terms, about what they see and what they know. Looking at girls will provide us with a new way of looking at both girls and boys.

But all of us know that the powerful drive to care and be cared for sometimes leads young people to use their sexuality to bind themselves to others. All too often, an early pregnancy results.

And so our work goes on and on.

Over the past four years, more than two hundred adolescent pregnancy programs throughout the United States have adopted "a community of caring" in their curriculums to provide a new value-oriented approach to serving adolescents.

I was delighted to learn recently that Governor Mario Cuomo of New York had formed a task force on adolescent pregnancy. This task force has recommended the development, and funding, of a new five million dollar adolescent pregnancy program that, in addition to advice on nutrition, education and parenting, will also teach young people values.

This is also the goal of "a community of caring."

What is "a community of caring?" It is both a place and an attitude—a program and a philosophy. Within such communities, young mothers-to-be and the fathers of their babies explore their feelings, examine their expectations, and make their plans for the future in an environment of acceptance and trust.

Here they find caring without judgment and through this caring, they learn that their lives are rich in value and in possibility.

Central to "a community of caring" is a curriculum which has been developed with the help of doctors, nurses, social workers, parents, clergy, teachers, and young people themselves. This curriculum contains the essential facts which teachers must transmit to pregnant adolescents to help them develop in health, education, work, marriage, exercise, parenting, and recreation.

And what is unique about "a community of caring?" It demonstrates the very values that it teaches. It assumes that young people who feel cared for by others, will eventually care for themselves. It realizes that people who are able to respect and care for themselves, can care more fully and realistically for others.

The "community of caring" curriculum inspires in young people a vision of a strong and healthy family. It offers a way in which the family helps preserve the centrality of the individual as the moral decision-maker in a caring relationship with his or her family.

The approach of the "community of caring" challenges all parents and professionals to be not only teachers, but moral educators. It does not apologize for its faith in the value of moral behavior. It recognizes that adolescents are hungry for values, for certainties, and for guideposts to lead them in their quest for values.

The first requirement for parents to help their children, and to help all children, is to clarify in their own minds their own feelings in respect to morals and values.

My argument is straight-forward and quite simple. When parents and teachers raise questions concerning values in adolescent's minds, but they do not try to force their feelings on the adolescent, moral values are not being imposed but communicated. The moral component exists in every human activity, whether we raise it and discuss it openly or whether we try to hide it.

To ignore the moral component of an issue is to ignore a crucial dimension of your understanding. You will not understand the problem adequately if you ignore the moral component. So by raising the moral question that is inherent in every problem we are not imposing anything. We are simply pointing out—for critical examination—something that is already there in the situation.

For example, there is a moral dimension in issues regarding nuclear policy . . . there is a moral dimension to how you deal with South Africa or the Middle East . . .

There is a moral dimension in adolescent pregnancy, and the technical person involved in adolescent pregnancy is absolutely wrong for not pointing out—for critical discussion—the moral elements of adolescent pregnancy. If you do not deal with the moral dimension of this question in public policy, then you are simply making public policy with a blind spot—in the same way that a person who says, "we are going to look at our relationships with Germany but we are not going to deal with the economic elements of that relationship," would be examining that issue with a blind spot.

You cannot deal with the public policy programs of adolescent pregnancy unless you are willing to deal with all the moral components of adolescent pregnancy issues. And so, it is not imposing anything on anyone to raise the moral question in discussing adolescent pregnancy. It is simply to ask: Since the moral dimension is already there, are we going to make public policy without any reflective treatment of the moral issue? Or are we going to make public policy on the basis of a conscious, reflective analysis of the moral elements that relate to every other element—the human, the medical, and the economic?

The imposing argument, I think, can be dealt with head-on. We are not imposing anything. Those who say we should exclude the moral policy are exorcising something from the problem by refusing to look at it. Yet, the very people they are trying to help, enthusiastically accept discussion of the moral policy once the questions are raised.

A sixteen-year-old in an Oklahoma "community of caring" program recently said to me about caring: "What I have learned here is to love and respect myself, and to find out the meaning of life. I never realized I had to do that for myself before I could love my baby."

The "community of caring" curriculum does not ask teachers to pose as experts in ethics. It asks them to share with their students the values of "a community of caring" so that the young people in their care can begin to formulate values of their own. We have found that when this candid sharing of values takes place, adults and adolescents agree on many values. For example: Caring for yourself is better than neglecting yourself. Having sex with love is better than sexual promiscuity. Raising a child in a family with a mother and a father is better than raising a child alone.

These are not religious dogmas or the property of any one group or value system. They are truths within the everyday life experience of adults and adolescents alike—not only in our culture, but in every culture.

Every teacher feels qualified to guide adolescents in nutrition, money management, or educational choices. In "a community of caring," we ask them to go a step further—to be as clear about moral values as they are about the other subjects they teach.

Does the "community of caring" curriculum work?

Yes!

As we listen to the young men and women in "community of caring" programs, they joyfully tell us how simple acts of caring have transformed their lives.

"You guys are my family," said a sixteen-year-old in New York recently. "I don't have anyone at home who listens to me and respects me."

"It's only here that I feel no one will judge me," says a young mother-to-be in Houston, Texas.

I am here today to urge you to help build "communities of caring" across this land. We must encourage teenagers who get pregnant to come to a place where caring is not only talked about, but practiced.

We must let our teenagers know that they do not live alone or in a world without values. They are part of a community of teachers, parents, and friends all struggling together for answers about the meaning and value of their lives. As novelist Toni Morrison has said, "it takes a village to raise a child, not one parent, not two parents, but the whole village." The "community of caring" is a village of caring. It helps give our youth a sense of connectedness to all aspects of themselves and others. The birth of a baby is a miracle that affirms the meaning and value of life. In the "community of caring," all elements of this community join to protect, enhance, and nurture this new life—this new family.

Thank you very much.●

PRESERVATION WEEK

● Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, this week, May 13-19, is Preservation Week. Some 5,000 preservation and neighborhood groups will be participating in activities in celebration of the week.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation has announced a theme, "Preservation is Taking Care of America" for the period.

This is, therefore, a particularly appropriate time to reflect upon the contributions of State and local preservation organizations to reclaiming and revitalizing neighborhoods and downtown centers throughout our Nation.

Historic preservation efforts have enabled us to save for future generations buildings of significance to our heritage and culture. They have given new life to urban areas which had degenerated physically and spiritually. They have made declining neighborhoods not just viable but inviting, attractive places in which to live.

I could cite endless examples in my State of Kentucky of historic structures protected, center cities revived and older neighborhoods reestablished through historic preservation efforts. Suffice it to say that the benefits have been not only economic, but also cultural. We learn from the past and it helps provide a sense of stability, of continuity with appropriate change.

I hope we can all take a few minutes this week to celebrate the past contributions of preservation efforts and to recommit to further worthwhile efforts in this field.●

THE PHARMACY CRIME BILL—S. 422

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I am pleased at the action of the Senate in taking final action on S. 422, the pharmacy crime bill.

The time is long overdue in providing protection to our Nation's pharmacists. Indeed, the National Association of Retail Druggists has advocated passage of legislation for over 12 years. During the debate on the Criminal Code Reform Act in the 95th Congress, the Senate unanimously adopted an amendment dealing with pharmacy crime. Similar provisions were contained in the reported version of the Criminal Code Reform Act in the 96th Congress. In 1982, the Senate passed pharmacy crime provisions as part of H.R. 3963. Unfortunately, these provisions were subsequently dropped in conference with the House.

More recently, pharmacy crime legislation was included in S. 1762, the crime bill passed by this body on February 2. So, I am pleased that we will finally see passage of this legislation. I do regret, however, that the House saw fit to impose restrictions on the jurisdiction of the bill.

I see no logic in treating the robbery of controlled substances any differently than obtaining them by fraud. Presently, the Federal Government controls who may prescribe drugs and under what circumstances those drugs may be prescribed. The Federal Government sets the penalties for illegal drug use and possession. And the Federal Government decides what drugs are enrolled in schedules I through IV of the Controlled Substances Act. Pharmacists are required to notify the Drug Enforcement Administration of thefts and are liable if they do not do so. There is no reason to treat robberies differently from other fraudulent thefts of controlled substances.

By the same token, I feel the $500 trigger is unwise. The interest of DEA is not in the replacement cost of the drugs but in their street value on the illegal market. Indeed, if the criminal walks down the street and attempts to sell the stolen drugs, the value DEA considers is not the wholesale value of the drugs but their street value.

In another area, the House attached a provision to the bill which triggers Federal jurisdiction where "significant bodily injury" results. Again, I see no need for this provision. The fear and intimidation engendered by the armed robbery of drugs is sufficient. Pharmacists and customers should not have to suffer injury or be killed to constitute a Federal crime.

While I regret that the House saw fit to add these provisions, I am pleased that we will finally have a pharmacy crime law. It has been a long struggle to see this law enacted.

It is imperative that we enact a comprehensive strategy for taking the profitability out of drug trafficking and provide an improved legislative framework for combating drug-related crime. The illicit drug trade is now estimated to be worth over $64 billion a year. That figure would make it the second largest corporation in America, behind Exxon and slightly ahead of Mobil.

And look at the result. The byproduct of this illegal industry is more violence, more crime, and an increasingly overworked criminal justice system.

So I am pleased to see us arrive at this point. Finally, I would again like to point to the hard work done by the National Association of Retail Druggists. It is their persistence and their concern that has resulted in a pharmacy crime law.●

ADVANCE NOTIFICATION—PROPOSED ARMS SALES

● Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive advance notification of proposed arms sales under that act in excess of $50 million or, in the case of major defense equipment as defined in the act, those in excess of $14 million. Upon receipt of such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Pursuant to an informal understanding, the Department of Defense has agreed to provide the committee with a preliminary notification 20 days before transmittal of the official notification. The official notification will be printed in the RECORD in accordance with previous practice.

I wish to inform Members of the Senate that such a notification has been received.

Interested Senators may inquire as to the details of this advance notification at the office of the Committee on Foreign Relations, room SD-423.

I ask that the letter of notification be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1984.
In reply refer to: I-20028/84ct.
Dr. HANS BINNENDIJK,
Professional Staff Member, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. BINNENDIJK: By letter dated 18 February 1976, the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, indicated that you would be advised of possible transmittals to Congress of information as required by Section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act. At the instruction of the Department of State, I wish to provide the following advance notification.

The Department of State is considering an offer to an East Asian recipient tentatively estimated to cost in excess of $50 million.

Sincerely,

GLENN A. RUDD,
Acting Director.

Attachments.●

THE 2D POLISH CORPS VICTORY AT MONTE CASSINO, ITALY

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, on May 18, 1944, the 2d Polish Corps attacked and secured the Nazi stronghold at Monte Cassino, Italy. This victory helped the Allies continue on the road to Rome. It is proper, today, that we remember and commemorate the brave and heroic acts of those soldiers.

In 1941, Germany overran Eastern Poland on its way to the Soviet Union. Shortly thereafter, the 2d Polish Corps was formed and marched through Persia to join the British 8th Army in Palestine. Thousands of Polish civilians who had fled to the Soviet Union accompanied the Polish Army to the Middle East and, during the march, were well looked after by the Polish soldiers.

After joining the British, these Poles fought side by side with the British in the campaign to liberate Italy. In March 1944, General Leese, commander of the British 8th Army, informed Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, the distinguished commander of the 2d Polish Corps, that he had received orders to break through the Gustav Line, where the Allied advance had stalled. The Polish Corps was assigned the task of taking Monte Cassino, one of the main strongholds of the Gustav Line. The historic battle of Monte Cassino began on May 11. The Poles fought with exemplary courage and characteristic determination for 7 bloody days. In his book entitled "An Army in Exile," General Anders remembered what General Leese said about the fighting prior to the taking of Monte Cassino:

> (General Leese) considered that by its fighting . . . the II Polish Army Corps had kept the enemy forces in the Monte Cassino key position entirely tied up, had drawn the Germans' artillery fire from other sectors and had prevented them (from) using their reserves. The II Polish Army Corps had thus carried out the task assigned to it in so far as it had been of great assistance to the XIII British Army Corps. . . .

Finally, on May 18, 1944, the 2d Polish Corps successfully seized control of the fortress. General Anders described that day in his book:

> On the morning of May 18, the forces on the sector of the 3d Carpathian Rifle Division renewed their attacks and met with prompt success, for, as I had foreseen, the enemy had withdrawn most of his forces during the night, leaving only covering detachments. The white and red flag of Poland was hoisted over the ruins of Monte Cassino monastery at 10:20 a.m. by a patrol of the 12th Lancers. The fortress that had so long blocked the road to Rome had fallen. Victory had been won by the gallantry of the Polish soldiers and the joint effort of the Allied armies.

Mr. President, we owe this corps a great debt. I am proud to say that in my home State of Michigan a 2d Polish Army Corps Center is being established in Orchard Lake. To maintain this memorial center, a foundation has been created. The goals of this foundation include remembering the heroism and sacrifices of those who gave their lives for the liberation of Europe, establishing and maintaining a library and archives of the artifacts and memorabilia of the corps, erecting a chapel to Our Lady of Kozielsk, and awarding scholarships to students of Polish descent. It is my hope that the foundation and memorial center at Orchard Lake will be a lasting tribute to the heroic accomplishments of this deserving unit.●

DR. AN WANG, A GOOD CORPORATE CITIZEN

● Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. President, it has been my privilege over the last 14 years to know Dr. Wang. As a resident of Lowell and as a public official representing the State of Massachusetts, I can state with a unique personal conviction that he and his company represent the best example I know of the "good corporate citizen."

Dr. Wang has been a leader in philanthropic support to a wide range of cultural and educational interests. His leadership has been an example and has inspired many other private contributions in this area. But more than this aspect of Dr. Wang's contribution should be recognized. Through his influence, the corporate decisions at Wang Laboratories take into consideration responsibilities to the total environment, including the physical, economic, and social surroundings. The entire Commonwealth of Massachusetts has been a principal benefactor of this policy and we take great pride in counting Dr. An Wang as one of our leading citizens.

Mr. President, I ask that an article from the New York Times, dated May 5, 1984, titled "Chinese Immigrant Emerges As Boston's Top Benefactor," about Dr. An Wang, chairman of Wang Laboratories, be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

CHINESE IMMIGRANT EMERGES AS BOSTON'S TOP BENEFACTOR

(By Fox Butterfield)

BOSTON, May 4.—The way Lorraine Wang recalls it, one day a friend approached her and her husband, An Wang, the chairman of Wang Laboratories, and mentioned that the roof was literally falling in at Boston's main performing arts center.

The Wangs were not particularly patrons of the arts, Mrs. Wang said, "but something had to be done." So when her Shanghai-born husband asked her if they should help, she replied, "Why not?" And without further discussion he pledged $4 million to save the theater from being closed.

This was but one of a series of recent philanthropic actions that have made the 63-year-old Chinese immigrant, who came to the United States in 1945, Boston's current leading benefactor.

Among his other major contributions are gifts totaling $4 million to Harvard University, a $1 million donation to Wellesley College that has not yet been announced, construction of a $15 million factory by Wang Laboratories in Boston's Chinatown to provide 300 jobs for inner city residents, and creation of the $6 million Wang Institute of Graduate Studies for software engineers and China scholars.

These actions do not include Mr. Wang's critical role in revitalizing the old industrial city of Lowell, 30 miles northwest of Boston, where his company set up its corporate headquarters in 1978. There Wang Laboratories, a leading maker of computer-based office automation systems, has established a free country club and day care center for all employees.

Mr. Wang's philanthropy is especially striking because, while Boston has a number of prominent cultural institutions, like the Boston Symphony Orchestra and its Museum of Fine Arts, business support for the arts here is much lower than in most other major cities.

Corporate contributions in Boston account for only 1.8 percent of the combined operating budgets of the city's arts groups, according to a study conducted by the Massachusetts Council for the Arts. In San Francisco the figure is 4 percent, in Houston 7 percent and in Minneapolis 14.6 percent.

Mr. Wang's role presents a nice historical irony. The fortunes of many of Boston's great families were made in the China trade of the early 19th century, when they often sold opium to Chinese.

These fortunes, however, were not comparable to the Rockefeller oil wealth or Carnegie steel wealth that made huge philanthropies possible elsewhere in the nation.

Mr. Wang is characteristically brief about the reasons for his charity. At a dinner in his honor Thursday night at Harvard's Faculty Club, he attributed his benefactions to an obligation he feels to repay the college community and country that helped him.

"I was fortunate that as soon as I got to the United States in 1945, I was admitted to Harvard," he told an audience of Harvard deans, professors and of other wealthy patrons. He rapidly earned his master's degree and then a Ph.D. in physics from Harvard in 1948.

AN INTRODUCTION TO COMPUTERS

It was in 1948 "that Harvard introduced me to computers and let me in on the very early stage of their development," he said, referring to his work in Harvard's pioneering Computation Laboratory. "I am honored that Harvard lets me show my appreciation."

Mr. Wang, a shy, very private man, conceded in an interview later that he hoped his gifts might "encourage" some of the executives of Boston's other successful new high-technology companies to make more contributions.

The dinner was arranged to celebrate his latest donation to the university, $1 million for the John K. Fairbank Center for East Asian Research, to be used for training young China scholars. In 1981, he donated $1 million to Harvard for four science fellowships to be named in honor of his physics professor at Harvard, and has made other gifts of $2 million.

In March the Wang family also gave $1 million to Wellesley, where his wife went to college, for a chair in English literature to be named after her.

CAREER COMES FULL CIRCLE

Construction of the $15 million plant in Chinatown, begun last winter, completes a cycle in Mr. Wang's career. In 1951 he set

up his tiny first factory over a garage in the nearby South End. Wang Laboratories' earnings that year were $15,000. They have grown by an average of 40 percent a year ever since and are expected to reach $2 billion for the fiscal year ending in June. That makes the company No. 227 on Fortune magazine's list of the 500 largest companies.

Dr. Wang and his family now own about 55 percent of the company's stock, which has led Forbes magazine to put his worth at $1.6 billion and rank him the fifth richest American.

Mr. Wang's help for Boston theater, originally the Metropolitan Center, built in 1925, and renamed the Wang Center after his gift last year, has not been limited to money. He also dispatched a vice president of Wang Laboratories to improve the theater's management. This week it was announced that the center would take over the Boston University Celebrity Series, New England's foremost presenter of classical music and dance. It will now be the Wang Celebrity Series.

A SPEECH THAT WASN'T NEEDED

Approaching the quick, decisive Mr. Wang is not like going to see other people, said Henry Rosovsky, the dean of Harvard's faculty. At the dinner Thursday night, he recalled that last year, when Harvard decided to increase its current fund-raising drive to $350 million from $250 million, he and Harvard's president Derek Bok, went to see Mr. Wang.

"We were all prepared with a half hour speech," Mr. Rosovsky said. "But when we went in his office, he just said, 'How do you do, I have decided to increase my gift,' and he named a seven-figure sum. Then he didn't want to hear our speech," we always felt it was somehow too easy."●

MONTANA'S TIMBER INDUSTRY

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, during the Senate's budget debate we have talked at length, about the situation in our Nation's overall economy. Today, I want to talk about the situation in one very important part of the my State's economy: The timber industry.

During the past 3 years, Montana's timber industry suffered from a severe recession. Now, because of increased housing starts, the industry is starting to recover.

But this welcome recovery should not delude us into thinking that the industry's problems have disappeared. Several important ones remain. Today, I would like to tell my Senate colleagues about three of these problems: The giant Federal budget deficit, the proposal to repeal the capital gains taxation of timber, and unfair foreign trading practices.

BACKGROUND

Beginning in the earliest days of frontier settlement, timbermen have made important contributions to Montana's development. and when mining activities boomed in the 1880's and rail lines were lain to serve the miners and their new towns like Butte and Anaconda, timber evolved into a major industry in its own right.

Since World War II, the Montana timber industry has grown to the point that it is now Montana's largest nonagricultural employer. In western Montana counties, it accounts for nearly 50 percent of nonagricultural labor income. In fact, it is no exaggeration to say that western Montana's steady growth in the 1970's was primarily the result of the remarkable expansion of forest products firms. By 1979, Montana's timber industry was generating almost 12,000 jobs and a $250 million payroll. At this point, Montana's forest product firms expected a bright future providing the raw materials needed to build new homes and businesses in America and abroad.

1980-83 RECESSION

Then the recession began, driving up interest rates and driving down housing starts and business construction.

This had an immediate impact on Montana's timber industry. By mid-1982, only the largest mills remained open. Four thousand jobs had been lost, and the timber industry payroll had falled by 40 percent. This decline, combined with the worst downturn ever experienced in Montana's mining sector, left western Montana in a deep economic depression.

A STRONG RECOVERY IN 1983

When the U.S. economy began to recover in 1983, Montana's timber industry recovered even faster. Mills reopened and employees went back to work. Profits remained low, however, because timber companies were eager to regain their market share even if it meant suppressing prices to levels lower than demand dictated.

By late 1983, sawmills were operating at normal levels and the industry was employing almost 10,000 people.

For 1984, the outlook was even brighter. Experts expect lumber production to reach nearly 1.5 billion board feet—compared to only 845 million board feet in 1982—and employment to reach almost 11,000. Since forest products jobs are among the highest paid in western Montana, this significantly improves the economic outlook for the entire western Montana region, although predatory foreign overproduction of copper continues to prevent the mining industry from recovering.

The recovery in Montana's timber industry is expected to continue for the next few years, but several problems could set us back.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT

The first problem is the giant Federal budget deficit.

The deficit is increasing by $22 million an hour. At this rate, our total national debt will double over the next 6 years, until it exceeds $3 trillion.

As a result of these giant deficits, the Federal Government has to borrow so much capital that there is little left for those who want to build homes or factories. This tightens our capital supply and drives up interest rates.

Recently, the prime rate climbed to 12.5 percent. It will climb higher and higher unless we act, quickly and forcefully, to reduce the deficit.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I have worked hard on a deficit reduction package.

We started working on this package last November. At that time, most Washington observers thought we would fail, because Congress was too timid to significantly reduce the deficit in an election year.

But there were those who showed some political courage and were willing to speak out about the deficit problem. For example, Champion International was one of the first major corporations to publicly support the Finance Committee's efforts. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Andrew Sigler, chief executive officer of Champion International, to President Reagan be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMPION INTERNATIONAL CORP.,
Stamford, Conn., November 9, 1983.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am greatly concerned that record deficits and the resulting high interest rates will effectively prohibit a return to the robust economy which is essential to the health of this nation.

The tenuous state of the recovery requires that careful consideration be given to realistic deficit reduction measures. By "realistic," I mean proposals that balance real spending cuts and tax increases on at least a one-for-one basis.

The time to act decisively is now. I urge your support for comprehensive deficit reduction measures such as Senator Dole and the members of the Finance Committee are now advocating in general form. I seriously doubt that a commission or other designated group, working through 1984, would devise a proposal greatly different from those currently being considered.

I ask your consideration of these views out of my concern for the future well-being of my country and of Champion International Corporation.

Sincerely,

ANDREW C. SIGLER,
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, we eventually succeeded, and drafted a "Downpayment" package that reduces the deficit by about $144 billion, over 3 years, by a combination of spending cuts and revenue increases. It is a solid, bipartisan package.

However, I do not think it goes far enough. That is why I joined Senators BIDEN, KASSEBAUM, and GRASSLEY in proposing the 1-year budget freeze. This proposal would have frozen all Federal spending for 1 year and thereby saved about $30 billion. It was fair, balanced, and bipartisan.

Those who supported the freeze showed great political courage. They realized that there are no easy solutions and that we need strong medicine. But I believe Americans want that kind of medicine and that is why I will keep working to convince others that our huge deficit creates an economic emergency. In the short term, a spending freeze is a fair and balanced solution. I remain confident that, ultimately, we will succeed.

TIMBER CAPITAL GAINS

The second problem is timber capital gains. In 1943, Congress determined that the application of the tax rules then in effect "discriminated against taxpayers who dispose of timber by cutting it as compared with those who sell timber outright." To reduce this discrimination, Congress enacted what is now section 631 of the code, which provides that, in certain cases, income from the sale of standing timber may be taxed at capital gains rates, whether sold outright, harvested by the owner, or sold under a cutting contract.

Recently, some people have proposed repealing section 631. For example, Senator METZENBAUM has introduced a repeal bill.

Mr. President, such legislation could have serious consequences for America's timber supply, America's timbermen, and the availability of housing and other timber products.

What's more, repeal would simply be wrong. Let me explain four reasons why.

First, timber is very different from most other products or crops. It takes many, many years—sometimes more than 100—to produce and harvest. Capital gains treatment compensates for this long growing cycle.

Second, to the extent section 631 provides a special incentive to timber growing, it is one that has worked well. Statistics show that, after timber capital gains treatment was enacted, reforestation of timber resources increased dramatically. If timber capital gains treatment is repealed, reforestation might decline dramatically.

Third, repeal would hurt an industry still smarting from the combined effects of high interest rates, worldwide recession, and unfair foreign imports. Indeed, it is hard to imagine any industry harder hit by recession than the timber industry. Today, the timber industry unemployment rate remains high.

Fourth, a recent joint tax committee report concluded that, in 1982, companies in the paper and wood products industry paid the second highest effective tax rate of any industry: 36 percent. Thus, repealing timber capital gains would penalize an industry that is already paying more than its fair share of tax.

Mr. President, David Jackson, an associate professor at the University of Montana, recently wrote a paper explaining why section 631 must be retained. I ask unanimous consent that the paper be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE OF RETAINING CAPITAL GAINS TAX TREATMENT ON TIMBER

(By David H. Jackson)

I. BACKGROUND

In a time when leading economists such as Lester Thorow are criticizing businesses for myopic planning horizons, timber investments on private land stand out in sharp contrast. Currently, private landowners are committing scarce investment funds for reforestation projects that won't pay off for as many as 50 to 100 years. Like all investments, the longer the investment duration, the more sensitive the return will be to income taxation policies.

II. THE COMPETITIVE ENVIRONMENT FOR PRIVATE FORESTRY

If a private timber owner were to give a brief synopsis of his/her competitive environment, the first and perhaps most startling observation would be direct competition with government. In the U.S., about half of the standing timber is owned and managed by government (primarily the national forests). In recent years, about 20% to 25% of the total timber harvesting has occurred on the national forests. These lands are not managed on the economic principal of profits. In fact, the national forests have contributed over $1.0 billion annually to the nation's budgetary deficit in recent years.

Federal tax policy should consider the fact that the federal government has the power to influence overall timber prices and investment returns for private timber owners as a result of the management practices on the public lands. Preferential tax policies for private timber owners can help alleviate competitive disadvantages of private ownership.

III. TAX POLICIES AND CONSERVATION

Perhaps the largest and most successful land reclamation program in the history of the world has been carried out on private lands in the United States. Because of the abandonment of farmland in the old South after the Civil War, and the general westward population migration, originally forested lands were often left to the vagaries of nature. It has been said that the state of Georgia lost a foot of topsoil as a result of deforestation and ensuing agricultural practices.

During the 1930's, a combination of federal subsidies, capital gains treatment for timber and considerable labor led to massive reforestation work in the South. In recent years, the most substantial growth in forest products industry investments has occurred in this part of the nation. Industry has returned to the South as a result of earlier investments made in reforestation and timber stand improvement. It can be said rather unarguably, that the South is a better place to live because of the private investments in timber growing stock, and capital gains tax treatment deserves credit in part for the "third forests" of the South.

But the salutory effects of capital gains treatment is by no means limited to the old South. Checkerboard ownership patterns in the West mean that private forest lands often provide significant scenic value, wildlife habitat and recreational space (multiple use amenities). Additionally, private land management is also responsible for meeting air and water quality standards. While Congress directly budgets the national forests to produce multiple use outputs, the same is not the case on private lands. Often there is no direct compensation for multiple use on private forest lands.

Removal of capital gains treatment of timber would certainly lead to significantly different financial incentives for land use and attendant multiple uses. Given tax treatment of other land uses such as condominiums (accelerated depreciation), mining, (capital gains in lieu of depreciation) and farming (a list too numerous to mention), it should be abundantly clear that without capital gains treatment for timber, we would have far less private forest land and the many living things that forests support than we do at present.

IV. WHY CAPITAL GAINS IN THE FIRST PLACE

Capital is a factor of production, but economists often think of capital in terms of plants and equipment. the usual kind of capital normally lasts for several years, so its usefulness is not exhausted immediately. Accounting and taxation conventions suggest that an expense is incurred when using the ordinary kind of capital. That expense is known as depreciation. Equipment wears out, and the cost of the loss in usefulness is realistic and pragmatic. It is also a deductible business expense.

Timber represents capital in the most pure sense of the word. Trees are factories, and growth is the annual product. Unlike other kinds of capital, timber appreciates until harvest and then the standing capital is exhausted (depreciated). In order to remove the product from the forest, the factory itself must be destroyed. (We haven't learned how to remove an annual growth ring without killing the tree.) We have federal tax provisions for depreciation allowances for capital equipment (the ordinary capital); we also have special tax provisions for other kinds of capital. Capital gains for timber, oil, gas and minerals take the place of depreciation allowances and are called "depletion" allowances. To remove capital gains treatment from timber would result in rather severe investment dislocations, given that there is no equivalent form of timber depreciation allowance. Under recent revisions to the IRS code, it is now possible to depreciate a race horse (write it off) in 3 years. Ostensibly, the nation is better off for such a convention. One cannot depreciate reforestation investments. Instead, the current code allows a lower (not zero) tax rate.

V. ARE CAPITAL GAINS TAX RATES ON TIMBER REALLY VERY LOW?

At first glance, it appears that capital gains tax rates are very low (40% for corporations). The fact of the matter is that the use of the 40% rate can be extremely misleading because the effect of inflation is to increase the effective tax rate. Determination of the taxable gain itself does not allow the taxpayer to adjust gains for inflation. Since the overall price level has more than doubled in the last 12 years, it is possible for timber owners to pay a capital gains tax when in fact they have suffered a real net of inflation loss. Indeed, were it possible to include inflation accounting in the IRS code for capital gains taxes, the Congress would induce a substantial increase in private investments in the U.S., something the nation sorely needs. Also the investments would be more long term.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The proposals to remove capital gains treatment for timber is misdirected. Without making a massive overhaul of the IRS code, the removal of a capital gains treatment will accomplish many deleterious results.

1. It will punish long-term investment foresight in one of the few places it is currently found in the private economy;

2. It will lead to nonforest lands uses which are usually considered less desirable;

3. It won't raise nearly the amount of money most people would anticipate since less timber will be grown in the long run;

4. Without timber "depreciation" allowances, timber would be taxed at higher rates than other "ordinary" capital;

5. It would place the private "for profit" part of the timber sector at a competitive disadvantage with the public sector.

Each of these points by themselves suggests substantial reasoning not only for maintaining the capital gains provisions for timber but for improving them. It is in the nation's interests to do so.

Mr. BAUCUS. The third problem is trade. The timber industry faces threats regarding both imports and exports.

On the import side, the American timber industry has been undermined by imports that are being subsidized by foreign governments. Even though America has one of the best resource bases in the world, we imported more than $4.2 billion worth of wood products in 1983.

Canadian softwood lumber imports have led the invasion. The Canadians have now captured more than one-third of the total U.S. softwood lumber market, and their market share is increasing each year.

This is happening primarily because the Canadians have two important advantages.

The first advantage is the low value of the Canadian dollar, which provides an automatic price advantage to Canadian imports. To even things out, we must reduce U.S. interest rates; to do this, in turn, we must reduce the budget deficit. This brings me back to my earlier point: We must act quickly and decisively to bring the deficit under control.

The second advantage is the artificially low stumpage fees the Canadian Government charges for logging on Government land. Canadian fees are nominal and fixed. Our fees are determined by free-market bidding, and therefore depend on supply and demand. Because of this difference, Canadian loggers pay less than half what American loggers do for stumpage.

Last year, American timbermen petitioned the International Trade Administration for relief against Canada's unfairly subsidized imports. Unfortunately, the ITA concluded that Canada's stumpage practices did not constitute illegal export subsidies within the technical meaning of section 321 of the Trade Act, and refused to impose quotas or grant any other relief.

This year, Congress may review the current version of the Trade Act to see if we can tighten it up. As part of this review, we may consider revising the definition of illegal export subsidies. If we can revise the definition so that so-called upstream subsidies like artificially low Canadian stumpage fees are clearly illegal, it will give our softwood lumber producers a fighting chance against Canadian importers.

THE CASE AGAINST JAPAN

On the export side, our timber industry is hurt by unfair foreign barriers to exports of American finished and semifinished products.

The most damaging of these barriers are those maintained by Japan. Despite our massive trade deficit with the Japan, and the near free access we provide to their competitive products, they continue to block many of our most competitive products.

Timber is a good example. Each year, we sell Japan between 1 and 1.5 billion dollars' worth of logs, which are converted into semifinished and finished products in Japanese mills. But when we try to sell Japan our own semifinished and finished products, we run headfirst into a wall of tariff and nontariff barriers.

For example, Japan imposes a 15-percent Japanese tariff on softwood plywood, a 15-percent tariff on softwood and hardwood veneer, and a 12- to 13-percent tariff on particle board. By contrast, U.S. tariffs on these products range between zero and 8 percent.

And it is not just Japan's high tariffs that block us. If any United States company bold enough to try to sell his products in Japan despite the tariffs, he encounters a baffling array of regulations and other administrative obstacles that make it virtually impossible to do business.

This situation is intolerable. Free trade must be a two-way street. We give Japan broad access to our market for the products they produce competitively. In return, we expect Japan to do the same. That is why Japan's high forest products tariffs must be reduced.

Mr. President, I recently spent a lot of time trying to convince the Japanese to reduce their barriers to American beef. After months of hard negotiations, they finally did, agreeing to increase their beef quota by 6,900 tons a year for the next 4 years.

I hoped that this indicated that the Japanese were ready to generally reduce their barriers against other competitive American products. What is more, the Japanese had led us to believe that the wood products tariffs would be cut as soon as the beef issue was resolved. Because of this, our timber industry and our negotiators had refrained from publicly attacking the Japanese on the timber tariff issue.

But the Japanese let us down. When the Japanese Government recently announced a set of tariff cuts for the coming year, it contained no cuts in wood products tariffs.

Japan's refusal to lower their wood products tariffs shows that the Japanese are prepared to drag their feet again, until we force them to make concessions the same way we did on beef. It is unfortunate that two nations with so many mutual interests must do business this way. But if this is the only way we can extract satisfactory trade concessions from Japan, so be it. I am prepared to do whatever it takes to bring Japan's wood products tariffs down.

On the bright side, Japan's failure to make tariff cuts has galvanized the timber industry. At their spring legislative conference, the National Forest Products Association emphasized the high priority they place on eliminating Japanese tariffs. On May 9, NFPA adopted this resolution:

The board of governors of the National Forest Products Association calls upon the Government of Japan to eliminate its high tariff wall to American processed wood products.

The U.S. wood products industry is a strong friend of, and one of the most important suppliers to, Japan. This industry has worked diligently for a number of years to explain the benefits which would accrue for both countries through tariff reduction. The U.S. Government has placed wood products at the top of its tariff priority list for negotiations with Japan. And the President of the United States himself has publicly indicated interest.

Concurrently the Government of Japan has spoken repeatedly in world forums about the need for all countries to open their markets and to resist protectionism. Yet at the same time it has refused to act to open its own markets to these basic products so important to both its economy and that of its major trading partners.

The NFPA board of directors calls upon the Government of Japan—particularly its Honorable Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone; its Honorable Minister of Trade and Industry, Hokosaburo Okonogi; and its Honorable Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Shinjiro Yamamura to change this protective policy and to truly open its markets by sharply reducing the prohibitive tariffs on processed wood products.

In the past, NFPA has worked hard and in good faith to convince the Japanese to reduce their wood products tariffs. Repeatedly, the Japanese have refused. Now, the NFPA has increased its pressure. Given this situation, we in Congress must do all we can to help, by making it clear to the Japanese Government that we consider the timber tariff to be a very significant trade issue and a potential impediment to improving overall United States-Japanese trade relations.

THE LODGEPOLE PINE ISSUE

A specific Japanese nontariff barrier that hurts Montanan timbermen is Japan's recent ban on the use of lodgepole pine for structural purposes.

Montana is America's leading producer of lodgepole pine. For the past few years, American lodgepole producers had been selling increasing amounts of unfinished lodgepole to Japanese mills, displacing the Russian fir producers who were Japan's traditional suppliers. It appeared that this eventually would result in hundreds of millions of dollars of new U.S. exports.

But, once again, the Japanese slammed the door. They claimed that lodgepole does not meet their standards for use in post and beam construction, and they banned it for that use. As any American timberman knows, this claim is groundless; lodgepole is sturdy construction material, and is frequently used for post and beam construction in the United States, where construction standards are exacting.

When a Montana lodgepole exporter told me about the ban, I was concerned that Japan might be manipulating its construction standards to favor its traditional Russian suppliers, in clear violation of its obligation under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade standards code. I immediately wrote a letter to U.S. Trade Representative William Brock. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1984.

Ambassador BROCK,
Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: I want to alert you to a new issue that threatens U.S.-Japan trade relations: Japan's barriers on imports of laminated lodgepole pine and ponderosa pine for use in veneer post and beam construction. The major traditional foreign supplier of the base material for Japanese veneer post and beam construction are Soviet log exporters. I am concerned that the Japanese may be unfairly manipulating their standards to favor these Soviet suppliers over American exporters of laminated lodgepole and ponderosa pine.

Let me briefly describe the issue. In the 1970's, U.S. exporters tried to crack the Japanese market for finished products made from wood, including lodgepole and ponderosa pine. Because Japan's tariffs on finished timber products were (and remain) high, it was difficult to sell U.S. finished products to Japan. So U.S. lodgepole and ponderosa pine producers tried another approach: they began selling laminated lodgepole and ponderosa pine to Japanese manufacturers, who would themselves put on a Japanese cyprus veneer before marketing the finished product—posts and beams—in Japan.

This approach worked. The Japanese manufacturers of veneered posts who began using U.S. lodgepole and ponderosa pine were manufacturing a highly competitive product; their sales grew rapidly. By 1983, U.S. lodgepole and ponderosa pine exports to Japan were projected to reach as much as $30 million.

But a problem arose. The increased sale of veneered posts made from U.S. lodgepole and ponderosa pine apparently disturbed the traditional Japanese manufacturers of veneered posts, who made their posts from domestic woods and logs imported primarily from the Soviet Union. From what I've been told, these manufacturers demanded that Japanese authorities ban the use of lodgepole and ponderosa pine for manufacturing veneered posts on the ground that Japanese standards officials had never formally approved the use of lodgepole and ponderosa pine for such manufacturing. Last August, Japanese officials acceded to this demand.

In response, Japanese manufacturers who use U.S. imported pines teamed up with the Western Wood Products Association (WWPA) to present their case to the Japanese standards officials. Discussions were held periodically during the past few months, culminating in a mid-December Tokyo meeting at which WWPA presented test results based on U.S. Forest Products Lab basic species data on laminated lodgepole pine. In addition, the Japanese manufacturers presented test results based on actual imported samples.

The Japanese standards officials reportedly determined that the test data indicated that laminated lodgepole pine and ponderosa pine is unsuitable for use in veneered posts and beams.

The Japanese manufacturers and U.S. exporters apparently believe that, while the Japanese standards officials' claims may be technically valid based on the limited data provided, they disguise the primarily political motivation for the decision to uphold the ban. This motivation is the pressure applied by Japanese manufacturers who use domestic wood or imported Russian logs to make veneered posts and beams. To support this allegation, the U.S. exporters charge that the Japanese officials never have clearly described the minimum standards for laminated lodgepole and ponderosa pine. In addition, Montana Mokko, a Montana laminated lodgepole exporting company, has informed me that it provided samples of its exports of laminated lodgepole pine to the officials of the Japanese agricultural standards organization, who tested the samples and concluded that they were acceptable.

Thus, it may be that Japanese officials are manipulating technical standards to favor not only domestic, but also Soviet suppliers over American exporters. If this is true, it is an outrage.

It is important that we investigate this issue quickly before our lodgepole exporters in Eastern Washington, Idaho, and Western Montana are seriously hurt. Some experts predict that veneered posts and beams will become standard features in Japanese construction by the end of this decade. If that happens, it could mean a potential market worth hundreds of millions of dollars a year. If we can resolve the technical standards issue quickly, our exporters will have a fair chance to supply that market. Otherwise, they will not.

Given the seriousness of the possibility that Japan's barriers protect Soviet producers at our expense, and the danger that U.S. lodgepole and ponderosa pine producers, once driven from the market, will have a hard time returning, I respectfully request that you immediately investigate this problem. I also would like to meet with you at your earliest convenience to discuss the issue.

Sincerely,

MAX BAUCUS.

Mr. BAUCUS. I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Brock's reply be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the reply was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1984.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MAX: Thank you for your letter of January 5 concerning Japanese barriers on imports of laminated lodgepole and ponderosa pine for use in veneer post and beam construction. I apologize for the delay in responding.

We have raised this issue with the Japanese Government in a number of recent meetings. We protested the imposition of the ban on U.S. lodgepole and ponderosa pine for use in manufacturing veneered posts to the Japanese side in the January 21-22 meeting of the U.S.-Japan Trade Committee chaired by my Deputy, Michael B. Smith.

Following that meeting, members of my staff met with officials of the Japanese Ministry of Agriculture to reiterate our position and ascertain the full facts regarding the Japanese standards governing materials approved for use in veneered post construction. A copy of the standards was obtained and has been translated. Simultaneously, the U.S. Forest Service Forest Products Laboratory in Milwaukee has been conducting technical studies on the Japanese standards as applied to ponderosa and lodgepole pine.

My office has been working closely with the Department of Agriculture, the National Forest Products Association, and members of your staff to bring about an early resolution to this problem. Please be assured of my commitment, and the continuing efforts of my office, to ensure the removal of this barrier to the Japanese market for our competitive exports of lodgepole and ponderosa pine.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM E. BROCK.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, in early April, the Japanese Government clarified their regulations to state that lodgepole pine would be acceptable for nonstructural purposes. This clarification alleviated the confusing impression that lodgepole was banned for both structural and nonstructural uses. As such, it is a step in the right direction, and has permitted some U.S. lodgepole sales to resume.

But our work is not done. Japanese standards still bar the use of lodgepole pine for structural uses. We must first determine if their standards are indeed legitimate. If they are, then we must look at ways to improve our product to meet the standards.

TRADE: AN IMPORTANT KEY TO TIMBER INDUSTRY GROWTH

There is a great deal at stake, for both Montana and overall U.S. forest products industries. In 1983, our trade deficit with Japan was nearly $20 billion, and with Canada was more than

$12 billion. By ending unfair Canadian and Japanese trade practices, we can significantly reduce these trade deficits.

Other markets are also ripe for U.S. wood products exports. China, South Korea, Taiwan, and the European Community require imported wood. But, once again, we must work to break down their barriers to semifinished and finished products. Once these barriers are removed, our timber industry will be able to demonstrate its competitive edge, and to claim its fair share of the timber market.

CONCLUSION

Montana's timber industry is in the midst of a healthy recovery. But we must continue to work hard on the problems that beset the industry, to assure that recovery continues for years to come. We must:

Cut the budget deficit;

Prevent the repeal of timber capital gains tax treatment;

Dismantle wood products import barriers our trading partners maintain; and

Make our loggers competitive with their Canadian counterparts.

A united industry effort in support of these goals can insure that today's recovery will be sustained and enhanced.●

TRIBUTE TO THE VERY REVEREND JOHN N. PEABODY

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, in a world that is increasingly uncertain of its values and direction, it is with very great pleasure that I rise to salute the life and work of the Very Reverend John N. Peabody, dean and rector of the Episcopal Cathedral of the Incarnation in Baltimore, Md., since its establishment in 1955.

A wise and compassionate shepherd of his congregation through the years, Dean Peabody has been an inspiration to his parishioners and has brought a wholeness of vision, remarkable in any age, to his service to his fellow man.

Whether in ministering to his congregation, serving the needs of both the young and the old in the wider community, addressing racial and religious prejudice in our society, helping in missionary work, or fighting for sanity in international relations, John Peabody has seen life steadily and seen it whole.

A devoted father and husband, Dean Peabody and his wife, Ruth, have been especially concerned for the well-being of young people and of families throughout his ministry. The dean has worked closely with students on the Johns Hopkins campus and has served on many occasions as chaplain at Hopkins' graduations and Founder's Day observances.

Symbolic of his deep interest and concern for the wider community in which the cathedral is situated, he played a leading role in the formation of the Greater Homewood Corp., a community service organization sponsoring, among many other programs, an outreach program for senior citizens in the area.

Responding to the problems of refugee families, the cathedral, under Dean Peabody's leadership, helped both to sponsor Laotian families and to provide a support network for any church in the Baltimore area working on refugee resettlement and received community-wide recognition for this important work.

Throughout his ministry, Dean John Peabody has also been widely recognized for his work for interfaith and interracial understanding and for world peace. He served as president of the Maryland Council of Churches from 1963–67 and as president of Maryland Churches United from 1975–78. He shared deeply in the civil rights struggle, serving as a member of the Ministers' Interdenominational Alliance and the NAACP.

The dean has worked closely with leaders of the Jewish community, serving on the Jewish-Christian Roundtable, and visiting Israel and Jordan in 1966 and returning to Israel in 1980 as one of two Christian clergy invited to take part in a factfinding mission. His ties with leaders of the Roman Catholic Church in Maryland have been extremely close throughout the years, and in 1979 Dean Peabody and Cardinal Shehan were asked to represent the Christian church in an appeal to erect a memorial to the victims of the Holocaust.

Concerned throughout his life with the overriding problem of world peace, the dean has served as chairman of the Interfaith Coalition on the Nuclear Dilemma, which plans education programs on the nuclear threat for the general public. Under his leadership, the cathedral has been host to a number of interfaith conferences on the arms race and world peace.

For the last 29 years, John Peabody's wisdom and strength have been an invaluable resource, both for the Episcopal Diocese of Maryland and for the community as a whole. As he and Ruth enter a busy and challenging retirement, I am proud to join with their many friends in expressing our affection, respect, and best wishes for the years ahead.●

MRS. NELLY AYVASIAN

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on this coming Sunday, May 20, 1984, the International Institute of Rhode Island will honor Mrs. Nelly Ayvasian upon her retirement as the executive director of the institute.

Mrs. Ayvasian is a truly remarkable person. Born in the Soviet Union, she was in her youth caught up in the turmoil of World War II, severely wounded and spent time in a German concentration camp before being released through the efforts of the Armenian Refugee Committee.

After the war, she and her family found their way to the United States arriving in Providence, R.I., in 1950.

As a refugee, Mrs. Ayvasian worked initially in a jewelry factory and as a dressmaker while, at the same time, adding English to her skills in the Armenian, Russian, German, and Italian languages and working as a volunteer at the International Institute of Rhode Island.

Fifteen years ago, in 1969, she joined the staff of the institute as a social case aide, won promotions as a supervisor and immigration and naturalization counselor, and nearly 7 years ago became the executive director of the institute.

During her tenure as executive director, the institute has grown significantly, moved to new and larger quarters and broadened its services.

Under Mrs. Ayvasian's direction, the institute provided essential services to aid thousands of refugees from Indochina who settled in Rhode Island after the war in Southeast Asia.

Mrs. Ayvasian's work on behalf of refugees and immigrants of many nationalities in Rhode Island have won her widespread recognition and many honors. In 1977 she was presented the Jefferson Award for Outstanding Public Service Benefiting Local Communities, and in the same year the "Haig Garaged Sarafian" Award of the Armenian Student Association of America for outstanding contributions in the field of citizenship, and the Armenian of the Year Award from the Armenian Masonic Degree Team of Rhode Island.

And, just last fall, Mrs. Ayvasian was presented the Outstanding Citizenship Award by the International Institute of Rhode Island.

I join Mrs. Ayvasian's many friends and the thousands who have benefited from her work in commending and congratulating her on her truly outstanding service to all of the people of Rhode Island.●

THE FRIDAY FORMULA

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I may have found the formula for Fridays. We came in at 8:30 a.m., had a quorum call at 9 a.m., had three votes, and it is now 12:10 p.m., which delights the heart of this leader.

Mr. President, I wish to extend my congratulations and thanks to all Senators, especially my friend, the minority leader.

ORDER FOR RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD remain open today until the hour of 3 p.m. so that Senators may submit statements, and introduce bills and resolutions, and so that the committees may file reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 21, 1984

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the Senate granted an order for a 10 a.m. convening hour on Monday. The language of that request was after we "recess" or "adjourn." I should like to propound a unanimous-consent request now in respect to the conditions of adjournment, and then I would plan to change the convening hour, and to designate adjournment instead of recess. I believe that language has been cleared. I will state it now for the consideration of the minority leader, who is on the floor.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes on Monday, May 21, 1984, the reading of the Journal be dispensed with, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, and following the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, there be a special order in favor of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), for not to exceed 15 minutes, to be followed by a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to exceed 1:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not more than 10 minutes each; and provided further that the morning hour be deemed to have expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, when the Senate completes its business today, it will stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 noon on Monday next. After the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order and the recognition of the Senator from Wisconsin on special order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business until 1:30 p.m., in which Senators may speak for not more than 10 minutes each.

At the conclusion of the time for transaction of routine morning business, it is the intention of the leadership on this side to attempt to reach the bankruptcy bill and/or the Wilkinson nomination for the balance of the day. Arrangements have not been completed on those two measures, but that is the agenda as it is viewed at this time.

I remind Senators that the coming week is the final week of session before the Memorial Day recess. It is also necessary that a number of other matters be dealt with, including the debt limit. The House of Representatives has not yet sent us a debt limit bill. However, it is the intention of the leadership on this side, after consulting with the minority leader, and I assume he might not object at that time, to proceed to the consideration of the debt limit bill reported by the Senate Finance Committee, with the intention of merging or melding those measures, the House and the Senate measures, at the appropriate time.

The leadership on this side also expresses the hope that we might get a short time limitation on a debt limit bill, perhaps even a shortened debt limit bill, as contemplated, I understand, by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I also admonish Senators in good spirit to understand that there will be votes on Monday. I am sure Members will agree that there is a lot of work to be done between now and the 25th of May, when we shall go out for the Memorial Day break.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 21, 1984

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the majority leader is not now on the floor, but he and I conversed earlier. I indicated that if there was any further business to transact, I would notify him. There is not. The distinguished chairman of the Energy Committee is now filing bills from his committee, which are authorized until 3 p.m. under the order previously entered.

Therefore, now, Mr. President, seeing no other Senator seeking recognition, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to, and at 12:18 p.m. the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 21, 1984, at 12 noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 18, 1984:

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HANDICAPPED

H. Latham Breuning, of New York, to be a member of the National Council of the Handicapped for a term expiring September 17, 1986.

Michael Marge, of New York, to be a member of the National Council on the Handicapped for a term expiring September 17, 1986.

Sandra Swift Parrino, of New York, to be a member of the National Council on the Handicapped for a term expiring September 17, 1986.

Alvis Kent Waldrep, Jr., of Texas, to be a member of the National Council on the Handicapped for a term expiring September 17, 1986.

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION

James W. Fuller, of California, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for a term expiring December 31, 1986.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Patricia A. Goldman, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the National Transportation Safety Board for the term expiring December 31, 1988.

James Eugene Burnett, Jr., of Arkansas, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term of 2 years.

The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Carol E. Dinkins, of Texas, to be Deputy Attorney General.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RABBI LEONARD CAHAN HONORED

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 years, Rabbi Leonard Cahan has led the Har Shalom Congregation in Potomac, Md. In honor of this occasion, Har Shalom recently sponsored a series of events celebrating Rabbi Cahan's outstanding service. The following article from the Tablet, the Har Shalom newsletter, describes this fine individual's distinguished career and his many contributions to the community.

The article follows:

WEEKEND CELEBRATION HONORS RABBI CAHAN'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY WITH CONGREGATION HAR SHALOM

Beginning Friday evening, May 11, and continuing through Saturday night, Har Shalom will sponsor a series of events honoring Rabbi Leonard Cahan on the occasion of his tenth anniversary as our spiritual leader. The schedule features Professor Neil Gillman of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America who will speak during services on Friday evening and Saturday morning on the topic, "The Emergence of Conservative Judaism." A gala dinner on Saturday will be followed by a musical program and a slide show retrospective of Rabbi Cahan's personal history and career, with special reflection on his Potomac years.

Although Rabbi Cahan has been at Har Shalom for 10 years, his life as a rabbi began in 1961 when he was ordained after completing studies at the Jewish Theological Seminary. A native of Philadelphia, he also is a graduate of the Akiba Hebrew Academy and the University of Pennsylvania.

Rabbi Cahan's first post-ordination position was a four-year stint as Assistant Force Chaplain to the U.S. Naval Forces at Yokosuka, Japan. In 1965 he joined Adas Shalom Synagogue, Detroit, Michigan, as Assistant Rabbi. Later he served as Rabbi of Temple Beth Abraham, Oakland, California, before coming to Har Shalom in 1974.

Throughout his professional career Rabbi Cahan has been active in community as well as religious organizations. While in Detroit, he was Board Chairman of Fair Access to Integrated Residences, Inc., Regional Chaplain for the Jewish War Veteran, and Chairman of the Nursing Home Volunteer Committee of the Jewish Family Service. In Oakland he was President of the East Bay Council of Rabbis and an officer of the Hillel Academy of the East Bay.

Locally, Rabbi Cahan has officiated as President of the Seven Locks Ministerial Association and Jewish Chaplain for Potomac District, Boy Scouts of America. He has been Membership Committee Chairman of the Rabbinical Assembly and is currently Vice President of the Washington Board of Rabbis. Continuing a long association with the Navy, Rabbi Cahan since 1980 has been Staff Chaplain of the Military Sealift Command, with rank of reserve Commander. And in 1982 the Navy awarded him the Meritorious Service Medal.

Service to G-d, man, and country not being enough, Rabbi Cahan, with his wife, Elizabeth, (nee Peilen), of Minneapolis, and children, Hillel, Benjamin, Joshua, and Sara, have created a family.

FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT OF OUR CIVIL RIGHTS LAW—HERE WE ARE 30 YEARS LATER

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 30th anniversary of the landmark Supreme Court decision, Brown against Board of Education. The Court unanimously declared this Nation's system of legally sanctioned apartheid to be unconstitutional.

Another decade passed before the promise of Brown began to be realized. In 1964, Congress enacted the Civil Rights Act which gave the President the tools to end segregation in public schools, public accommodations and employment. Since then Congress has enacted legislation to provide equal opportunity in voting and housing. Furthermore, the Congress has established laws to prohibit discrimination against minorities, women, the aged and the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal of progress has been made in our efforts to keep the promise of Brown. Over this 30-year period we have learned that the progress has been greatest and most enduring when all three branches of Government have been committed to effective enforcement of Federal civil rights laws. In retrospect, those periods of collective commitment have been too few and of fleeting duration.

I am sad to say that on this 30th anniversary, we are in a period where great lip service is paid to effective enforcement of these laws but real performance is lacking. This criticism extends to each branch of government.

But perhaps no where is the rhetoric more empty then in the executive branch. I have attached to the end of my remarks the Committee on the Judiciary report on the enforcement record of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice as it appears in the fiscal year 1985 authorization request.

Mr. Speaker, it is sad indeed that civil rights advocates now refer to it as the "Department of Injustice" and identify the Civil Rights Division as the locus of anti-civil rights activity.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this Nation stands ready to reaffirm its commitment to Brown. And I urge this Congress to recommit itself to the not yet completed task of ending discrimination.

The material follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION

During consideration of the Department's FY 1984 Authorization Request, the Committee reported that for the first time since the creation of the Civil Rights Division in 1957, civil rights attorneys and advocates identified the Department of Justice as the locus of anti-civil rights activity. They made various recommendations to the Committee for corrective action including dismantling the Division.

Without exception, all of them asked that this Committee take steps to limit the Division's participation in civil rights cases because the positions advocated by the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights are harmful to the interest of those victimized by discriminatory practices.

Since then, the Committee has continued extensive review of the Division's enforcement record including joint subcommittee hearings on the Division's enforcement of the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act. The Committee has identified a persistent pattern of activities, fully documented in testimony before this committee and in documents within the public domain, which raise serious questions about the extent to which the Attorney General is frustrating Congressional intent in enforcing federal civil rights laws.

The Committee has identified several areas where the Department's record is particularly egregious:

CIVIL RIGHTS OF INSTITUTIONALIZED PERSONS ACT (CRIPA)

In testimony before this Committee, the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights demonstrated a mistaken understanding or patent disregard for the purpose of this 1980 law. The legislation was enacted to assure the Attorney General's legal authority to *initiate or intervene in litigation* to redress violations of the rights of persons confined to public institutions. Although the statute encourages reasonable efforts to consult with state officials in an effort to achieve possible settlement and thus avoid litigation, the law is not intended to foster conciliation as the alternative to needed litigation nor does it empower the Attorney General to act as advocate for the institutions which are the subject of litigation. It is expected that the Attorney General will act in a timely fashion on such matters, setting reasonable timetables for state action before litigation is commenced. Thus far, the Civil Rights Division has been slow to

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

act to correct life-threatening conditions, and reluctant to file suit although warranted by Division investigations.

In stark contrast to its predecessors, this Department of Justice has a record which can best be described as a passive observer/overseer of violations against persons in institutions. The Department has initiated only 3 cases under the Act—none involves the rights of juveniles or mentally retarded persons. One of the cases, *U.S.* v. *Hawaii*, Civil No. 83-0248 (D. Hawaii), was dismissed on May 10, 1983 because the Department failed to give sufficient notice to the state. The only "enforceable" agreement negotiated by the Division was recently rejected as unenforceable by the U.S. District Court to which it was submitted for approval, *U.S.* v. *Michigan*, No. G84-63, E.D. Mich., March 23, 1984. The court ordered the parties to meet and to attempt to redraft the consent judgment. And in a case brought by pretrial detainees the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights is the sole author of an Amicus brief filed in the Supreme Court siding with the Los Angeles County Jail, No. 83-317, filed December 22, 1983.

TITLE VII OF THE 1964 CIVIL RIGHTS ACT (EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION)

The Attorney General is authorized to initiate litigation against public employers, i.e., to prosecute violators. The Department's record shows that the Attorney General refuses to support race and gender-conscious relief despite the fact that such relief continues to be upheld by the courts. For example, the Justice Department filed a brief challenging the race-conscious affirmative action plan adopted by the City of New Orleans to increase the number of blacks on the city's police force. The EEOC was reportedly prevented by the White House from filing its brief which supported the plan. The Department's challenge was recently rejected by the 5th Circuit in an *en banc* ruling. *Williams v. City of New Orleans*, No. 82-3435, April 23, 1984.

In a recent news report, the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights announced plans to challenge a decision in which women state employees successfully sued the State of Washington for discriminatory practices in employee compensation. If the Department goes forward with this challenge the Attorney General would be advocating on the side of the defendants an act which is clearly inconsistent with the Title VII mandate.

TITLE IV OF THE 1964 CIVIL RIGHTS ACT (SCHOOL DESEGREGATION)

Title IV of the 1964 Act gave the Attorney General litigating authority to "materially further the orderly achievement of desegregation." The Attorney General's role is to *foster* desegregation. Congress has set forth a priority of remedies in school desegregation litigation; voluntary plans, however, are specifically exempted from this priority preference. (Educational Opportunity Act of 1974).

Yet, the Department opposed a well publicized voluntary plan in Seattle, Washington. The Department changed sides and opposed the plan which was subsequently upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court. *Seattle School District v. Washington*, U.S. ——, 72 L. Ed. 2d 896 (1982).

In the only school desegregation case initiated by the Department since 1981—Bakersfield, California—the Department has negotiated a voluntary magnet school plan which the Assistant Attorney General acknowledges would permit the school district to continue a segregated system so long as it provides "an even-handed opportunity to every child in the system." The Committee finds that not only is this in direct conflict with the Attorney General's Title IV mandate to further desegregation, it smacks of the repudiated doctrine of "separate but equal."

The Attorney General's statutory right to initiate school desegregation litigation is based upon a written complaint from parents who believe their children's rights have been denied, and a certification by the Attorney General that the parents are unable to maintain the action themselves. The Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights has unequivocally stated his refusal to seek *all* of the remedies allowed in law to facilitate school desegregation. Concerned therefore that their children' rights would not be fully vindicated, parents in Charleston, S.C. sought intervention in a case first initiated by the Carter Administration. The Department first sought to oppose their intervention.

The Committee is deeply troubled by the civil rights enforcement record of this Administration. Our disagreement is not merely one of philosophical differences over which remedies are most appropriate. The less than exemplary record of this Department represents a dramatic change in both the quantity and quality of civil rights enforcement. When comparing the first three years of this Administration to the preceding one the record shows an 83% drop in the number of new civil complaints filed. The Committee notes there has been no decrease in Division staff. The Committee must wonder whether allegations that "enforcement" is being conducted from the Assistant Attorney's office and that line-attorneys have little to do are accurate.

The Department's record clearly establishes that there has been a qualitative change in the Division's advocacy role. The Committee finds growing evidence that some courts are so concerned with the Division's role that, as one judge observed in dismissing the Department from continued participation in a prisoners' rights case, the "interests of the United States . . . are no longer co-existent with or common to the interests of the plaintiff class." *Gates* v. *Collier*, No. GC 71-6-k (N.D. Miss. Greenville Division) Order, June 6, 1983, pp. 2-3.

The Committee hopes the Department appreciates the seriousness of these findings, and admonishes the Department to take steps to fully comply with the letter and spirit of its statutory mandate. Although an amendment was not offered at this time, the Committee wishes to make clear that the Division's continued disregard for its statutory mandate will most surely result in legislative action in the upcoming year.●

LOOPHOLE OF THE MONTH: HIGHWAY ROBBERY

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the "Loophole of the Month" is a tax shelter involving the purchase of billboards. Millions of dollars in tax revenues are being lost because a group of investors has purchased millions of dollars' worth of billboards. The term "purchase," however, is used loosely here, since the investors merely lease the billboards back to the original owner and after 5 years actually sell them back.

Public Citizens describes how the Tax Code subsidizes this scheme in the following article from their monthly publication, People & Taxes. I commend it to my colleagues:

[From People & Taxes, June 1983]

LOOPHOLE OF THE MONTH: HIGHWAY ROBBERY

Late last fall, 534 wealthy Americans got together to make an unusual purchase. They bought 45,000 billboards, Metromedia, Inc.'s entire stock of outdoor signs.

The investors have no interest in roadside advertising. What they are interested in is avoiding taxes. And that they will do. Despite a seemingly inflated price of more than $10,000 per billboard, the 534 investors have been promised profits of as much as $200 million ($375,000 each) over the next five years.

Every nickel of these profits will come at the expense of Uncle Sam—and average taxpayers. In fact, the deal involves nothing but shuffling paper. Metromedia will continue to manage the business side of the project and after five years, is expected to buy the billboards back. Thereafter, it will garner huge tax breaks on its own.

Informed sources say that the $485 million transaction—which will generate exactly zero dollars in new investment—is almost certainly the largest syndicated tax shelter offering ever.

The poster panels that are producing this massive cash transfer out of the pockets of ordinary folks and into the bank accounts of wealthy investors and one of the country's fastest growing corporations are not exactly social policy winners—even as billboards go. Forty-one percent of them promote cigarettes and another 21 percent push alcohol. In fact, the prospectus for the deal cautions that part of the partnership expenses will go for lobbying to keep the government from beginning or restricting this kind of outdoor advertising.

How does a deal like the "Outdoor Advertising Associates, Limited Partnership" work? Well, one key is that only a small fraction of the cost of the billboards was actually provided by the doctors and executives who bought into the shelter. They anted up a mere $150,000 each, for a total of $80 million, only 16 percent of the overall purchase price. And, of their $80 million, about 20 percent was skimmed off immediately in expenses and fees to middlemen, including $9 million to Bear, Sterns & Co., the investment banking firm that engineered the deal. Another $3.4 million went to lawyers and accountants who helped out.

The bulk of the money to buy the highway signs was borrowed, including a $70 million loan back to the tax-shelter partnership by Metromedia itself and $350 million put up by a consortium of banks, led by Citibank. In addition to receiving 15.5 percent annual interest, by the way, the banks extracted $3 million in "arrangement" and "facility" fees for their trouble.

The individual participants in the billboard shelter probably don't care much about a little profit-taking on the part of the organizers of the deal. In fact, wealthy taxpayers lined up in droves to give Bear, Sterns their money. The program was so quickly filled that Bear, Sterns was able to set up "a waiting list of additional subscrib-

ers" in case any of the early birds should decide to drop out.

The investors enthusiasm was not surprising. Bear, Sterns projects almost a 43 percent after-tax annual return for participants—the equivalent for these 50 percent bracket individuals of an 85 percent pretax return (not even counting state and local tax savings). This is almost 10 times the going rate on tax-exempt municipal bonds and 16 times the after-tax return on federal government long-term issues.

Over the five years they will own the billboards, the investors expect to write off about a third of their investment as "depreciation," even though Bear, Sterns estimates that the actual value of the signs will go *up* by over a third. And, while the writeoffs will be worth 50 cents on the dollar in tax savings, the gain when the billboards are sold back to Metromedia will be taxed at only 20 percent—due to the special treatment of capital gains.

Bear, Sterns' projections about the future value of the road-side attractions may be optimistic, but even if the pretax rate of return on the billboard shelter turns out to be zero (that is, after five years the investors simply get their money back), the after-tax annual return from writeoffs will average 28 percent—five times the after-tax return on Treasury bonds. Even if the investors get *none* for their money back, they will still earn more than 6 percent annually, which is also greater than the after-tax yield on government bonds.

They can't do worse, since they have no personal liability to pay back the loans. The tax code's "at risk" restrictions, which limit some kinds of shelters financed with borrowed money, don't apply to "real estate" like billboards (nor do provisions "recapturing" some excessive depreciation when property is sold).

The tax shelter prospectus doesn't concern itself with why Metromedia finds the temporary sale of its billboards advantageous, but one lucrative scenario is apparent. When Metromedia buys its displays back after five years, it will get a new "basis" for tax depreciation of about six times the $111 million "book" value of the billboards before the tax shelter deal was entered into. And, as "newly-acquired assets," the signs will be eligible for fast depreciation write-offs under the Accelerated Cost Recovery System (ACRS).

The net result is that Metromedia will be entitled to about 10 times the annual depreciation write-offs that it had before the sale and buyback of the billboards. The added deductions will be much greater than the short-term costs to Metromedia from the deal. Metromedia will thus have deftly circumvented restrictions on such asset "churning" included in the 1981 tax act.

Shelters involving billboards could be closed, but it would take more than mere tinkering. Unlike some currently popular tax avoidance schemes, the billboard shelter doesn't require any shady game-playing. Nor is it premised on not being audited. Instead, the highway placard deal is simply a very large, very unusual example of the standard real estate shelter as it now exists under the Reagan regime.

The relatively straightforward nature of the billboard shelter makes it much more frightening than deals that might be curbed by better enforcement or small technical changes in the law. Equally scarifying is the overall proliferation of tax shelter transactions that is now occurring.

Jim Glassman reports in *The New Republic* that even though 1982 was a weak year for oil and real estate shelters, overall syndicated offers increased 13 percent. And in the first quarter of 1983, they jumped another 53 percent. OMB Director David Stockman's 1981 prediction that the cut in the top tax rate from 70 to 50 percent would "effectively eliminate" the shelter industry has proven slightly hyperbolic. Contrary to his supposition, wealthy investors who were previously unwilling to pay 70 percent have failed to queue up at the IRS to pay 50 percent.

Glassman attributes the shelter surge in part to the Administration's glorification of self-interest and denigration of government. "In the process," he notes, "they have made avoiding taxes seem a noble pursuit." There's probably truth in this analysis (see "Of Consumers and Entrepreneurs—Why Supply-Side Fosters Moral Prostitution," *P&T* May 1983). But shelters, including billboards, were given an even more important boost by the huge new loopholes in the President's 1981 tax program, most notably the ACRS fast depreciation write-offs.

The Reagan administration's term in office has featured numerous record-setting accomplishments on the tax and economic fronts: Biggest deficits in history. Deepest recession and highest unemployment rate since the 1930s. Lowest national savings rate (in 1982) in the post-war era (breaking the 1949 record). Largest volume of mergers in a single year ($82.6 billion in 1981). Lowest corporate tax collections (fiscal 1983, in constant dollars) since Pearl Harbor.

The latest "supply-side" milestone—the biggest syndicated tax shelter deal in history—helps explain why all those other records have been shattered at the same time.●

THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, while many people have tried to justify recent efforts to improve relations with the People's Republic of China by citing the strategic and economic advantages of being on good terms with the world's most populous nation, I believe that there are a number of things which we should remember about that nation and its history. Ideologically, the People's Republic of China is and always has been very opposed to everything that the United States of America stands for. Theirs is a long history of ignoring the human rights of their citizens. Their official policy includes forced abortions, the execution or imprisonment of dissidents, and complete intolerance for the basic rights of free speech and association. It is essential that we bear these facts in mind as we go about opening up relations with a nation that, in spite of a very limited amount of free enterprise, is still staunchly Communist.

Because I believe that it is extremely important to remember these and other facts, I would like to include the following document in the RECORD today. It is a brief account of the recent history of mainland China. I hope that my colleagues will take the time to read this account and then compare it with the recent history of the Republic of China on Taiwan. The differences, of course, are startling. I can only hope that our relations with the People's Republic of China do not come at the expense of Taiwan.

THREE AND A HALF DECADES ON MAINLAND CHINA

(By Dr. Han Lih-wu)

Three and a half decades of the Communist rule on mainland China is a long enough time for an objective review and assessment. From a humanitarian point of view, we feel a great sorrow for people everywhere who suffer under the yoke of Communism so ruthlessly efficient in controlling people, but so hopelessly deficient in caring for man's basic needs. Much of the difficulty has been the internal political struggle and chaos experienced in these Communist countries, Communist China being the prime example. I shall attempt to review the political history of the China mainland since 1949, a history responsible for so much human waste and suffering.

1949

The Chinese Communist regime was established on October 1, 1949 after a protracted war. The next day the Soviet Union recognized the Communist Government. The ties to the USSR were from the start very close. Mao Tse-tung on June 30, 1949 wrote in an article entitled, "On People's Democratic Dictatorship," that "The Communist Party of the USSR is our very best teacher, and we must learn from it." In foriegn affairs, the Chinese Communist leaders supported Soviet policy by both words and deeds. In domestic economic, social and polictical policies, the Soviet experience was the model consciously applied. The Soviet's purges of the nineteen-twenties and thirties were repeated by the Communist Chinese as they exercised ruthless control over the people and liquidated "capitalists, landowners, imperialist-dogs, and Kuomintang agents."

1950

The Chinese Communists grew closer to Moscow with the coming of the Korean war. Mao Tse-tung visited Stalin in Moscow from December 1949 until March 1950 and signed a series of treaties and agreements which guaranteed the Soviets a strong voice in the affairs of Communist China. Mao most firmly won Stalin's "trust" when, on October 25, 1950, he sent the Chinese Peoples' Volunteers to aid the North Koreans in their attempt to wrest control of the Korean peninsula. The Chinese Communists simultaneously launched a "Hate America and Aid Korea" campaign.

1951–52

These years was the coming to all its destructive fruition the land reform campaign of 1950 which served as a prototype for all the following "campaigns." The land reform campaign launched ostensibly to suppress counter-revolutionaries soon showed its true purpose to dispossess the peasantry of its meager land holdings. As the program became despised in the countryside and in the cities, the Chinese Communist leaders sought to stifle any dissent with the start in 1951 of the drive for "ideological rectifi-

cation." The campaign aimed to eradicate and silence landlords, dissidents and intellectuals, broad categories which came to include anybody who spoke out.

1952 saw more of the same with the initiation of the Three Anti movement (anti-corruption, anti-wastefulness, and anti-bureaucratism). The obvious economic failure of Communist policies did not cause the Communist leaders to reappraise their policies, rather the leaders sought scapegoats among the people and tougher controls. The Communist leaders, furthermore, started in the same year the Five Antimovement directed more at urban areas with emphasis on bribery, tax evasion, theft of national property, cheating on government contracts, and catch-all category of the theft of economic information from government sources which included all aspects of the economy. 1953 saw new campaigns against bureaucratism, commandism and violations of law and state discipline.

1953

The Communists' fanaticism and disregard for human life evidence itself in the Korean War. Addicted to a human-sea strategy, the Communists threw away the lives of a million soldiers in that bloody war. It is worthy of note that when the armistice was signed in 1953, 14,000 of 23,000 Chinese prisioners-of-war chose to enjoy freedom by being repatriated to the Republic of China.

1954–55

These years saw the start of what was to become a standard feature of life in Communist China—internal division in the government followed by purge and executions. Kao Kang, member of the Political Bureau, and Yao Shu-shih, head of the Party Organization Department, were charged with plotting an anti-party alliance. In two years over a thousand followers of Kao and two hundred of Yao's were purged from the party and sent to uncertain fates.

At the same time, the Communist leaders attacked Hu Feng, a leading member of the literati, who was severely criticized for promoting anti-party and anti-socialist attitudes in his works. The Hu Feng incident grew into an overall purification movement against intellectuals. The number of intellectuals punished has been estimated at 1,400,000. The conclusion to be drawn is that the Communist leaders were from the start determined to suppress any independent thought and any artistic expression which did not conform to the state's doctrinaire pronouncements. Socialist art has little room for art itself.

1956–57

This was shown to the world with brutal clarity when in May 1956, Mao launched the so-called Hundred Flowers Bloom and Hundred Schools of Thought Contend campaign. Its ostensible purpose was to allow the free expression, but its true purpose was to give Mao a forum to press his ideology on the people. To Mao's surprise, but not to anyone else's, the Hundred Flowers' campaign unleashed a torrent of criticism of Communism and the regime. Mao quickly in 1957 put an end to the small freedoms allowed and netted all prominent dissidents. Indeed, to catch the dissidents by giving them an opportunity to show themselves was thought to be Mao's deeper purpose. Mao claimed that when he called for free expression, he did not mean poisonous weeds. But, in his eyes, all disagreement was poisonous.

1958–59

As the Chinese economy on the mainland continued to stagnate, Mao grew impatient. The result of his impatience was the promotion of mass movements to achieve increased production. These programs became collectively known as the "Great Leap Forward." In steel production, there was large increases in production, however, much of the steel was of poor quality and most importantly it was not needed, except to please the Communist leaders' desire to emulate the USSR.

Along with this frenzied drive for industrialization, the Communist leaders introduced the Commune system in the countryside. By November 1958, ninety-eight percent of the population on farms were in People's Communes. Planting, crop selection, and work assignments became dictated from above with disastrous results. A recent report indicates that perhaps up to fifteen million people starved to death due to the disruption of agriculture created by the commune system (Mainichi Shimbun, Tokyo, Dec. 19, 1983). The commune system now has been altered in most areas in line with Teng's new modernization policies. The commune administrative structure remains, but is now geared towards social, as opposed to economic control.

There was an inevitable reaction to the purification campaign and the economic chaos generated by the Great Leap Forward Movement. The results was increased infighting among the Communist leadership. In the party chaos, Mao took the opportunity to remove any future rivals. In particular, Mao purged the Defense Minister Peng Tehuai who had spoken out against Mao's economic policy and the growing tensions with the USSR.

1960–65

This period was dominated both internally and externally by the split between the USSR and the Chinese Communist leaders. Though during the nineteen-fifties relations had been close as the Soviet Union poured machinery and advisers into China, they began to sour when the Soviets refused to recognize Maoism as an improvement upon Marxist-Leninism designed for an Asian setting. As long as Joseph Stalin was alive, Moa remained subservient. However, Mao felt no such father-like feeling toward Nikita Khrushchev with whom he sparred for leadership in the world communist movement. Mao particularly disliked Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin.

The clash between the two communist regimes came in the wake of the attempted invasion of the Quemoy and Matsu islands. The Soviet Union by refusing to aid the Chinese Communists garnered the latter's suspicion. In the aftermath, Khrushchev refused to aid in Communist China's development of nuclear warfare capacity. In 1960, the USSR withdrew its advisers from the mainland and cancelled hundreds of contracts. The supply of crucial materials to the Chinese Communists was cut abruptly.

The withering of party-to-party ties and economic cooperation brought to the fore the long-standing territorial conflicts along their mutual border. Outer Mongolia, Southern Siberia, and islands in the Ussuri river were areas of particular controversy as the Soviet Union refused to grant Peking's request that they acknowledge the territory as having been acquired by unequal treaties. Negotiations to improve relations including a trip to Moscow by Teng Hsiao-ping and Peng Chen failed. By 1969, a number of clashes broke out with heavy casualties on both sides. Despite the growing tensions with the Soviet Union, Mao did not let up in his destructive pursuit of uniformity in the thinking of his subjects as witnessed by the 1964 "Four Purifications" campaign and his 1965 warning against revisionism at a meeting of the Central Politburo. These, however, were only precursors of the Chinese Communist leaders' next project.

1966–76

This period is known as the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. It may be divided into four stages. The Cultural Revolution grew out of Mao's fanatical desire to "cleanse" the country of counter-revolutionary thought through internal revolution. Indirectly, he hoped that it would boost his own power by instilling fear into all who might consider challenging him.

In the first period, Mao set the stage by enlisting the support of the army under Lin Piao. This gave him leeway over the party. The actual direction of the Cultural Revolution was dictated by an ad hoc committee in the Politburo first headed by Peng Chen and then later by Chiang Ching; this constituted the nucleus of what later became the "Gang of Four." The Red Guard composed of youths, many of whom were students, was created in order to give Mao a shock troop with which to bypass Liu Shao-chi and the established party mechanisms.

In the second stage, the Red Guard staged demonstrations throughout China and attacked all whom it thought had deviated in the slightest way from Maoist thought. The Red Guard in attacking party leaders established itself as the power in control throughout the twenty-nine provinces. The balance shifted dramatically against Liu Shao-chi, first of all he was expelled from the party and stripped of all titles than he died in disgrace in late 1968. Liu's passing strengthened Mao's power and the power of Lin Piao whom Mao nominated as his successor. Lin Piao reciprocated by helping to increase Mao's positions by suggesting that the system of having a state chairman should be revived and filled by Mao who could thus exercise tighter control over the party bureaucrats.

Lin appeared on the surface as totally loyal to Mao, but covertly he was marshalling his supporters in order to stage a coup against Mao. Mao and Chou En-lai, however, were aware of Lin's designs and took emergency steps to purge him and his coconspirators. Lin, realizing that his plot had failed, attempted to flee. The Trident airplane which he and his companions were flying either crashed or was shot down in Outer Mongolia in September, 1971.

The third stage of the Cultural Revolution coincided with the Communists' approaches to the United States through the so-called "ping-pong" diplomacy of 1971. As the communists feared the Soviet Union in the wake of the border clashes and the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, they sought to befriend the U.S. After months of secret diplomacy between Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, the U.S. President Richard Nixon visited the mainland on February 21, 1972. Relations between the two were "normalized" with the signing of the Shanghai Communique of February 28th.

At the same time, Mao tried to ease the Cultural Revolution out of the hands of the Red Guard, and the Gang of Four. Teng Hsiao-ping was rehabilitated as Deputy Prime Minister in March of 1973. At the tenth Party Congress in August of 1973, other leaders who had been purged by the

Red Guard were brought back including Wang Hung-wen who assumed the title of Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee.

The return of Teng and his alliance with Chou En-lai posed a strong threat to the Gang of Four. As tensions between the two groups grew, Mao came to fear for his own power—and at this stage of his life, control over his successor.

Against this confused and bitter background, the fourth stage began in January 1974 when the Gang of Four launched the Anti-Lin and Anti-Confucious campaigns. The Anti-Lin campaign was directed at purging any followers of Lin Piao who remained in the army. The Anti-Confucius campaign was aimed at Teng and Chou. Chou's prestige and skillful maneuvering, however, maintained Teng's position and on January 8, 1975, Teng was elevated to the vice-chairmanship of the Central Committee. When Chou died on January 8, 1976, the Teng group, riding on a wave of the popular memory of Chou, made a move against the Gang of Four. The Teng group encouraged millions of people to trek to Tienanmen square during the customary grave-visiting days to lay wreaths in Chou's memory. At the same time, there appeared slogans and posters denouncing the Gang of Four.

To ease the struggle between the two groups, Mao appointed the hard-liner Hua Kuo-feng as Acting Prime Minister in the place of the now-gone Chou. Hua, however, aided the Gang of Four in denouncing the attacks upon them as "counter-revolutionary." Subsequently, Hua was given the additional position of first vice-chairman of the party, while Teng was relieved a second time of all his positions in the party and the government. However, when Mao died on September 9, 1976, Hua went the other direction and cooperated with the Teng group. The Gang of Four were duly arrested. On the next day, the Politburo elected Hua as Chairman of the party as well as the military commission. Thus the Cultural Revolution came to its inglorious end.

1977

While Hua had officially succeeded Mao, real power gradually shifted to the Teng group. At the third session of the Tenth Central Committee of the Party meeting in July of 1977, Teng was restored to his previous positions in the party and in the government. The advent of the Teng group probably influenced Hua's announcement in August at the eleventh Party Congress that the Cultural Revolution had officially ended.

1978-81

It was not too long before Teng sought to consolidate his power and to settle his old scores. Initially the Teng-Hua alliance held. At the fifth National People's Congress, Yeh Chien-ying, who had arranged the coalition between Hua and Teng, was appointed Chairman of its standing Committee and Hua was confirmed as Prime Minister. In December of 1978 began the "rectification" of leftists active in the Cultural Revolution. The party decided to establish a committee in charge of discipline which was to lay the groundwork for a purge of leftists in the party. In 1979, Teng enunciated his "four insistences:" insistence on socialism, proletarian dictatorship, Communist leadership, and Marxist-Leninist-Maoist thought; through this Teng established himself as the source of future ideological developments. As Teng's influence grew so did his influence over appointments. In 1980, Teng's protege, Hu Yao-pang, was appointed secretary-general of the party and de facto took over control of party work. Another Teng associate, Chao Tzu-yang, was made a deputy prime minister and gradually took over the running of the cabinet. With Teng's men in place, bolder actions could be taken against the leftists. On January 25, 1981, the People's Supreme Court sentenced Lin Piao, Chiang Ching, and eight other Gang of Four leaders as anti-revolutionary criminals. The final step was taken in June of 1981 at the sixth session of the eleventh Central Committee when Hua tendered his resignation as chairman of the party and of the military commission; Hu Yao-pang and Teng respectively assumed these positions.

1982

Teng's victory was not complete. Although he himself controlled the military and his proteges held the highest offices in the party and government, there was, and still is, opposition. For instance, Hua, though shorn since September 1982 of all positions except his membership of the party Central Committee, has continued to refuse admission of error and continues to uphold Mao's teachings with vehemence. Teng's much publicized Four Modernizations begun in 1979 has met considerable resistance and has made only slow progress.

To overcome obstacles within the party and government bureaucracies, Teng took several steps. Beginning in 1981, he started to shift military commanders around to prevent them from becoming too entrenched. He furthered plans to purge the party of "leftists" who entered the party during the Cultural Revolution. To train the much needed next generation of experts and leaders, Teng sent thousands of students and teachers abroad to universities in the U.S., Japan, and Europe. These students, however, once exposed to free societies have often refused to return. Even on the mainland, increased contacts with visitors and travellers from abroad has made the people more conscious of their own lack of freedom.

It will be remembered that Teng's return to power was helped by the mushrooming of wall posters, underground magazines, and secret societies calling for human rights. The movement which began on November 10, 1974 with the appearance of the "Li-I-Che" big character wall posters grew more vociferous in the following years. But, after Teng consolidated his power, he wasted no time in denouncing the workers for freedom and human rights as counter-revolutionaries. In a key speech on January 16, 1980, Teng stated: it is absolutely impermissible to publicize any freedom of speech, publication, and assembly or to form associations which involve counter-revolutionaries. The "four big freedoms"—speaking out freely, airing views fully, holding debates and writing wall posters—allowed in the 1978 constitution were cancelled in the new constitution passed on September 10, 1980. A number of dissidents were arrested and imprisoned. One case was Wei Ching-shen, editor of *Tansuo*, who was sentenced to prison for fifteen years.

To give impetus for agricultural production, the Commune system was modified after 1978 to allow the farmers more control over their production. The Communes gradually become an administrative rather than a productive unit, and, instead, increased their power over the daily lives of the people. The Neighborhood Committees observe and report all aspects of the people's lives down to the menstrual cycles of women in order to enforce the strict birth control policy. The system, according to a Western reporter John Woodruff, compares to George Orwell's vision of the totalitarian state in his novel, 1984, which as "Big Brother" watches everybody anytime and anywhere.

In 1983, the most inhumanitarian part of the Communist regime's policies became known—forced abortions and female infanticide. An American researcher, Stephen Mosher, reported on the Neighborhood Committees forcing women to undergo abortions if it was thought they had too many children. The one child per household policy linked to the Chinese tradition of preferring boys to girls has led to many parents killing their female offspring. There are no exact figures of girl infants drowned or abandoned, but according to the Women's League of Anwhei Province, the ratio between the sexes are so unbalanced as to have become 5:1 by 1982.

In the field of foreign relations, the Communist regime after establishing diplomatic relations with the U.S. in 1979 undertook new diplomatic moves against the ROC. The Communists were very disturbed with the Taiwan Relations Act passed in 1979 by the Congress and signed by the President. They criticized the U.S. for promoting a policy of two Chinas, or one China and one Taiwan. That the U.S. continued to sell arms to the ROC after 1979 greatly irritated the Chinese Communists. To mollify them, the American government agreed to the "August 17, 1982 Communique" which said that the U.S. would keep its weapon sales to the ROC at or below current levels and would slowly decrease such sales ultimately ending them when the need for them ceased to exist. There was no timetable, however, agreed upon. Despite this agreement, Taiwan remains a contentious issue between Washington and Peking.

An interesting development in strategic relations has occurred as a result of America's approach to the Chinese Communists. The U.S. sought a relationship with the Chinese Communists in order to contain the Soviet Union. However, the Chinese Communists once they felt unsure of the U.S. policies over the Taiwan and other issues, began overtures to the Soviets themselves playing the American Card just as the U.S. had tried to play the China Card. The recent Sino-Soviet mild thaw has put aside the Chinese Communists' possible strategic relationship with the U.S.

The Sino-Soviet rapprochement has continued into 1984. Communist China's Vice Premier Wan Li visited Moscow on February 13, 1984 to attend the funeral of Yuri Andropov. The death of the Soviet leader received prominent and sympathetic attention in the mainland press. Wan's visit marks the highest-ranking official visit by the CCP in twenty years. Upon his return, Wan stated that he hoped normal relations could be reached with the USSR and that "substantive progress" should be made at the forthcoming talks on the subject in Moscow. In exchange for Wan's visit, the USSR will send its Deputy Premier, Ivan Arkhipov, to Peking in May 1984 to discuss trade. He would be the highest ranking Soviet delegate since the late nineteen-sixties.

As the new Soviet leader, Konstantin Chernenko, took office, mutual decrees were issued calling for improved Sino-Soviet relations. However, the Soviets have given no indication that they will compromise on the issues which divide them. The Chinese Communists have noted this. The prospect

for a more formal and lasting rapprochement is poor even though both sides will continue to have small, symbolic exchanges of friendship.

1983

This year saw the fruition of Teng's plans to further secure his power through a purge of the "leftists" in the Communist party, its so-called "rectification." In October 1983, at a plenary session of the twelfth Central Committee meeting, a three year purge plan was adopted. It was aimed at three kinds of people: those who followed the radical Gang of Four, those who engaged in serious factional fighting, and those who had engaged in political violence. There was naturally resistance to the planned purge. Po I-po, deputy head of the Central Steering Committee of Party Reform, warned that there were members admitted during the Cultural Revolution who had not changed their ways and were secretly plotting to return to power in ten or twenty years. For the Communists, political power comes from the barrel of the gun—Mao's dictum. To hold power the chief weapon is struggle, struggle against the opposition, struggle against those in and out of power, and struggle against each other for ascendancy.

The interminability of strife on the mainland can be seen that even before the rectification campaign against the leftists has been launched, two other campaigns are now underway. The first, a crackdown on what the Communists call serious economic, political, and legal criminals, began in July 1983. Since August, thousands have been executed. The first wave of executions involved major criminals. The second included lesser criminals, those serving hard labor sentences and who had refused to reform, and those who had appealed against their sentences. The third stage of executions dealth with political criminals including intelligence agents, supporters of the Gang of Four, and any other opponent of Teng. The Communist leaders ignored all pleas from humanitarian organizations such as Amnesty International.

The second campaign of late 1983 has been since October aimed at "Western Spiritual Pollution." It must be admitted that the Chinese Communists are witty in devising slogans and catchy terminology in dealing with people or ideas they consider undesirable or harmful. This so-called pollution includes four main categories: spreading things and ideas obscene, barbarous and reactionary; expressing vulgar taste in artistic performances disgusting to people; seeking personal gain at the public's or the party's expense; and writing articles or delivering speeches contrary to the social system. The main target of this campaign are the youth and intellectuals who want to see more liberal ways and policies. The specter of the Cultural Revolution soon settled over the Spiritual Pollution campaign, as a result, assurances have been given that the campaign will be conducted in a calm way and will not lead to repression akin to that earlier exercised. Such guarantees, however, ring hollow and it can be seen that there will be new limitations on contact with foreigners, stricter regulations on students going abroad, more severe censorship of films and publications, and a general restricting of lifestyles.

The three campaigns while each aimed at a different group, leftists, criminals, and rightists, have quickly become jumbled together. A leftist can be accused of being a rightist if he is thought to have been polluted with Western ideas. The distinctions made are largely a matter of convenience for the people in power. The authorities when they find it convenient will stress the ideas they have recently spent time and money persecuting. For instance, to forward the Four Modernizations, Teng will loosen up the strict application of Communist ideology. However, when he feels that a freer economy is threatening his political power, he will shift and insist on strict ideological adherence. Contradictions and confusions abound with the result of poor economic performance.

A prime example lies in Teng's handling of Mao's legacy. Teng has attempted to dismantle the personality cult surrounding Mao—to make Mao appear less the single exalted, irrefutable and central figure in Chinese Communism. Yet on the occasion of Mao's ninetieth birthday anniversary, Teng and his colleagues celebrated with the extensive publication of Mao's writing and speeches, symposiums on Mao thought, films depicting Mao's military exploits, and the whole paraphernalia of special stamps and other nick-nacks. All this demonstrates that Teng has to elevate Mao even when attempting to level his legacy because the deceased leader's followers still exert a strong influence over the state and must, therefore, be accommodated.

Furthermore, Teng must treat Mao's memory delicately in order to pose as his valid heir. Teng cannot appear to have broken with Communist ideology and tactics which after all he depends upon to control the country. Like Mao did, Teng needs to press Communism in order to secure his power. As a result, government policy swings back and forth stirring much uncertainty in the people. As a result, the Communist regime faces the basic problems of the people's lack of confidence in the Communist leaders, disillusionment with Communism, and loss of interest and hope in the future. The Communists' struggles have only brought untold suffering—a human cost only barely calculable.

Various people at various times have been held within a blind attraction for Communism in mainland China, particularly for its early period of ideological fanaticism. But, these intellectuals are now becoming more realistic. An outstanding example is Ross Terrill, a Harvard professor who for over a decade and a half was a vocal advocate of Communist China. After his most recent visit in 1983—perhaps his last—he summarized his changed views in a remarkable article in the June issue of the *Atlantic Monthly*. He confessed that "my own optimism about the Middle Kingdom has waned. I was already bracing myself for the official lies, depressing signs that China's goals may elude it, pleas by bright but downcast young people to help them come to the West—for study." He summarized his last impressions forthrightly: "In 1983, one sees on all sides boredom, cynicism and escapism. . . . Corruption spreads as relatives and friends help each other avoid playing by the rules, laughing at their success against a system that has made many people bitter and depressed."●

THE FEDERAL PAY EQUITY AND MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1984

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing along with Congresswoman SCHROEDER and Congressman HOYER "The Federal Pay Equity and Management Improvement Act of 1984." The bill would promote pay equity by requiring a study of discriminatory wage-setting practices and wage differentials in the Federal Government and would reform the merit pay and Senior Executive Service programs.

Fair and equitable pay practices are of great importance to every employee. Federal workers are no exceptions. During 2 days of hearings, I chaired through my Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits on Sex-Based Wage Discrimination, we learned that, as in the private sector, the more an occupation is dominated by women, the less the Federal Government pays. The majority of women who work for the Federal Government are clustered in low paying positions, grades 1-7 and average $17,000 a year; while the majority of male workers are concentrated in the midlevel and upper grades, earning an average of $28,000 a year. Over 40 percent of the Federal work force are women, but only 12 percent of them are Federal managers and supervisors. The obvious question is "Why?"

One reason may be that the classification system in the Federal Government is tied to standards which were formulated in 1923. Not only has the work force changed dramatically since that time, but the work performed and the responsibilities of the various occupations are decidedly different from what they were 50 years ago. Yet, no analysis of the system has been done in half a century.

An objective and comprehensive study of the Federal classification and pay structures to determine compliance with pay equity principles, which is provided in this legislation, is long overdue. The largest employer in the Nation needs to examine its pay structure for sex bias and begin to take responsible actions to remedy any disparities inherent in the system.

Equally as important to the Federal work force is the issue of merit pay. One hundred and eighty thousand Federal managers and supervisors are under a compensation program that was established in 1978. Unfortunately, a program that was designed to provide incentives for high quality is creating disincentives for thousands of workers. My bill would restructure the

system to overcome the shortcomings identified by the GAO, the affected employees, and experts on compensation practices and performance appraisal systems.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate a point I made earlier. Federal employees count on the Government to provide equitable compensation practices. Women working for the Federal Government need to be reassured that they are not being placed in low paying occupations merely because of their gender. Managers and senior executives deserve fair treatment and the Federal Government needs to take a lead in abolishing discriminatory practices.

All workers should have equal access to all occupations. The Federal Pay Equity and Management Improvement Act of 1984 would achieve these essential goals.

I might add that my Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits approved titles I and II under separate legislation, on May 15, 1984. I personally believe that the timeliness and necessity of each title of my bill strengthens and enhances the other. The Federal Pay Equity and Management Improvement Act of 1984 deserves the support of all my colleagues. I have included a detailed summary of the legislation for each Member's information.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to House consideration of this legislation. Thank you.

The material follows:

THE FEDERAL PAY EQUITY AND MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1984

SOURCE

The Federal Pay Equity and Management Improvement Act of 1984 was introduced by Congresswoman Oakar on May 17, 1984.

PURPOSE

The bill promotes pay equity by requiring a study of discriminatory wage-setting practices and wage differentials in the Executive branch and substantially improves the merit pay system and the Senior Executive Service.

EXPLANATION

Title I mandates OPM to conduct a seven-month study on discriminatory wage-setting practices and wage differentials. OPM must consult with Congressional committees and a "Pay Equity Study Council", consisting of representatives of Federal employee unions and women's organizations. OPM's final report must include its findings and recommendations for eliminating discriminatory pay practices and the views of Council representatives. OPM is prohibited from reducing the pay for any position as a result of the study.

Title II abolishes the Merit Pay System which was established by the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 and creates instead a Performance Management and Recognition System under which supervisors' and managers' pay increases are based on performance as follows: An unsuccessful employee receives no increase; minimally successful receives one-half comparability; fully successful—full comparability plus all or part of a merit increase (about 3% of pay); exceeds fully successful—full comparability plus all or part of a merit increase, and eligible for a performance award; outstanding—full comparability, full merit increase, and a performance award (2% to 10% of pay).

Title II also provides a minimum level (.75% of covered payroll) and a maximum limit (1.5% of covered payroll) for agency performance award programs. The minimum increases to 1.5% by the fifth year of the program. The maximum limit applies only in the first four years. Individual performance awards may not be less than 2% nor more than 10% of pay. Title II provides for performance appraisal systems for covered employees. The systems must provide five rating levels. Finally, title II requires each agency to establish a Performance Standards Review Board to assess the appropriateness of agency performance standards.

Title II places Congress on record in favor of continuation of the Senior Executive Service (SES) and makes certain adjustments in the laws governing the SES. The bill eliminates the 50% limit on the number of senior executives eligible for performance awards and establishes, in its place, a dollar limit. Agencies are permitted to give performance awards amounting to no less than 2% and no more than 4% of the total payroll of SES appointees. Current law limiting individual performance awards to 20% of base pay is retained, but a 5% minimum for such awards is established. The bill changes the limit on SES political appointees from 10% of all SES positions to 10% of the number of SES appointees. The bill also revises SES reduction-in-force provisions to guarantee a riffed executive placement in a GS-115 position and requires a 45-day placement effort by OPM. The notice period for career executives subject to geographic reassignment is increased to 60 days from 15, and agencies are required to consult with executives concerning such reassignments. The bill requires OPM to issue regulations providing senior executives comparable rights to competitive service employees in transfer of function situations.

BACKGROUND

The provisions of titles I and II were approved separately by the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits, both by record votes of 4-2, on May 15. Title III addresses problems raised during the oversight hearings of the Subcommittee on Civil Service on the Senior Executive Service. The Subcommittee held four days of hearings and received testimony from 21 individuals and organizations. The hearings were held to comply with the provision of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 requiring a review of the SES after five years of operation.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION

The Administration generally supports title II although it is opposed to certain provisions. It is opposed to the provisions of title I. Its views on title III are not known.●

THE HARASSMENT OF JEWS IN THE U.S.S.R.

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to an official complaint filed by Mrs. R. L. Mintz, aunt of the well-known Soviet refusenik Leonid Volvovsky, with the Gorky Director of Public Prosecutions following a June 2, 1983, search of her apartment. It is clearly illustrative of the sort of harassment of Jews that is typical in the Soviet Union today.

In this complaint, Mrs. Mintz describes the KGB's breaking into her apartment, ransacking books, papers, personal items, pictures, and even food, displaying indifference to her severe health problems, and confiscating many materials having nothing to do with their instructions.

The following is a full transcript of Mrs. Mintz' complaint:

Background: A copy of this translated document was directed to Chicago Action for Soviet Jewry by Mrs. R. L. Mintz, aunt of well-known Refusenik activist Leonid Volvovsky. It is a complaint, sent originally to the Gorky Director of Public Prosecutions, following a June 2, 1983 search of Mrs. Mintz's apartment. Volvovsky's home was searched at the same time.

June 4, 1983. Procurator, R.S.F.S.R., Director of Public Prosecutions (for investigation and inquiry of the organs of the Ministry of the Interior). Copy: Procurator for Investigations in the Gorky Region. From: Mintz, R. L., Gorky Automobilnaya Street, Dom 20, Flat 102.

Complaint concerning the illegal actions of Senior Investigator of the Regional Procuracy of Gorky, V. Turin, and his accompanying assistants.

2nd June 1983. Physically straining, I did my exercises, got washed, put drops in my eyes, and went to take my sandals in for repair. They said I should come for them by one o'clock in the afternoon. Then I bought some sour cream, and put the bag with it on the table. There was a knock at the door. With the chain on, I asked: "Who is it?" He shoved forward a document: Senior Investigator Turin. "You must be mistaken," I said. "No," he answered. I opened the door, and six men burst in. I explained that I was not feeling well: for several days I had had high blood-pressure. Whatever they were looking for, we did not have and could not have had. Please go ahead, have a look, I said, but because I had not eaten breakfast and was so tired, I could not follow which books and whatever else they were confiscating. I was alone, my head was spinning, there was an unbearable pain in the back of my head. On that day, even before the search, I had scarcely been able to telephone the Polyclinic to ask for an appointment with a doctor. They told me that there were no vacancies left, neither with the physiotherapist nor with the therapeutist—they said that they had too few doctors!

So the search started. Wherever they found books—in the writing-desk, in the bookcase, where the folders were—they rummaged through them all. Private papers, which were in order in folders, and could not have had any bearing on whatever they were looking for—they examined. Then Turin's assistants began ransacking the bathroom, where there was nothing except household items—these they threw everywhere. Then, without me, they examined what was in a suitcase in the hall. I still haven't checked to see if everything is still in order in the case, because my head up till now has been painful, and my gener-

al state is terrible. On the evening of the 2nd of June I learned that, simultaneously with our search, there was one at Lenya's wife's flat (the Volvovsky's). They took all the literature: journals, books, etc.—in which there was nothing and could not have been anything such as investigator Vorob'ev assumed, namely, items and documents containing fabrications discrediting the Soviet state and social system. Everything they took from us, and from the flat of Lenya's wife, was simply: interesting books, journals, personal papers. They amassed from us almost a full sack, and I thought: "Is it really possible that encyclopedias (4 volumes), the Talmud, papers, rolls of film and pictures, colorful pictures with panoramic views, none connected in any way with the Soviet Union, can in some barbaric manner or another relate to valuable cultural items?

During the search I needed to take heart medicine and to lie down on the couch, on which the witnesses, who were reading "Israel Today," were sitting. They took this journal. Of course this journal is interesting to read, as we read translations from English, French, Spanish and so forth; but there was nothing anti-Soviet in it. The journal portrays life in Israel. Not knowing how to express this, I just longed that they would leave and give me a chance to lie down quietly.

When they gave me a copy of the inventory of what they had taken, I did not sign it, because it was impossible to make out what was written on the copy. I gave it to one of them, another helper of Turin, and asked him to read even a single line—the response was silence. Then they wrote another one, but I was already on the couch, had closed my eyelids, and was not in a state for anything, especially reading; I only wondered why there was so much in the sack. Without a doubt, they must have taken literary works, not only Lenya's books, but also mine and my sister's. It was completely immaterial in what language they were written, not even important if there was a single line in them against the Soviet Union. Why had they taken them?

In such a rude manner they had checked all the bags, photos, and even savings-books. They had shoved their filthy dirty hands into a box of Matzos—after all, it's only food! They even opened and checked a small gold watch in its little box, which my relatives had given me as a present on my 50th birthday. And now I am 74, and my head aches terribly, even when I write these few lines. They did everything they wanted, paying no attention to me. How it was that I didn't have a hemorrhage I myself am amazed! I said to them: "I feel so bad, if you want you can hit me on the head and carry everything away, because there are no witnesses—you yourselves are the masters here."

I'm sad for the books, which you can't buy anywhere, but the main thing is that I am certain that because there was nothing here, and could not be anything here which they would have liked to find, this fact probably saved my life. I have not written everything about this search. If I were to describe it in detail, you would receive an interesting booklet on how not to carry out a search.

An outrageous injustice! They promised to return things after checking. What could they possibly return?—when they so carelessly threw things from the table into the sack, like potatoes or forks with cabbage on them.

How offensive it all is! Perhaps this is what they aimed at—they achieved their goal. Up till now the insult has not passed. Everything aches, and I can't comprehend that all this is possible. For what purpose such injustice?

They went sometime after one o'clock. I had strength to get up from the couch and to go for the sandals. The master had already locked up his kiosk and left, but at my shout he returned, opened up the kiosk, and gave me the sandals. Thanks be to him. At 3 o'clock I came home, hungry and worn out, and at last could lie down.

On the next day, 3rd June 1983, I went away to a cousin's, where they looked after me the whole day. I was so unwell, they tried to persuade me to have an ambulance called, although I begged them not to. Having swallowed all types of tablets, I had an attack of high blood pressure. 4th June they called a doctor; then I asked them to change the call, as a doctor would only come at the end of the day, and I could not wait so long, not knowing whether I should take any more tablets. At 12 o'clock I had a pressure of 130/60—this is very low. If I had taken more tablets, I could have died. I stopped taking medicine and am now at 150/75. But I'm frightened of ambulances, of injections, since the death of Georgi Lykich, who received an injection given in an ambulance which lowered his pressure to 50, and they could no longer save him.

But why did I write all of this when I was going out of my mind and trying to forget? How many more details I could tell: the contented smirking face of Turin (although he had nothing to be happy about), the gloomy silent faces of the witnesses, the curious faces of the assistants from amongst whom only one of them, Denisov, gave his surname before leaving. The rest were incognito. What were they afraid of?

Therefore I request you to instruct investigator Turin and his assistants to return everything that they took from us.

R. L. MINTZ.●

THE REAL ISSUE: FAIR TRADE IN STEEL

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks, administration spokesmen have claimed that imports are not the problem facing the steel industry today. Instead, they point to the declining consumption of steel in relation to real gross national product (GNP), or steel intensity. They imply that steel intensity will continue its fall in the years ahead.

Although it is true that steel intensity declined sharply from 1970 to 1980, the decline has halted and should remain level throughout most of the 1980's. In a report prepared at my request by Dr. David Cantor of the Congressional Research Service, entitled "Trends in Steel Intensity: Will It Continue to Decline?", evidence has been assembled to show that steel intensity has in fact leveled off. The decline in steel intensity of the past decade has come to a halt. The report's findings are based on the results of two independent forecasts of steel consumption and growth of real GNP by Chase Econometrics and Data Resources, Inc.

The conclusions drawn in this report provide further evidence that we must take a hard look at the central problem facing the steel industry today—imports. It does not further the interest of anyone to divert attention away from the import problem. The fact is that while steel intensity has stabilized, the number of unfairly traded steel products has risen. According to the American Iron and Steel Institute, 6,468,000 tons of steel were imported into the United States during the first 3 months of this year. That translates into a 25-percent share of the market. Unless action is taken, imports will continue their precipitous climb while steel intensity remains stable.

I urge all of my colleagues to request Dr. Cantor's report on steel intensity because I believe it goes a long way to clear the air and focus attention on the real issue: Fair trade in steel. Thank you.●

THE BROKER DEPOSIT LIMITATION ACT

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would replace the drastic regulatory restrictions on brokered deposits imposed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board with more modest restrictions designed to permit prudent, legitimate uses of brokered funds while preventing abuses.

Although the practice of deposit brokering has been around for many years, regulatory and legislative concern with it is a relatively recent phenomenon. One reason is that the volume of funds placed through money brokers has increased dramatically in recent years, spurred by the deregulation of interest rates on certificates of deposit, technological advances, and increased sophistication of consumers. Deposit brokers have presented consumers with expanded opportunities to purchase the certificates of deposit of banks and thrifts throughout the Nation. These certificates generally have been issued by top quality institutions, carry competitive interest rates, and can be highly liquid, since many brokers also make a secondary market in the certificates they sell.

Brokered deposits have also served many useful purposes in the financial markets. They have given banks and thrifts a mechanism for matching their assets and liabilities. They have also provided a mechanism for chan-

neling funds to regions of the country where they are needed to satisfy the credit needs of homebuyers and small businesses.

A second reason why deposit brokering has attracted increased interest is that, beginning with the Penn Square Bank, brokered deposits have turned up conspicuously in a disquieting number of failed institutions. This does not mean that brokered deposits should be made the scapegoat for failed banks, however. The vast majority of failed banks since Penn Square had no brokered deposits in them at all; failure would be more properly attributed to bad management or other reasons. Nonetheless, the Federal regulators have produced enough evidence of actual and potential abuses of short-term brokered funds to make the case that the practice of deposit brokering should not remain unregulated.

Unfortunately, the regulation adopted by the FDIC and FSLIC would eliminate the benefits of deposit brokerage as well as any actual or potential abuses. It would limit deposit insurance on funds deposited for consumers by money brokers to $100,000 per broker per institution, thus denying consumers the passthrough of insurance that they previously enjoyed.

Another extreme way to regulate deposit brokerage is to have the regulators monitor all institutions, and deal with problem institutions on a case-by-case basis. Unfortunately, as the Penn Square failure demonstrated, regulators often do not foresee problems, or cannot do anything about them, until it is too late.

I believe that the bill I have introduced restricts deposit brokerage in a way which will help preserve benefits for consumers, promote the safety and soundness of depository institutions, and allow the regulators to spot potential problems early.

The bill prohibits "troubled" institutions—those with unimpaired capital and surplus below 3 percent—from accepting short-term brokered deposits. Institutions with unimpaired capital and surplus above 3 percent could accept insured short-term deposits in an amount equal to 200 percent of its unimpaired capital and surplus, up to a maximum of 15 percent of its total deposits.

The bill limits the percentage of insured deposits placed in an institution by any single broker according to the maturity of the deposits. No institution may maintain insured deposits from any single broker in an amount exceeding 5 percent of the total deposits of the institution which will mature in a 12-month period (computed on a rolling base).

Individual depositors could not be paid more than $100,000 in insurance benefits on all of their brokered deposits over any 4-year period.

Money brokers would be required to submit reports to the FDIC and FSLIC containing information on their activities, including the name of each institution they have deposited funds in, and the total amount, maturity, and interest rate of such deposit. The regulators could request other information, but could not request the names of a deposit broker's customers.

In sum, I believe that the provisions of this bill creates a framework which will insure that brokered funds will be deposited responsibly by brokers and used responsibly by financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that at this point the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD:

H.R. 5681

A bill to limit the amount of short-term broker deposits which may be accepted by any insured depository institution

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 1. This Act may be cited as the "Broker Deposit Limitation Act".

LIMITATIONS ON SHORT-TERM BROKER DEPOSITS

SEC. 2. (a) Section 5 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1815) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(d)(1)(A) In any case in which a deposit broker deposits funds for the benefit of any person in one or more insured banks, the total amount of deposit insurance benefits payable to such person by the Corporation with respect to such funds shall not exceed $100,000 in any four-year period.

"(B) Except for purposes of carrying out the provision of this subsection, in determining the total amount of insured deposits which may be made by any person, the Corporation shall not differentiate between deposits made with the assistance of a deposit broker and deposits made without such assistance.

"(2) If an insured bank's unimpaired capital and surplus—

"(A) is less than 3 percent of its total liabilities, such insured bank shall not accept any short-term broker deposits from a deposit broker; and

"(B) is equal to, or exceeds, 3 percent of its total liabilities, such insured bank may accept insured short-term broker deposits from a deposit broker in an amount which does not exceed the lesser of—

"(i) 200 percent of such insured bank's unimpaired capital and surplus; or

"(ii) 15 percent of the total deposits of such insured bank.

"(3) With respect to any insured bank whose total short-term broker deposits exceed the limitations imposed by this subsection, the Corporation shall work with such insured bank to develop a plan to provide for the orderly reduction, consistent with preserving the safety and soundness of the insured bank, in the amount of short-term broker deposits maintained by such insured bank to an amount which conforms with the provisions of this subsection.

"(4) Each deposit broker which places deposits with any insured bank shall transmit periodic reports to the corporation. Each such report shall specify—

"(A) the name of each insured bank in which such deposit broker has deposited funds;

"(B) the total amount of funds deposited in such insured bank and the maturities of such deposits;

"(C) the rate of interest received on such funds and the dates on which such funds were deposited; and

"(D) such other information as the Corporation deems appropriate to carry out the provisions of this subsection, except that the Corporation may not request the names of a deposit broker's customers.

"(5) With respect to any one deposit broker, no insured bank shall maintain insured deposits from such deposit broker in an amount which exceeds 5 percent of the total deposits of such insured bank which will mature in any twelve-month period.

"(6) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no deposit insurance coverage shall apply to any deposit which is placed by a deposit broker on behalf of—

"(A) any department or agency of the United States; or

"(B) any depository institution.

"(7) The corporation shall prescribe regulations to carry out the provisions of this subsection. Such regulations may contain such provisions as the corporation determines are necessary or proper to effectuate the purposes of this subsection, to prevent circumvention or evasion thereof, or to facilitate compliance therewith.

"(8) For purposes of this section—

"(A) the term 'deposit broker' means any person (other than an insured bank or an affiliate thereof with respect to funds placed with such insured bank) which, for a fee, places funds or facilitates the placement of funds of third parties in accounts issued by an insured bank;

"(B) the term 'depository institution' shall have the same meaning given such term in section 19(b)(1)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act; and

"(C) the term 'short-term broker deposit' means any deposit which—

"(i) is made for a period of time—

"(I) which is not greater than 15 months; or

"(II) which is not specified; and

"(ii) is placed by deposit broker.

(b) Section 403 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1726) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(e)(1)(A) In any case in which a deposit broker deposits funds for the benefit of any person in one or more insured institutions, the total amount of deposit insurance benefits payable to such person by the Corporation with respect to such funds shall not exceed $100,000 in any four year period.

"(B) Except for purposes of carrying out the provisions of this subsection, in determining the total amount of insured deposits which may be made by any person, the Corporation shall not differentiate between deposits made with the assistance of a deposit broker and deposits made without such assistance.

"(2) If an insured institution's unimpaired capital and surplus—

"(A) Is less than 3 percent of its total liabilities, such insured institution shall not accept any short-term broker deposits from a deposit broker; and

"(B) is equal to, or exceeds, 3 percent of its total liabilities, such insured institution may accept insured short-term broker deposits from a deposit broker in an amount which does not exceed the lesser of—

"(i) 200 percent of such insured institution's unimpaired capital and surplus; or

"(ii) 15 percent of the total deposits of such insured institution.

"(3) With respect to any insured institution whose total short-term broker deposits exceed the limitations imposed by this subsection, the Corporation shall work with such insured institution to develop a plan to provide for the orderly reduction, consistent with preserving the safety and soundness of the insured institution, in the amount of short-term broker deposits maintained by such institution to an amount which conforms with the provisions of this subsection.

"(4) Each deposit broker which places deposits with any insured institution shall transmit periodic reports to the Corporation. Each such report shall specify-

"(A) the name of each insured institution in which such deposit broker has deposited funds;

"(B) the total amount of funds deposited in such institution and the maturities of such deposits;

"(C) the rate of interest received on such funds and the dates on which such funds were deposited; and

"(D) such other information as the Corporation deems appropriate to carry out the provisions of this subsection, except that the Corporation may not request the names of a deposit broker's customers.

"(5) With respect to any one deposit broker, no insured institution shall maintain insured deposits from such deposit broker in an amount which exceeds 5 percent of the total deposits of such insured institution which will mature in any twelve-month period.

"(6) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no deposit insurance coverage shall apply to any deposit which is placed by a deposit broker on behalf of—

"(A) any department or agency of the United States; or

"(B) any depository institution.

"(7) The Corporation shall prescribe regulations to carry out the provisions of this subsection. Such regulations may contain such provisions as the Corporation determines are necessary or proper to effectuate the purposes of this subsection, to prevent circumvention or evasion thereof, or to facilitate compliance therewith.

"(8) For purposes of this section—

"(A) the term 'deposit broker' means any person (other than an insured institution or an affiliate thereof with respect to funds placed with such insured institution) which, for a fee, places funds or facilitates the placement of funds of third parties in accounts issued by an insured institution;

"(B) the term 'depository institution' shall have the same meaning given such term in section 19(b)(1)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act; and

"(C) the term 'short-term broker deposit' means any deposit which—

"(i) is made for a period of time—

"(I) which is not greater than 15 months; or

"(II) which is not specified; and

"(ii) is placed by deposit broker."●

STATISTICIANS PETITION SOVIETS TO RELEASE INNA KISTROSSKAYA

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, recently, at the annual Statistical Mechanics meeting held at Rutgers University, some 55 percent of the scientists attending endorsed petitions to Soviet scientific authorities on behalf of Inna Kistrosskaya, wife of Soviet mathematical physicists Naum Meiman. In their petitions, the scientists appealed for humanitarian intervention by Soviet officials to permit Mrs. Meiman, who is suffering from a life-threatening carcinoma, to go abroad for medical treatment.

Physicians who have studied Mrs. Meiman's medical records have concluded that radiation therapy and chemotherapy might prolong her life. Yet, although doctors in the United States, Israel, France, and Sweden have volunteered to treat her, Soviet authorities have not, as yet, granted Mrs. Meiman permission to leave the country.

The current plight of the Meimans is only the most recent manifestation of the years of suffering this family has experienced at the hands of the Soviet officials. Their problems began in 1975 when Professor Meiman first applied to emigrate to Israel. This attempt and all subsequent requests have been refused on the ground that Professor Meiman was involved in secret work during his 20-year employment at the Soviet Academy of Sciences. Counterarguments that his research was in abstract mathematics and had been published in public reports were ignored by Soviet authorities.

Because of their attempts to emigrate, the Meimans have been subjected to continuous harassment. They have had to cope with a range of reprisals including separation from their only child who now resides in the United States; interference with their telephone service; interception of mail; denial of access to the medical facilities open to employees of the Academy of Sciences; apartment searches and confiscation of Professor Meiman's personal and scientific papers; lengthy interrogations and threats of further retaliation for his human rights activities.

Now, as Inna Kistrosskaya's condition worsens, mounting concern is being translated into appeals to Soviet authorities from diverse quarters. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to the protests of these American scientists and others that the Soviet Union act quickly to allow Mrs. Meiman to go abroad for treatment to save her life. The Soviet Union must relax the repressive treatment of her husband and others who have asked to emigrate and live up to their commitments under the Helsinki accords to allow free emigration.●

SAFER NAVIGATION ON THE GREAT LAKES AND WESTERN RIVERS

HON. ROBERT W. DAVIS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, in 1980, we enacted the Inland Navigational Rules Act which unified the rules that mariners use on the Great Lakes, the inland waterways, and Western rivers. The purpose of this legislation was to make one set of rules that mariners throughout the United States could follow and which would closely resemble the international navigational rules. However, certain customary practices were retained in the inland rules that differ from the international rules, due to the nature of the waters concerned. I am introducing legislation today which will clarify the use of the customary practice when vessels meet on the inland waters.

Presently, the inland rules leave a strong presumption that starboard-to-starboard passage of vessels is prohibited in most instances. Specifically, these are rules 9 and 14 of the inland navigational rules. However, mariners on our inland waters must make starboard-to-starboard passages frequently. While port-to-port passage should be the general rule, safe practice often dictates that starboard-to-starboard passage be allowed when necessary. This would be done through agreement by the two vessels involved. Under the old Great Lakes and western rivers rules and their respective pilot rules, the right-of-way in a meeting situation was given to the downbound or descending vessel with a following current over an upbound or ascending vessel proceeding into the current. The two rules that I have cited above cover a head-on meeting situation, generally as well as specifically in a narrow channel.

However, the port-to-port passage presumption, embodied in the current rules, does not take into consideration certain maneuvering situations. For example, the "points and bends" custom was developed to handle a situation of two meeting vessels at a bend in the river. This custom called for the upbound vessel to hold as near to the bank as possible and below the point of the bend while the downbound vessel proceeded around the bend. Once the downbound vessel was passed, the upbound vessel could proceed. Applying this custom, about one-

half of all passing situations required a starboard-to-starboard passage, depending on whether the bend is to the right or the left. Further, on the Great Lakes, the custom was developed that the downbound vessel was given the right-of-way in several specified rivers and generally in any narrow channel with a current. For example, a situation like this could arise in the St. Marys River.

When the current inland rules were enacted, they did not fully incorporate these customary practices. In essence, Great Lakes and western rivers mariners have lost the legal use of a customary passing procedure developed over many years.

The bill I am introducing would propose changes to rule 14 which would allow the downbound vessel with the following current to have the right-of-way over an upbound vessel. In addition, the downbound vessel would be responsible for proposing the port or starboard passage and for initiating the manuevering signals required. Further, the bill would allow vessels that are meeting on a river to agree between themselves on which side they would pass each other. The agreement would be accomplished by signals of intent and agreement, required by the rules, and also through the use of bridge-to-bridge radio. Since the signal would be "a signal of intent" by the privileged vessel, the other vessel would have to send back a "signal of agreement" before any change of course would take place. Therefore, no safety hazard or confusion would be created by this change to the rules.

I understand that this rule change has been recommended by the Rules of the Road Advisory Council and has been supported by the towing vessel and barge industry, the pilots, and the Coast Guard. It is also consistent with a recommendation by the National Transportation Safety Board that interpretive rulings are necessary to clarify application of rules 9 and 14 as they currently exist. This bill would, in effect, promote safety on the Great Lakes and inland rivers at no additional cost. Thus, it preserves the longstanding downbound vessel privilege and the "points and bends" custom which mariners consider to be vital to the safety of navigation on the Great Lakes and western rivers.●

BROWN AGAINST BOARD OF EDUCATION—30 YEARS LATER

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 30th anniversary of Brown against Board of Education, the landmark Supreme Court case mandating desegregation of public schools. Since then, we have made great strides in race relations, but it was this decision which signaled to the country that major changes were in order.

Today the New York Times published an editorial noting this historic decision. Indeed, the Times states that "nothing less" than a celebration is in order. I wholeheartedly agree and hope my colleagues will join with me in honoring this historic decision.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, May 17, 1984]

THE ENDURING PROMISE OF "BROWN"

Anniversaries of Supreme Court decisions don't usually inspire celebration. But nothing less is in order this week, the 30th anniversary of the decision by which the Court struck down its own colossally wrong acceptance of "separate but equal" treatment for blacks and whites in the preceding half century. To celebrate Brown v. Board of Education is to celebrate a continuing revolution in America's race relations.

The Brown decision was evoked by a carefully developed, 20-year legal assault on racial segregation in public education. But its logic, that separate is inherently unequal, reached far beyond the classroom and still reverberates throughout American society.

Until Brown, the painful-three-century struggle of blacks to move from slavery to full citizenship seemed to be obstructed by the Constitution itself. Despite great cultural advance, generations of blacks could see no end of segregation. But on May 17, 1954, all perspectives changed.

The Brown ruling mandated desegregation in public education—democracy's most promising ticket to equality. It also signalled the end of Jim Crow and the badge of inferiority that had been "legally" imposed on all black Americans.

And the decision has stood rock solid as a matter of law, despite the continuing resistance, not only in the South, to desegregation in schools and housing, and despite the lukewarm enforcement efforts of several Administrations. Brown has left no doubt about the right even where conditions are still woefully wrong.

Even the worst Jim Crow laws did not collapse without further struggle. Segregation in buses and restaurants and voting booths had to be challenged and resisted with boycotts, sit-ins, marches and other demonstrations, almost all nonviolent.

But since Brown, the blacks and whites who fought those battles have had a proud and legal banner to display. Within a decade and a half, Brown's principles were finally written into laws that prohibit discrimination in public accommodations, employment and housing.

The most important of those laws by far was the 1965 Voting Rights Act, whose fruits are only now ripening. With the vote secured, blacks have won a growing number of political offices and gained political awareness and strength, as can be seen from their rallying to the Presidential campaign of the Rev. Jesse Jackson.

Brown v. Board of Education stands as a national confession of error, a true landmark. It propelled the modern civil rights movement, a still-incomplete social revolution. It reaffirmed the American spirit of equality and rekindled hope of peaceful transformation. It is a living monument, a cause for celebration.●

THE 18TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SKY KNIGHT HELICOPTER PATROL PROGRAM

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 2 the city of Lakewood, Calif., will host a special breakfast in honor of the 18th anniversary of the Sky Knight helicopter patrol program, the Nation's only multijurisdictional helicopter patrol. Sky Knight serves the communities of Artesia, Bellflower, Cerritos, Hawaiian Gardens, Lakewood, and Paramount.

Sky Knight is an aerial patrol completely integrated within the Lakewood Sheriff Department's tactical operations system. It has been very popular with local residents who recognize it as an effective law enforcement program. Sky Knight was originally begun in 1966 as an 18-month trial program under a Federal law enforcement assistance grant.

This program pioneered routine helicopter patrols, becoming the first such program in the Nation. At first, only Lakewood was served by Sky Knight, but at the end of the "trial run" period the other cities were added. Since 1966 the Sky Knight fleet has grown to three helicopters patroling an area of 35 square miles and a population of over 240,000.

It is important to note that within the six-city Sky Knight patrol area, a helicopter is always less than 3 minutes away from any law enforcement emergency. Sky Knight is in the air an average of 8 hours a day, and the three helicopters are piloted by city employees with sheriff's deputy observers. Lakewood's first woman pilot on the Sky Knight team is Monica McIntyre.

The helicopters used in this program are two Hughes Aircraft model 300 "C" and one model "B" unit. All are equipped as "silent C" helicopters for quieter operation. They have high intensity direct control searchlight and highpower public address systems for night patrol duties and crowd control. A Sky Knight copter cruises at an altitude of 500 feet during the day and 700 feet after dark at speeds between 50 and 60 miles per hour with a top speed of over 90 miles per hour.

The continuing success of the Sky Knight program, as evidenced by the 18th year anniversary of its inception, proves that innovative technology in law enforcement has made our communities safer and better places to live. I join with my wife, Lee, and the communities served by Sky Knight, in

wishing all involved continued success and progress in combating crime.●

REMARKS CONCERNING SELECTIVE DISCLOSURE OF NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, serving as a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence since that committee was established in 1977, I have seen all too many occasions during which national security information—information which our committee has scrupulously protected—has been selectively released by the executive branch in order to sell an administration policy.

Unfortunately, this week, we have again seen this type of dangerously selective release. The President's National Security Adviser, Mr. Robert McFarlane, appeared on "Meet the Press" last Sunday and referred to an intelligence report which argued that a Cuban-inspired Tet-like offensive by Salvadoran guerrillas is likely to take place this fall. What Mr. McFarlane did not discuss in his "Meet the Press" appearance was information appearing in the very same document—information which contradicts U.S. intelligence estimates that the administration has used to build its case against Nicaragua and the Salvadoran guerrillas. Unfortunately, this information—the other side of the story—remains classified.

Thus, the administration has again released information that supports its case while using security classification to discard or conceal the information which does not support its case.

Mr. Speaker, this issue has been addressed before. Over 1 year ago, some observations were made in the other body by the senior Member from the State of Kentucky about "the selective release of national security information to promote particular policies." It was explained, "sometimes this is done by unauthorized leaks, sometimes in public statements and reports designed to sell an administration's policy." The examples cited over 1 year ago ranged from the Defense Department's release of its report on "Soviet Military Power," to the early 1982 release of classified photography of the arms buildup in Nicaragua. As I have mentioned, Mr. McFarlane's reference to a Cuban-inspired "Tet-like" offensive is another such example.

Such selective dislosure puts the Congress at a great disadvantage. As stated over 1 year ago,

> Those who may see the evidence differently do not have the power to declassify the data that might support their point of view. The President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of Central Intelligence have the authority to declassify; the Congress does not, except in the most extraordinary cases.

The gentleman from Kentucky, whose 9 years of service on intelligence committees adds particular weight to his views, concluded that the attempt to politicize our foreign intelligence and national defense agencies in getting out of hand.

The "selling" of selected pieces of intelligence is of particular concern to the Subcommittee on Oversight and Evaluation. In September 1982, a report by the staff of that subcommittee warned of the politicization of intelligence performance on Central America. While emphasizing that much fine work is done by the intelligence agencies, the report expressed concern that "the environment in which analytic thought and production decisions occur is under pressure to reinforce policy—or perhaps to oppose it—rather to inform it." It concluded that "the influence of consumer desires for 'ammunition' rather than analysis can be subtle or forceful, but its effect upon the intelligence process can become costly."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the pressure upon our intelligence agencies has not decreased since the release of that staff report in September 1982. Of all the loose talk about Central America, I am most concerned about the way information and numbers are bandied. Take, for example, the size of Nicaragua's armed forces. Two years ago, an administration press conference displayed photography of Nicaraguan bases and airfields and stated that Nicaragua's "regular army" was "headed for somewhere between 25,000 and 30,000," with a militia of 100,000 or 150,000. Last year, administration statements suggested that there were as many as 70,000 active-duty personnel, although, in early 1983, the President used a figure of 200,000 to describe the prospective Nicaraguan threat. Last week it was a 100,000-man Nicaraguan Army.

Concerned with these numbers, I have repeatedly asked the Defense Intelligence Agency to provide their most up-to-date figures for all the Nicaraguan military forces. The response distinguishes among the various components of the armed forces, police, militia, and reserves.

It is extremely frustrating to look at the classified answers over the last 2 years while the administration's resounding claims of vast hordes are ringing in my ears. Unfortunately, I cannot say publicly what the intelligence community really believes to be the size of the Sandinista army, border guards, militia, or reservists.

Likewise, to reveal the information in the document which Mr. McFarlane chooses not to reveal because it weakens the administration's position, would be to disclose classified information.

Mr. Speaker, the sad irony is that while the truth remains classified, the rhetoric is released.●

TRIBUTE TO REV. GEORGE A. MILES

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1984, Rev. George A. Miles will retire after having served as president of the Washington Bible College and Capital Bible Seminary for over 39 years. This impressive record gives him the distinction of being the longest incumbent president of any accredited institution of higher education in the United States today.

When President Miles was sworn in as president of the college in 1945, Washington Bible College was a little known school, enrolling 16 students. Today there are over 1,500 students, the school is fully accredited by the Maryland State Board for Higher Education, and is considered a leader among the members of the American Association of Bible Colleges.

In 1958, President Miles founded the Capital Bible Seminary, a graduate school offering three graduate level degrees. He later directed the relocation of the two colleges from the District of Columbia to a 63-acre campus in Prince Georges County. The campus development program entailed seven major building programs with an estimated value of some $10 million.

His outstanding contributions to the field of religious education have not gone unnoticed. He was awarded a certificate of commendation for the leadership he has given to the bible college movement during an annual meeting of the American Association of Bible Colleges.

President Miles has ministered to churches throughout the world beginning in 1951 when he visited American and Korean troops. Since that time, he has ministered to countries in Asia, Latin America, Africa, Europe, and the Middle East. He has been an important force in developing Bible schools in Third World nations and has an especially strong interest in the Bible and missionary theological college in Ikwa, Nigeria.

Mr. Speaker, President, Miles has had a long and distinguished career and his well deserved retirement from religious education will be a great loss to the students and faculty at the Washington Bible College and Capital Bible Seminary. I invite my colleagues to join with me in extending best

wishes to one of America's vital leaders in higher education.●

REBUTTING "STAR WARS" PROGRAM

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues two articles from the Los Angeles Times which masterfully rebut the administration's "Star Wars" program. These are important and timely articles on the President's defense policy as Members continue their discussion on the 1985 defense authorization bill.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 9, 1984]

"STAR WARS" HAS BEEN BADLY OVERSOLD

(By Ernest Conine)

President Reagan, though sometimes a clumsy diplomat, is a good politician. Otherwise he would not have been twice elected governor of California, then gone on to win the nation's highest office. Nor would he now be in such an excellent position to win reelection as President in November.

That being true, it is hard to understand his bungling of the "star wars" issue.

Both the President and Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger have indulged in sometimes careless and exaggerated rhetoric about the purpose and prospects of a stepped-up research-and-development program on ballistic-missile defenses. By doing so they have puzzled and frightened America's allies abroad and handed the Soviet Union a propaganda windfall; they have also given additional fuel to critics at home—all unnecessarily, and all without contributing a thing to national security.

Keep in mind that a sizable research program on possible defense against nuclear-missile attack had been going on for years before Reagan ever took the oath of office. And properly so.

The 1972 ABM treaty drastically limited the actual deployment of anti-ballistic missile systems by the United States and the Soviet Union. But neither side has been willing to run the risk of being caught flat-footed if the other suddenly scrapped the treaty and began to deploy an ABM system in order to tip the nuclear balance.

So both great powers have continued to do research-and-development work on missile-defense systems. Such activities do not violate the 1972 treaty.

Considering that the Soviets have begun to do things that bend if they do not break the treaty, no one should have blamed Reagan if he had announced an acceleration of the R&D program on ballistic-missile defense and warned the Russians to abide by the ABM agreement. But he went further.

In his March, 1983, speech on the subject, the President conjured up the vision of an America—and ultimately of a world—free of the threat of nuclear destruction. In his words, a strategic defense program could 'give us the means of rendering . . . nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete."

If the English language means anything, the President was clearly holding out the prospect of a missile-defense system capable of protecting American cities from nuclear destruction in event of a large-scale missile attack.

Weinberger reinforced that impression when he described the Administration's goal as "a thoroughly reliable and total" defense against nuclear missiles.

Any President must feel cold chills at the thought that, as things stand, this country's only defense against a missile attack that would kill tens of millions of Americans is the threat to kill tens of millions of Russians in return. The idea of a missile-defense system that would hold a protective umbrella over our heads should be alluring to us all, not just to the President.

The problem is that in order to protect cities from attack an ABM system must be nearly perfect. If even a small proportion of the Soviet Union's 9,000 strategic nuclear warheads got through, millions of Americans would die. And almost nobody, even among the most enthusiastic proponents, believes that achievement of a leakproof system is likely.

Any serious effort to build such a system, rather than merely to conduct research and development as an insurance policy against a Soviet abrogation of the ABM treaty, will be enormously expensive.

The Pentagon estimates that it will require an expenditure of $26 billion over a five-year period to explore alternative technologies and to enable whoever is President in the early 1990s to decide whether an actual missile-defense system should be built.

If the answer is yes, the ultimate price tag is anybody's guess. Estimates run as high as half a trillion dollars—this for a program that, according to most knowledgeable defense scientists in and out of government, couldn't be relied on to save the American people from nuclear destruction, anyway.

Given a large enough development effort, there is a better chance of developing a system that would stop, say, 40% or 50% of incoming warheads aimed at this country's land-based strategic missiles. That wouldn't protect the populace, but it might introduce enough uncertainty into Soviet calculations to keep the Kremlin deterred from any thought of a surprise attack.

This more limited objective is in fact the most that most of Reagan's own advisers think is possible. But even here there is a downside.

To begin with, the Soviets might try to offset the effectiveness of such a missile-silo protection system by building more missiles which they could do more cheaply than we could improve the ABM system. They could also place more emphasis on submarines launched cruise missiles that could be countered only by an expensive U.S. air-defense network that does not now exist.

Obviously such a train of events would be inconsistent with the stated U.S. goal in the strategic-arms negotiations, which is to bring about a reduction in numbers of warheads on both sides.

Beyond that, as Weinberger was reminded by this country's allies again last week talk of a limited ABM system disturbs the Europeans on grounds that (1) it smacks of an American attempt to avoid the consequences of a nuclear war in Europe, and (2) by ensuring that the Soviets would build a comprehensive ABM system of their own, it could erode or destroy the deterrent value of the independent French and British nuclear forces.

Again, Reagan could simply have asked Congress for more money to pursue an expanded research-and-development program as a hedge against Soviet abrogation of the ABM treaty and let it go at that. After all, by the Administration's own optimistic timetable, we are talking about a weapon system that wouldn't be ready before the 21st Century.

By talking prematurely and unnecessarily in terms of changing this country's entire strategy in a way that could introduce new instabilities into the balance of terror, he has done a disservice to himself and to true national security.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 15, 1984]

"STAR WARS": MISGIVINGS IN BONN

The Reagan Administration's program aimed at eventual development of a space-based missile defense system has come under heavy attack in this country. The proposal also is stirring deep concern among America's European allies.

Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger outlined the Administration's program for development of a strategic defense system—dubbed "star wars" by its critics—at a recent meeting of North Atlantic Treaty Organization defense ministers.

The idea was to build allied support and understanding for the concept, but the effort fell considerably short of success. The West Germans, especially, are openly uneasy about the U.S. strategic defense program.

Bonn's concerns, as expressed by Defense Minister Manfred Woerner, are in part identical to those expressed by American critics of the "star wars" program—that the United States, by initiating a space-based missile defense system, might introduce a dangerous new instability into the East-West balance of power.

However, the defense minister and other West German leaders also have some specifically European concerns.

One such worry is that if the United States succeeds in building an effective strategic defense system it might be less careful about avoiding situations that could trigger nuclear war in Europe.

A related concern is that such a defense system might be less effective against the short- and medium-range Soviet missiles that threaten Western Europe. Weinberger insisted that the system could be built to protect Western Europe as well as the United States. Even if technologically feasible, however, such a step would require building costly missile defense installations in Europe.

European leaders worry that the enormous resources that would be ultimately required for a "star wars" defense system would force a cutback in other areas of military spending of direct consequence to the defense of Europe.

Finally, there is a concern that the Soviets would be pushed into a more serious missile defense program of their own, thereby depriving the independent French and British nuclear forces of their deterrent value.

Weinberger insisted that European interests would be taken into account every step of the way, but uneasiness persists.

West German leaders have their hands full in dealing with public opposition to the deployment of medium-range missiles in keeping with a 1979 decision by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The last thing that they need is having to defend a new arms race in space.●

COUNTY REVENUE ENHANCEMENT ACT

HON. ED BETHUNE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. BETHUNE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the County Revenue Enhancement Act. This bill would significantly increase State and county revenues derived from national forest lands. My proposal would achieve this by increasing, from 25 to 35 percent, the percentage of revenues States receive from national forests and other lands by limiting road building by the forest service and by requiring that all oil and gas leases on Federal lands be bid on competitively.

As you know, many of our counties are highly dependent upon national forest receipts and other revenue returns. Those counties with a high proportion of Federal lands within their boundaries are unable to collect a sufficient amount of property taxes and, therefore, must rely on these revenues to finance schools and roads. By increasing the county revenue return, these countries will be more capable of meeting the needs of local communities.

My proposal would require a 20-percent reduction in the amount of funds expended in fiscal year 1985 for road construction in the national forests. I have felt for some time now that many of the timber roads constructed are of a quality and quantity that exceeds the needs of the Forest Service, timber purchasers, and recreationists. I understand the Forest Service has been looking into this matter and has revised its plans on paper, but I am not convinced that it has begun to implement any changes on a systemwide basis. Therefore, I am recommending a 20-percent reduction in expenditures on forest road programs. This will free up money for the counties which can be distributed and used for schools.

Additionally, our controversial oil and gas leasing system not only acts as a drain on the U.S. Treasury, but has a similar effect on potential county revenues, as well. As you may know, a State receives 50 percent of the proceeds from oil and gas leasing on Federal lands within its borders. The present, noncompetitive system clearly hurts the States and counties when Federal lands are leased for a mere $1 per acre. If a tract of Federal land does not overlie a proven geological structure—an area where oil or gas deposits are likely to exist—it is generally leased for $1 per acre. Often, these same areas later prove to have valuable oil and gas potential, and the leases may be resold for several thousands of dollars per acre. Thus, both the U.S. Treasury and the States are victimized by the system. In 1982, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that a competitive system could bring in an additional $700 million in revenues over a period of 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the efforts of the Interior Committee, which has already considered a revenue enhancement proposal introduced by my colleague from Oregon (Mr. WEAVER). I would also encourage the Interior Committee and the Agriculture Committee, as well, to look into the merits of my bill. I think it is a sound proposal, which brings some sense to our system of oil and gas leasing, and one that recognizes the special needs of those areas dependent upon Federal revenue returns.●

FLEMING COMMUNITY CENTER, TURNERS STATION, MD.

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today I want to draw the House's attention to the small community of Turners Station in my district, and to the dedication this Saturday of the new Fleming Community Center there. This project is an outstanding example of what can be accomplished when Federal, county, and local leaders unify their efforts. The Fleming Community Center will provide a much needed meeting place for my constituents in Turners Station. So far, those who plan to use the center include the Fleming Senior Citizens, the Baltimore County Day Care Center, the Baltimore County Recreation and Parks Programs, Headstart, and Baltimore County Health programs. The entire Turners Station Community will benefit from the opening of this center.

One group which will be particularly pleased about this new facility will be the Fleming Senior Citizens. This group has been meeting for social, educational, and public service activities since 1975. The new center will provide them with a pleasant atmosphere to come together for their many meetings and activities. It will also provide a location where they can hold their "lunch-plus" program, a program which offers low-cost meals to senior citizens.

I have long been aware of the need for seniors to have a centralized location where they can meet for organized activities. Currently, I am cosponsoring a resolution in the House to identify the second week of May as "Senior Center Week". More than 8,000 of these centers across the country truly "bring-it-together" for our Nation's elderly. They bring Federal assistance and community resources together, as the Fleming Community Center demonstrates so well. As the group of citizens who have certainly contributed the longest and the most to our society, older Americans surely deserve all the respect and assistance the community can offer.

A multiuse facility, like the Fleming Community Center, can only come into being with foresight and management in the public sector. Baltimore County Executive Don Hutchinson, was instrumental in securing the success of this project. I commend Don, the Baltimore County Department of Aging, and the Baltimore County Department of Recreation and Parks for their efforts on behalf of my constituents in Turners Station. I am extremely pleased and proud of the opening of this new center and hope that other communities in the 2d District will soon benefit from similar facilities.●

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, this is "National Police Week," a time to remember that we need police and they need us. As a 23-year veteran of the New York City Police Department, I am distressed that this occasion has come and gone over the last 20 years with very little public notice. Simply put, our Nation's 528,000 law enforcement officers deserve better.

Consider, for example, that the total number of reported crimes in the United States dropped 7 percent in 1983. In fact, there was a drop in every major crime index category from 1982 to 1983. Murders were down 9 percent; forcible rapes were down 1 percent; robberies were down 9 percent; aggravated assaults were down 3 percent; burglaries were down 10 percent; larceny thefts were down 6 percent; motor vehicle thefts were down 6 percent; and arson was down 13 percent.

I am proud to report that in my home city of New York, crime dropped an even greater 9.8 percent in 1983, with murders down 2.8 percent; forcible rapes up 3.2 percent, only category that increased; robberies were down 12.4 percent; aggravated assaults were down 1 percent; burglaries were down 17 percent; larceny thefts were down 1.1 percent; and motor vehicle thefts were down 12.5 percent.

As the front line of defense against crime, our Nation's law enforcement officers deserve a great deal of the credit for these favorable statistics. In fact, looking at the New York City situation, we find that in 1983 there were 384 more police personnel on the city streets than in 1981, and 323 fewer crimes each day. Violent crimes in

New York City plunged from 430 per day in 1981 to 183 per day in 1983.

Due largely, then, to more and better trained police personnel, we appear to be making major strides in the war against crime, but not without a high toll. Just last year, 147 law enforcement officers died while performing their official duties, 5 of them in New York City. During the last 10 years, more than 1,600 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty—nearly 1 police death every 2 days.

The risks a police officer faces in the name of public safety are greater than any other profession. In 1982, there were an average of 153 bodily assaults against police officers each day—more than six police assaults every hour. The number of police officers injured as a result of gunshot wounds averaged 36 a month in 1982.

There are other costs involved, as well. Consider, for example, that approximately 90 percent of the police officers killed in the line of duty are married and, on the average, have two children. Using this data, it is estimated that during the time the public safety officers death benefits program has been paying out benefits for fiscal year 1977 through fiscal year 1983 some 2,926 persons have lost either a spouse or parent as a result of police deaths.

There is also a tremendous financial loss each time a police officer is killed. A 1977 study conducted by the Detroit Police Department concluded each police fatality costs an estimated $200,000, which includes death benefits to survivors, as well as the officer's training and replacement costs. Since the public safety officers death benefits program was established by the Congress a total of $52,800,000 has been paid out to 1,036 families of slain police officers.

Earlier this week, our Nation commemorated "Peace Officers Memorial Day," a once-a-year opportunity to pay tribute to America's forgotten patriots, the men and women of law enforcement who have lost their lives in the line of duty. For the third year in a row the Fraternal Order of Police Ladies Auxiliary brought together the families and comrades of the law enforcement personnel killed in the line of duty during the previous year. The event was held in Senate Park, here in Washington, D.C., and this year the Roll Call of Heroes was made up of the 147 brave men and women who died in the line of duty during 1983. The outstanding work performed by the Fraternal Order of Police Ladies Auxiliary in organizing this very moving and well deserved tribute to our Nation's fallen heroes should not go unnoticed. Each year the event has grown in size and prestige and I wish to salute the members of that fine organization and their President, Trudy Chapman, for their work.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay a special tribute to those 147 courageous men and women who lost their lives in the line of duty during 1983. The Roll Call of Heroes—1983 includes by State:

ROLL CALL OF HEROES—1983

Alabama: Nathaniel Conner, Rex W. Winchester.

Alaska: Gordon B. Bartel, John D. Stimson.

Arizona: Milton P. Antone, Ernest Calvillo, Russell L. Duncan, Thomas P. McNeff, Richard G. Stratman, James M. Young.

Arkansas: Harold G. Matthews.

California: Michael J. Bentley, James P. Clark, Robert J. Davey, Jack Evans, Michael A. Gray, Ramon Irizarry, Jr., Kirk L. Johnson, Lawrence M. Lavieri, David E. Miller, William L. Sikola, Larrell K. Smith, Arthur K. Soo Hoo, Paul L. Verna, William Wong, Kenneth S. Wrede.

Colorado: Larry F. McMasters.

Florida: Thomas A. Bartholomew, Eddie Benitez, Gary Bevel, Charles E. Bruce, Stephen O. Corbett, Ronald L. Fewell, Amedicus Q. Howell, III, Curtis M. Moore, Gary S. Pricher, Joseph F. Solano, Sr., Robert L. Zore.

Georgia: Mary A. Barker, Drew H. Brown, Frank M. Ellerbe, Edward Kitchens, Donward F. Langston, Euel T. Smith, Charles J. Wright.

Hawaii: Thad F. Sugai.

Illinois: Donald A. Bejcek, Kenneth L. Blunt, Anthony L. Creed, Denis Foley, Wayne J. Klacza, Steven W. Mayer, Raymond Lee Terry, Lawrence J. Vincent.

Indiana: Robert S. Grove, Paul A. Kortepeter, William D. Miner, Paul H. Prater.

Kansas: George P. LaBarge.

Kentucky: Jackie D. Claywell, Ricky A. LaFollette, Alexander Obersole, Charles D. Wentworth.

Louisiana: JoAnne Couzynes, William M. Kees.

Maryland: Richard J. Beavers, Carlton X. Fletcher, Samuel Snyder.

Massachusetts: Michael K. Aselton, George L. Hanna, Walter P. Langley.

Michigan: Michael J. Bossuyt, Tony L. Thames, Terry Lee Thompson.

Minnesota: Brian W. Heikkila.

Mississippi: George Daniel Nash, Jr., Earnest C. Null.

Missouri: Charles D. Hartman, Charles E. James, Phillip A. Miller.

New Jersey: Lester A. Pagano.

New Mexico: Gerald E. Cline.

New York: Paul Ashburn, Joseph P. McCormack, Donald W. Robinson, Brian N. Rovnak, James P. Rowley, Malcolm D. Strong, Charles J. Trojahn.

North Carolina: Donald Wade Allred.

North Dakota: Robert S. Cheshire, Kenneth B. Muir.

Ohio: Frederick J. Beard, Richard E. Becker, Benjamin Grair, William L. Johnson, Bruce E. Mettler, Joseph Z. Moore, Sharon E. Moore, Robert B. Rigoni, Michael L. Sweeney.

Oklahoma: Travis L. Bench, Steven Leroy Mahan, Richard Oliver, Donald W. Smiley.

Oregon: Joseph V. Omlin III, Donald E. Smith.

Pennsylvania: Charles E. Attig, Jr., David A. Barr, Frank J. Bowen, Edward M. Butko, Jr., John F. Duffy, William R. Evans, James R. Milcarek, Sr., Norman A. Stewart, David W. Witmer.

South Carolina: John R. Clinton, Daniel W. Cogburn, Harold N. Cousar.

Tennessee: Dennis R. Armes, Aaron D. Glenn, Robert S. Hester, Ronnal R. Stanley, Larry J. Tidwell.

Texas: Ernesto Alanis, Milton C. Alexander, Ronald D. Baker, Russell L. Boyd, R. F. Camfield, Ollie F. Childress, Jr., Charles R. Coates II, Daniel M. Higdon, Jr., Robert R. Jones, William Moss, Carl J. Norris, John R. Pasco, Gilbert E. Ramirez, Charles A. Renfro, Clark M. Rosenbalm, Billy G. Smeley, Lowell C. Tribble.

Vermont: Arthur L. Yeaw.

Virginia: John E. Rafter, Clifford W. Scott, Jr., Dennis M. Smedley.

Washington: Brian F. Orchard.

Wyoming: Jon R. Hardy, Craig L. Schulte.

District of Columbia: Raymond E. Mumford.

Guam: Abraham Sablan Quitugua, Raymond Salas Sanchez.

Puerto Rico: Jesus Diaz Batista, Raul Moldonado Coreano, Rafael Cumba Ortiz, Jose M. Ortiz Otero, William Santiago Pagan, David Perez Valentin.●

A TRIBUTE TO LUKE GRAY

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, we have lost a fine American today, Mr. Lewis Gray of Somerset County, N.J. A man who commanded respect and admiration from both friends and adversaries.

I came to know Luke when I first ran for Congress; the words Somerset County and Luke Gray were synonymous. Luke had served as Republican county chairman since 1955. His knowledge, wisdom, and political savvy encouraged many, included myself, to pursue public office. Luke's unique "old boy" personality was sought out by many a Federal, State, and local official. His efforts have been recognized by many Presidents including Ronald Reagan.

Luke Gray was an exceptional human being whose energy was devoted to public service. Besides serving as county chairman for 29 years, Luke served as mayor of Watchung, sat on the board of governors of Somerset Trust Co., and the county tax board.

Luke's office, covered with signed photographs, letters of recognition, and other memorabilia of a political career which spanned many decades, is perhaps the best illustration of his influential position, and the degree of respect he gained over the years. I know there are many, many people who mourn today over the loss of what Luke was to them—mentor, confidant, troubleshooter, adviser. I know because he was all those things to me. Most importantly, Luke was my trusted friend. I, too, mourn this deep loss.●

THE MX VOTE

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House capitulated once again to administration pressure and voted for production of the MX missile. This is a dangerous, destabilizing first-strike weapon that can only make the United States and the world more vulnerable. It is a crime to build it. Any pretense that it is defensive in nature was demolished when the Reagan administration decided to place it in vulnerable Minuteman silos. This weapon is useless to us as a deterrent, and its power as a bargaining chip is as illusory as all the other new weapons systems the administration has sought to justify on this basis.

Deterrence is the art of producing in the mind of the enemy the fear of counterattack. Right now the United States has deployed 11,000 strategic nuclear weapons. According to former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, the firepower from just one of our nuclear submarines is enough to destroy 160 Soviet cities. If this is not enough to deter a Soviet attack, then what is? One hundred MX missiles in highly vulnerable silos will not swing the balance, they will merely give the Soviet Union one more set of targets and a stronger incentive to move their defensive weapons onto a launch-on-warning system, not a scenario we should be encouraging.

As to enhancing our bargaining power with the Soviet Union, the MX has not done the job yet, and there is no indication that building more will change that situation. In fact, all historical evidence points to the likelihood that the Soviets will move ahead and match us missile for missile. When we built an intercontinental bomber in the 1950's, the Soviets followed suit. When we developed the multiple warhead missile, the Soviets did the same 2 years later. When we deployed our first MIRV's in 1970, the Soviets accelerated their program and had MIRV's by 1975. All these initiatives diminished the security of the United States and discouraged arms control rather than providing an effective incentive for negotiations.

In 3½ years, the Reagan administration has produced nothing of substance in the area of arms control. Rather, we have driven the Soviet Union away from strategic arms talks by deploying Pershing and cruise missiles in Europe; the Reagan administration has pursued weapons systems and testing which threaten to violate SALT II and the ABM treaties; it has refused to negotiate space weapons, and has pursued an end to our 16-year moratorium on chemical weapons production.

Last year the MX was funded by the Congress, in part due to President Reagan's promise that the administration would bring about a change in the Soviet's bargaining position. The administration has not delivered on that promise, and it has given us no reason to believe that building more missiles would make any difference.

The Scowcroft report admits that the MX in easily targetable silos is a sitting duck, so why should the administration so desperately want it built? What the MX gives us is a dramatic first-strike missile. With 10 warheads, each of which can take out a Soviet ICBM silo, 100 MX's would be a significant threat, but only if we use it first. The Soviets most likely response to our building the MX will not be to come back to the bargaining table, it will be to develop their own first strike weapon.

The MX missile program makes no sense defensively, economically, or as a bargaining tool. Since 1979, the cost of the program has increased 66 percent. We cannot continue to finance a disastrous weapon on the empty promises of an administration that has no real commitment to arms control. I fervently hope that when the House considers the MX again during the appropriations process we may reach a different conclusion.●

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE FIRPTA REPEAL BILL

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to repeal the Foreign Investment in Real Property Tax Act (FIRPTA). I am pleased to announce that joining me in this effort are my colleagues from the Committee on Ways and Means Messrs. GIBBONS, DUNCAN, FLIPPO, FRENZEL, MATSUI, and VANDER JAGT.

FIRPTA was an amendment to our Internal Revenue Code which was enacted by the 96th Congress as part of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1980. Under the provisions two new Internal Revenue Code sections were added. Section 897 imposes a capital gains tax on nonresident foreign investors who are not engaged in a U.S. trade or business and who are not otherwise subject to the capital gains tax generally applicable to transactions in U.S. real property. The other provision, section 6039C, provides for extensive reporting with respect to U.S. real property transactions in which foreign investors are engaged, whether or not these persons generally were subject to U.S. tax prior to the FIRPTA legislation.

Numerous problems developed subsequent to the enactment of this legislation. Specifically, the Treasury has had an enormous amount of difficulty providing regulatory guidance relative to the extent reporting is required. This difficulty exists primarily because of an inability to interpret precisely the extent to which this legislation requires reporting in a variety of complicated situations. As a result a tremendous amount of uncertainty has been created relative to the reporting required. In addition, the reporting requirements have created an enormous amount of concern on the part of foreign investors who have no objection to paying U.S. tax with respect to their real property transactions in the United States, but are most concerned about maintaining their anonymity with respect to these transactions for a variety of concerns unrelated to U.S. tax policy.

While I am not completely satisfied that an outright repeal of all the provisions of FIRPTA is absolutely necessary to address the concerns set forth above, I do believe that this is certainly one alternative for addressing these problems. My bill would eliminate all of the reporting confusion that has been created as a result of FIRPTA and would relieve some foreign taxpayers from tax liability with respect to their U.S. real property transactions. I should note that a number of foreign taxpayers will continue to be subject to tax with respect to their real property transactions in the United States as was the case under the law prior to FIRPTA. I certainly should indicate that I am more than willing to consider other alternatives for addressing the concerns which have prompted me to introduce this legislation. I should note that my colleague, Mr. GIBBONS, has introduced an alternate approach to these problems, H.R. 5326, the FIRPTA Withholding Tax Act of 1984. Under Mr. GIBBONS' bill the reporting requirements of FIRPTA are repealed and replaced with a withholding system. The Florida Bar Association has supported Mr. GIBBONS' approach as one that addresses many of the concerns raised by the current FIRPTA provisions. As a result I would certainly consider examining this approach as an additional alternative for addressing the problems created by the existing statute. In view of the amount of confusion and uncertainty that has been created by the existing statute, I urge the Congress to take action in the near future on either my bill or other alternatives, such as the one suggested by Mr. GIBBONS, for addressing this urgent need.●

GIFTED MUSICIAN AND EDUCATOR PASSED AWAY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this past winter, the State of Maryland lost a very special and gifted musician and educator. Dr. Eulah Viola Blue Peters, professor of music at Bowie State College, and a prolific voice in Maryland's music education system, passed away on February 12, 1984.

Dr. Peters was well known and greatly admired not only by her students, but by music aficionados around the State of Maryland. At Bowie State College, she served as chairperson of the department of fine and performing arts and was a frequent guest conductor, clinician, and adjudicator for junior and senior high school choruses throughout the State.

Her dedication to music and education is apparent as one reviews her impressive list of accomplishments. She trained the Bowie State College Choir for a special performance with the National Gallery Orchestra under the direction of Mr. Richard Bales, collaborated and assisted with the music program for special education students in the Prince Georges County public school system, and served on the board of trustees for the Prince Georges Art Council. In addition, she directed the choruses for the Christian Community Presbyterian Church in Bowie, Md., and the Sargent Memorial Presbyterian Church in Washington, D.C.

Her indefatigable spirit and determination to live life to the fullest, even as she suffered the final stages of cancer, never flagged; 2 months before her death, Dr. Peters brought a group of students from Bowie State College down to my Washington office to sing Christmas carols for me and my staff.

Mr. Speaker, her death has left a void in both the Prince Georges County and the State music education systems that will be felt for many years to come, and I join with Dr. Peters' long list of friends in extending my sympathies to her husband, Raymond, and her family.●

WARBASSE HOUSES AND TRUMP VILLAGE: A COOPERATIVE HOUSING DREAM COME TRUE

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay tribute to a unique community and institution in my congressional district, Amalgamated Warbasse Houses and Trump Village. These are two, adjacent, high rise cooperative apartment developments which will celebrate their 20th anniversary this Sunday, May 20, 1984.

Cooperative housing ventures have made it possible for thousands of American families to find decent, safe, affordable housing in our cities. New York State led the Nation two decades ago in the cooperative housing movement for moderate-income families when it designed the New York State Mitchell Lama cooperative housing program. This program made it possible for large, attractive, and modern housing to be built on West 5th Street in place of an old, decaying bungalow colony, which had outlived its usefulness and become an eyesore.

Today Amalgamated Warbasse Houses and Trump Village are home to 20,000 New Yorkers—which means that they actually contain more residents than many of our Nation's cities. This community within a community is a remarkable place not only because of its size and stability, but also because it has allowed New Yorkers' who otherwise would have been forced to flee the city because of soaring housing costs, a chance to remain in the city in attractive and safe surroundings.

These Mitchell Lama cooperative apartment buildings are now an anchor of stability and a source of community strength and pride. What was once a rundown and delapidated neighborhood is now a vibrant and vital community with 15 highrise buildings surrounded by landscaped grounds and pleasant sitting areas. Local businesses have benefited from this development, and two thriving shopping centers are located along Neptune Avenue. Three neighborhood public schools, as well as a number of synagogues, churches, and community organizations have also been positively effected by the development of these buildings, and by the contributions and active support of the residents of the high rises who have proven themselves to be most generous and civic-minded neighbors.

The planners and developers of this community within a community, as well as the citizen activists and elected officials who worked to bring about the construction of these apartments, were truly men and women with a vision. But they also had the foresight and determination to accomplish this dream. Thanks to them, and to the continued interest and support of the generations of cooperators who have lived there, Warbasse Houses and Trump Village have kept the dream of a cooperative affordable residential community alive and well.

The residents of these buildings are now a mainstay not only of the shorefront area, but of the entire borough of Brooklyn. The cooperators have wisely and generously invested their time, energy, ideas, and financial resources to benefit their neighborhood, the larger shorefront community. Such efforts have kept New York a city of neighborhoods, and a city with a heart.

In closing, I would like to pay a special tribute to Stella Burris, Mark Daitsman, Paul Deutsch, Jeff Friedman, Sidney Jonas, Sam Meltzer, Mindy Sherman, Ruth Tanenbaum, Mike Weber, and Florence Weissman, who planned this week's celebration and are members of the 20th Anniversary Committee. I also want to acknowledge once again the countless thousands of dedicated community leaders whose vision, foresight, and hard work helped to make the dream of Warbasse and Trump—a lovely, clean, attractive, and thriving middle-income family community—a reality.

May the success of Warbasse and Trump help convince the Congress, our States, and our Federal Government that programs to enable more Americans to achieve the dream of owning affordable, decent housing must again become one of our highest priorities as a nation.●

A TRIBUTE TO CATHERINE O'RESTO SCARSELLA

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues a celebration which will serve as testament to the continued vibrance and strength of the American family. On Saturday, May 26, 1984, Catherine O'Resto Scarsella will be honored by her children, grandchildren, nieces, and nephews on the occasion of her 70th birthday. The outpouring of love and respect at this family gathering will be more than a simple commemoration of Mrs. Scarsella's birthdate, it will be a celebration of her life and the indomitable will and spirit with which God has blessed her.

Widowed at age 37, with four young daughters, Mrs. Scarsella assumed the roles of both father and mother, breadwinner and homemaker. Her success as a single parent is evidenced not only by the love her children feel for her, but by the happiness, joy and success they have enjoyed in their lives. Her eldest daughter Elizabeth is happily married and blessed with two sons; daughter Maryann is busy raising a family of three sons and a daughter; her daughter Catherine is married with two daughters and resides with her husband in West Germany; Joan, the youngest of the family, carries on the family tradition

by providing Mrs. Scarsella with four grandchildren, three boys and one girl.

Mrs. Scarsella's life experiences extend far beyond the realm of raising a family. For 15 years until her retirement in 1982, she was a valuable and respected employee of the New York City court system. She has traveled extensively, and she is an ardent patron of the arts.

I hope that all of my colleagues in the Congress will join me in recognizing the life of Catherine O'Resto Scarsella as one that vividly personifies the continued vitality of the American family and its importance to the well-being of this Republic.●

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF MONTE CASSINO

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues the 40th anniversary of the World War II battle of Monte Cassino in Italy, where the heroic men of the Polish Army-in-exile fought courageously against the forces of nazism. It was on May 18, 1944, that Monte Cassino Monastery, a most important strategic point in the Nazi defense system was taken by the 2d Polish Corps under the able command of Lt. Gen. Wladyslaw Anders.

The city of Cassino was a major position in the German winter defense, the "Gustav Line," and because of the flooding of the Rapido River in the spring of 1944, it was impossible to use tanks and motorized equipment in this area. Instead, the allied attack of this position had to be made, unsupported by tanks, by infantry alone, and this action was extremely costly in casualties, being one of the bloodiest battles in World War II.

British, French, and American troops were engaged in this campaign, which reached a climax during the month of May. A massive air raid on February 15, 1944, was launched against the German command within the Benedictine abbey situated on top Monte Cassino, a hill which dominated the surrounding ground, and this stronghold was finally captured by the brave efforts of the 2d Polish Corps on May 18, 1944.

The 2d Polish Corps was part of the Fifth Army under the command of Gen. Mark W. Clark, and following the battle he praised his troops for this impressive military victory, by saying:

> The Polish 2d Corps fought so splendidly under Lieutenant General Anders that it accomplished the nearly impossible—it took Cassino . . . without the superb fighting of the Polish Corps the capture of Cassino would have been extremely difficult, prolonged, and perhaps long delayed . . .

I was privileged to visit the cemetery at Monte Cassino dedicated to the Polish war dead while I was in Europe attending a conference of NATO parliamentarians, and we must never forget the bravery of those who were willing to give their lives in dedication to the freedom of their respective countries. Close to 5,000 members of the Polish Army were killed in this battle, and they are buried in four separate cemeteries in Italy.

Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of the 40th anniversary of the battle of Monte Cassino, I am proud to join with the Polish Americans in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am honored to represent, and Americans of Polish descent all over this country, who are commemorating the heroism of those who died for our freedom at the battle of Monte Cassino. To Poles, the struggle for freedom and self-determination is universal, and they have fought bravely for the sanctity of these noble principles for all freedom loving countries throughout the world.●

A MODEL PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE PROGRAM

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to salute today the efforts of the Health and Medical Education Center at Portland Adventist Hospital in Portland, Oreg.

"The Good Health Pioneers," as they are called at Portland Adventist, have helped make Oregon a national leader in health maintenance efforts.

More than $300 billion was spent on health care in the United States in 1983, at the same time that the U.S. Surgeon General has found that the general quality of our health has diminished. Clearly, unless we start taking preventive health care more seriously, we will continue to pour more money into our health care while getting very little in return.

Although general awareness of the importance of preventive medicine in keeping our Nation fit and in keeping health care costs down is just beginning to grow, Portland Adventist has emphasized health, fitness, and preventive medicine for more than 90 years. The center offers a wide variety of hospital-sponsored programs in health education and fitness, in keeping with their belief that the best way to find health for life is through proper nutrition, adequate exercise, and a healthier lifestyle.

While the center is helping individuals live healthier, fuller lives, it is also helping employers develop cost-effective fitness and health programs for their employees. Programs such as these can increase productivity, reduce sick time, and help business, industry, and ultimately the Federal Government save thousands of dollars each year on medical and insurance costs.

More than 10,000 health-conscious Oregonians participated in Portland Adventist's health maintenance programs in 1983; 20,000 are expected to participate this year. Portland Adventist has been actively pursuing preventive health programs aimed at all Oregonians, including programs to educate the public on the dangers of smoking, alcoholism, and obesity, and on the importance of prenatal care, stress relief, and proper dental care.

I applaud Portland Adventist for its progressive health maintenance programs and all Oregonians for their active involvement in the center's good works. Portland Adventist has the jump on the Federal Government in terms of the benefits of preventive medicine. We should use them as an example as we try to catch up.●

NORTH AND SOUTH KOREAN PARTICIPATION IN THE 1984 OLYMPIC GAMES

HON. HAL DAUB

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity to learn that overseas Koreans, numbering approximately 750,000 in the United States, are campaigning for the establishment of a united athletic team, comprised of athletes from North and South Korea, to participate in the 1984 Olympic games and other international sports competitions.

The General Council for Unifying Olympic Teams from North and South Korea [GCUOTNSK], initiated on March 27, 1983, was formally established on May 3, 1984, as a self-sponsored, nonprofit organization.

The purpose and philosophy of the organization is to encourage the formation of a joint sports team for the 1984 Olympic games and a single team for international sports competitions. The proposals for joint single teams for the 1984 Olympic games in Los Angeles and for international sports competitions was first advanced by a Korean immigrant, Pak Bong Chul and others, to petition to both proper authorities of Korea.

The Minister of Sports of the Republic of Korea has expressed his willingness to meet North Korean officials to discuss measures necessary to bring about a united Korea Olympic team.

I am pleased to note the spirit of this courageous initiative for peace

and fellowship, which deserves support from all quarters, and I lend the initiative my support.

Conflict, it is feared, could arise out of misperceptions or miscalculations, as a result of the permanent tension between the parts of this country, divided by an accident of history. All attempts at reunification over the years have failed.

In the 1970's, there were some direct contacts, both on a governmental level and through Red Cross organizations, but these attempts ended in bitter wrangling and failure.

Confidence-building measures, such as bilateral sports exchanges, family reunification and mail exchange, would have to be realized before the expansion of the negotiating track between the two halves of the bitterly divided peninsula.

The official dedication of the single teams for the 1984 Olympics would constitute a major occasion for reaffirming the close ties between the people of North and South Korea and would present a unique opportunity for insuring that those ties are strengthened.

Also strengthened would be the hope for peaceful reunification and at the very least a relaxation of tensions in Northeast Asia.●

A TRIBUTE TO LAURA CUSHMAN

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on May 19 the Miami community is honoring an outstanding educator, Laura Cushman, the 97-year-old funder of the Cushman School. The Cushman School is the oldest independent elementary school in Dade County. This year it celebrates its 60th anniversary.

Miss Cushman is one of south Florida's pioneer residents, moving to Miami with a degree from Morningside College in Sioux City, Iowa. She taught kindergarten and home economics for about 6 years and, in the afternoons, she held education classes for teachers. In 1922 when Dade County officials decided to eliminate kindergartens, Miss Cushman resigned her job and set up a school on her front porch.

The first year she attracted 12 students. The next year there were enough students to move off the porch and in 1924 the school, now known as the Cushman School, moved into a two-story, stucco building not far from downtown Miami. It has been a landmark there ever since. A newer building houses kindergarteners and first graders.

For 10 years Miss Cushman was an associate professor at the Florida State College for Women which is now Florida State University at Tallahassee. Later she studied, furthering her own education, at the Columbia Teaching College in New York, Wheelock College in Boston, and the University of California at Berkeley.

A priority of the Cushman School is building good character. The Cushman School is justly proud of the fine citizens it has graduated. The Cushman School also produces youngsters who are trained to achieve. Its 175 students constantly strive to improve their own performance.

In addition to the traditional grade school subjects the Cushman School also teaches music, art, and computer science. All students, including the kindergarteners, study Spanish. The students produce monthly plays and two major productions a year.

The Cushman School makes a special effort to accommodate students whose parents are financially unable to send them. Out of the 175 student body 22 are on scholarship even though there is no endowment. Miss Cushman finds a way for them to attend even if it means waiting until the parents can afford to pay.

The Cushman School is very special and in this as well as other matters it reflects the guiding spirit of its founder, Laura Cushman. Miss Cushman worked actively at the school until she was 86 and remains chairman of the board of trustees.

On its 60th anniversary it is fitting that the school pay tribute to the remarkable and vital lady who has served it so long and well.●

WHERE'S THE INITIATIVE?

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, one might sum up the present state of the budget by paraphrasing both a well-known television commercial and a well-known Presidential candidate: "Where's the initiative?" It sure isn't here in Congress. We'll talk up a storm about deficits and the need to cut them. But then we will turn right around and pass every conceivable spending bill in sight; and quite a few that are out of sight.

The proper role of Congress, and especially the House of Representatives, is to keep a watchful eye on the Nation's Treasury and act responsibly to insure that we spend within our means. Well, we know what the chances of that are. If we had been doing our job, there would be no talk about a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. It would not be necessary.

Sadly, congressional neglect of its fiscal duties has prompted the people of this Nation to take the steps necessary to bring about responsible budgetary practices without and despite Congress. In 32 States, weary taxpayers have passed resolutions calling for a balanced budget amendment, either through congressional action or mandated by a constitutional convention. Two more States and bingo! The matter will be out of Congress' hands.

Now quite a few folks, including several erstwhile budget-conscious colleagues, are fearful of calling such a convention. There has only been one in our Nation's history. Will another one jeopardize the very framework of the Constitution? Will a "runaway" convention consider and draft amendments other than a balanced budget? It is possible. But steps can and ought to be taken to insure that the deliberations of the convention delegates are limited to only a balanced budget amendment. And the biggest obstacle of them all, three-fourths of the States must ratify whatever the convention drafts. It is difficult to conceive of a runaway, irresponsible convention—junking our entire present Constitution, or materially changing various aspects of it—succeeding in obtaining popular acceptance. One need only consider the great difficulty which the ERA has encountered along the way.

The bottom line is, of course, that this route of action—which is in a sense radical—has been reserved for the people to take when their elected representatives fail or refuse to take requisite action. And, since Congress will not balance the budget, the American people are determined to do it themselves. The fact that we are 32 States—94 percent—toward that goal should provide ample cause for reflection on the seriousness of the matter.

On February 17, petitions bearing the signatures of over 600,000 Californians were filed in order to place the balanced budget initiative on the November ballot. Similar drives are underway in other States—Montana is a hopeful prospect at this date. Elsewhere, in both Kentucky and Michigan, the amendment has passed one legislative chamber. Washington and Vermont are two other States where there is potential for activity this year.

From among this group of six States, the chance that any two of them will put the amendment drive over the top is no worse than 50/50. The time is quickly approaching when the powers that be in Washington, from Congress to the Federal Reserve to the Treasury to the corporate and financial infrastructure, had better realize that they can no longer ignore or casually dismiss this initiative. They have allowed the situation to deteriorate to the point where the authority to control matters will be in someone else's hands—the people's. Perhaps

that ultimate solution is better than the alternative after all.●

D.C. STUDENTS PARTICIPATE IN MATH COUNTS COMPETITION

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 19, a team of five seventh and eighth grade students from the District of Columbia public schools will represent the District in Math Counts, a national mathematics competition. The competition will be held in the District of Columbia on the campus of George Washington University.

The competition which produced the statewide teams were held in two rounds in February and April of this year. The students who will represent the District of Columbia team in the national competition are Warren Tildon, Charles Jones, and Amani Harrison from Jefferson Junior High School, Todd Goren from Brent School and Michelle Smith from Taft Junior High School. Ms. Sue P. White, mathematics teacher from Jefferson and Mr. John Coleman, retired statistician are the coaches for the District team.

Math Counts is an accelerated coaching program combined with a series of competitions to produce high levels of math achievement in junior high school students across the Nation. Although successful Math Counts programs have existed for several years in Alabama, Florida, and Illinois, this year will mark the first national Math Counts competition with participation by teams representing all 50 States. The program is sponsored by the National Society of Professional Engineers, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, and the CNA Insurance Co.

The students must compete in written and oral examinations which cover a wide range of mathematical topics including many concepts taught in college-level courses. The students compete on an individual and team basis.

Mr. Speaker, this program is an excellent example of the ability of the District of Columbia public schools to produce students with exceptional skills.●

FASCELL CALLS FOR A NEW SPACE ARMS CONTROL POLICY

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last year the Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs, which I chair, initiated a series of hearings on "Arms Control in Outer Space." The hearings examined and evaluated the arms control, foreign policy and national security issues and implications of the administration's space arms control and defense policy.

Based on these hearings to date, I believe that the major elements of a national space arms control and defense policy should include:

First, suspension of the U.S. ASAT testing program provided that the Soviet Union does not resume its testing program.

Second, resumption of bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union to ban antisatellite weapons.

Third, initiation of bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union to ban all space weapons.

Fourth, upgrading U.S. satellite survivability through effective hardening measures. Hardening our satellites is something we can do unilaterally to protect our satellites against the present marginal Soviet ASAT capability.

Fifth, maintaining ballistic missile defense research consistent with existing arms control agreements. This would provide a hedge against possible Soviet breakout—a policy which we have maintained since the signing of the ABM Treaty.

During the subcommittee's hearings, I learned that the administration's space policy is expensive and serious doubts were raised as to its technical feasibility. Such a policy could lead to an irreversible arms race in space.

Based on these hearings, the subcommittee has issued an "Interim Report on the Administration Space Arms Control and Defense Policy," which follows my remarks. The report identifies five major problems of the current space policy. These are:

First, excessive costs.

The cost of the antisatellite (ASAT) weapons program will be in the "tens of billions of dollars."

The cost of the strategic defense initiative (SDI), the so-called "Star Wars" policy ranges from $500 billion—double the current DOD budget—to over a trillion dollars.

Second, technically unworkable.

The proposed strategic defense initiative (SDI) is presently technically unworkable. A recent OTA study made that very conclusion and recommended that such a program should not serve as the basis of public expectation or national policy.

Third, negative impact on arms control.

Deployment of the strategic defense initiative (SDI) will ultimately mean the abrogation of the ABM Treaty, one of the most successful arms control agreements to date.

Furthermore, engaging in an ASAT competition with the Soviet Union, jeopardizes satellites that are vital to our national security interests and our capability to assure Soviet compliance with current and prospective arms control agreements. As a matter of fact, the report indicates that the United States has more to lose than the Soviets in a space arms race.

Fourth, results in a dual arms race.

Active pursuit of the strategic defense initiative (SDI) will result in a dual arms race: Escalating the current arms race in offensive weapons as well as initiating a new arms race in defensive weapons. The result will be less not more stability.

Fifth, reignites the volatile issue of decoupling.

Pursuit of the strategic defense initiative (SDI) and antisatellite (ASAT) weapons will result in the potential alienation of our closest allies. NATO allies have already expressed concern that this administration's policy will leave them unprotected and decoupled from the U.S. nuclear umbrella. This understandable concern is premised on the very difficulty I have with the program: If the program is not technically capable of defending the United States, how can our allies be expected to believe that it will protect them as well?

Accordingly, I am calling for a more balanced U.S. space arms control and defense policy, one that enhances U.S. national security and arms control interests.

It is my sincere hope that this will help to preserve the use of space for peaceful purposes as opposed to creating yet another facet of the arms race: A dangerous arms race in space.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

As of May 1984, the Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs, chaired by DANTE B. FASCELL, completed three hearings on "Arms Control in Outer Space." The subject of arms control in space was brought to the forefront of public attention primarily due to President Reagan's speech of March 23, 1983. In that speech the President challenged the scientific community to find ways to "render nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete." This sparked a number of responses among scientists and arms control experts, many of whom testified before the subcommittee.

Under the chairmanship of the late Clement J. Zablocki, the Subcommittee on International Security and Sci-

entific Affairs began a series of hearings to examine and evaluate the arms control, foreign policy, and national security issues and implications of the administration's space policy. In particular, the subcommittee examined the administration's antisatellite (ASAT) weapons policy and its strategic defense initiative (SDI), commonly referred to as "Star Wars."

On November 10, 1983, the subcommittee held its first hearing on "Arms Control in Outer Space. Witnesses testifying before the subcommittee included: Hon. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY (Democrat, Massachusetts), Hon. JOHN F. SEIBERLING (Democrat, Ohio), Dr. John Steinbruner, director of the foreign policy studies program, at the Brookings Institution, and Dr. Richard L. Garwin, IBM fellow at the Thomas J. Watson Research Center.

INTERIM REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S SPACE ARMS CONTROL AND DEFENSE POLICY

Under the Chairmanship of Dante B. Fascell, the subcommittee held its second hearing on April 10, 1984. Witnesses testifying before the subcommittee included: The Honorable George E. Brown, Jr. (D-Calif.), the Honorable Norman D. Dicks (D-Wash.) and Mr. Kenneth L. Adelman, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

On May 2, 1984, the subcommittee held its third hearing on the issue. Witnesses testifying before the subcommittee included: the Honorable Mel Levine (D-Calif.), the Honorable Gerard Smith, former chief of the U.S. Delegation to the SALT I negotiations, who was accompanied by Mr. John Rhinelander, Legal Counsel to the SALT I negotiations, the Honorable Robert W. Buchheim, former head of the United States Delegation to the United States-Soviet negotiations on Antisatellite Systems and Dr. Kurt Gottfried, a physicist representing the Union of Concerned Scientists.

FINDINGS

During these hearings, testimony was heard from congressional and administrative witnesses as well as from private experts in the scientific, arms control, legal and defense communities. During these hearings considerable concern was expressed about the viability, practicality and desirability of the administration's space arms control and defense policy. These areas of concern include:

(1) The excessive costs of the United States and Soviet military space policy

The subcommittee learned that the Department of Defense's original estimate of $4 billion for the air-launched ASAT would more likely cost in the "tens of billions of dollars." At the same time, the subcommittee learned that the Soviet Union has dedicated important resources toward the development, testing and operation of an ASAT interceptor in the 1970's.

Furthermore the subcommittee learned that cost estimates for completion of SDI program would range from $500 billion to over one trillion dollars. Equally important, the subcommittee learned that the Soviet Union has provided substantial resources toward improvements in air defense capability, including a research effort on strategic defense against incoming warheads.

(2) The technical feasibility of the SDI program

To date, the subcommittee has not received conclusive evidence that a perfect or near perfect defense is technically feasible. This will be a matter of continued subcommittee attention as it pursues hearings on space policy. As has been the practice between the superpowers in the nuclear age, the practice of each side developing a countermeasure to the other side's systems could continue unabated under the United States and Soviet strategic defense programs. In its study, the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) found that for every strategic defense technology proposed to date a countermeasure has been found.

(3) Its adverse impact on arms control

The subcommittee learned that the proposed U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) as well as Soviet efforts in this area, including their construction of new radars, could very well undermine the ABM Treaty. The ABM Treaty was based on the common superpower recognition that ballistic missile defense could not only accelerate the offensive arms race, but also create another arms race in defensive systems, which could result in a destabilization of the existing strategic balance. An increase in both United States and Soviet ASAT capabilities, as well as a strategic defensive build-up may well prove unavoidable, if efforts to limit these weapons are not mutually made by both superpowers.

Verification of a ban on ASAT systems is already difficult and would be made even more difficult if the United States moved forward with its F-15 launched ASAT program. While the U.S. Air Force only plans to equip about 40 F-15's with ASATs, the fact that every F-15 is potentially a platform for an ASAT system makes adequate verification agreements more difficult to achieve. At the same time, the subcommittee learned that the Soviet interceptor is relatively small and is fitted to a Soviet space booster used for other launch missions.

Finally, deploying weapons specifically designed to destroy satellites, many of which are crucial to national technical means of verification, could jeopardize the verification of current and prospective arms control agreements.

In this regard, the subcommittee learned that current U.S. and Soviet ASAT systems could threaten only lower orbiting satellites which largely monitor tactical troop and naval maneuvers. The satellites that the U.S. and the Soviet Union depend upon for early warning, nuclear attack assessment, electronic intelligence, military communication, and verification of arms control agreements are generally in higher orbits. Both countries have much to lose in an uncontrolled ASAT race, particularly one which leads to attacks on higher orbiting satellites. Since the United States is more dependent on satellites for arms control verification than the Soviets, the United States has more to lose in this regard than the Soviets in an uncontrolled ASAT arms race.

(4) A dual arms race

United States and Soviet strategic defense programs could further stimulate an arms race in offensive weapons as well as defensive weapons. Both the United States and the Soviets could resond to the development of defensive systems by not only increasing their defensive capabilities but also by upgrading the ability of their offensive weapons to penetrate upgraded defensive systems.

(5) The potential alienation of our country's closest allies

Many of our allies have expressed grave concern over the President's space weapons program. They view this as a policy that will not only promote confrontation between the superpowers but will leave them unprotected and de-coupled from the U.S. strategic defensive umbrella.●

MINORITY VIEWS OF HON. HENRY J. HYDE ON THE INTERIM REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S SPACE ARMS CONTROL AND DEFENSE POLICY

I am compelled to register my strong dissent to the subcommittee's findings of the Interim Report on the Administration's Space Arms Control and Defense Policy.

First and foremost, I am distressed over the report's repeated use of the phrase "the subcommittee learned". The subcommittee didn't "learn"—it was "told"—by witnesses more often than not opposed to the Administration's proposals for the development, testing, and possible deployment of anti-satellite (ASAT) weapons as well as a strategic defense umbrella (SDI) to defend the American population from incoming nuclear warheads. Unfortunately, the findings not only ignore a discussion of United States and Soviet strategy doctrine, which was an important part of our hearings, but also failed to more fully recognize the advantages of moving towards a doctrine of Mutual Assured Survival and away from the increasingly unacceptable doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction.

Furthermore, I am disappointed that the findings included a reference to a recent study by the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) which has been criticized by one of the top engineers at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

This publicly released document questions the technical feasibilities of the proposed U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative and contains what the Defense Department has defined as security information. Given OTA's alleged security breaches in regard to this matter, I will seek an inquiry into the question of OTA's possible public release of classified information while introducing legislation which would seek to make such semi-autonomous organizations as OTA more accountable in handling sensitive information.

I also believe that the findings did not fully reflect the definition and verification problems associated with ASAT programs, thus making any ASAT ban unsound. The Soviet ASAT interceptor, for example, is somewhat small and is launched by a type of space booster that the Soviets use for outer space launch missions. It would not be clear, through national technical means, as to how many interceptors or boosters have been manufactured. Moreover, the USSR could maintain a covert supply of interceptors which could be readied quickly for operational use, probably without risk of U.S. detection. Also, launch vehicles could be diverted from other missions to launch ASAT interceptors.

Finally, although some West European defense ministers, including German Defense Minister Manfred Worner, have expressed concerns over the proposed strategic defense initiative, Secretary of Defense Weinberger has sought to assure our NATO allies that the SDI system would protect Europe as well. Moreover, France has recently expressed interest in moving beyond nuclear weapons and is worried over the

possible deployment of a Soviet strategic defensive system.

In conclusion, I believe that this Interim Report reflects important shortcomings. It is, therefore, my hope that the subject of arms control in space will be more thoroughly and objectively reviewed by this subcommittee before specific conclusions are drawn in relation to this extremely complex matter.●

APPENDIX

1. COMPARISON OF SOVIET AND UNITED STATES ANTISATELLITE WEAPONS

The Soviet ASAT

The Soviet antisatellite weapon is a ground-based system. The interceptor is launched from the top of a large booster. When in range of its target, the interceptor explodes its non-nuclear warhead, and the shrapnel destroys the satellite. The Soviet ASAT has to go around the Earth at least once before it can intercept its target. These time requirements enable the United States sufficient time to detect, track and take possible evasive maneuvers against it.

The Soviets have tested their ASAT about 20 times in the past sixteen years. About half of those tests have been reported to be successful. Of the four tests in 1980-82, one was successful and the other three were failures. The Soviets have not tested their ASAT since 1982 and in 1983 they announced a unilateral moratorium on ASAT testing.

The U.S. ASAT

In the 1960's, the United States developed a ground-based antisatellite system. This system used nuclear warheads launched by Air Force Thor missiles and Army Nike-Zeus missiles. The Army system lasted from 1963-1964. The Air Force system lasted from 1964-1975. This operational system, based on nuclear warheads, was deactivated in 1975 because emphasis shifted to use of non-nuclear systems.

The United States is currently developing an ASAT interceptor called a miniature homing vehicle (MHV). It is a small cylinder (one foot in diameter) that locates its target through infrared telescopes, a laser gyroscope, and a set of small jets that can alter its trajectory. The interceptor destroys the satellite on direct impact at very high velocity.

The MHV interceptor is carried by an F-15 and is launched from a two-stage rocket: a short-range attack missile (SRAM) and an Altair stage which guides the interceptor to the target area in space.

There are about 500 F-15's, all of which could be modified to carry the ASAT/MHV interceptor. The Air Force, at this time, plans to equip about 40 of the F-15's with the interceptor.

Both the Soviet ASAT and the proposed U.S. ASAT can attack satellites only in low earth orbit (an altitude of 1,000 miles). The Soviet ASAT is generally viewed as a cumbersome system (launched from fixed sites known to the United States) that cannot readily be modified to attack satellites in higher orbits. The U.S. ASAT is a mobile F-15 launched system that could readily be equipped with a third rocket to propel it into higher orbits.

2. SOVIET AND UNITED STATES SPACE ARMS CONTROL INITIATIVES

United States-Soviet bilateral ASAT negotiations were conducted in 1978-79 but were never concluded because of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

In 1981, the Soviets proposed a draft treaty in the United Nations to limit ASATs. A provision that included "reusable manned vehicles" (the shuttle) as weapons to be banned in space was particularly objectionable to the United States.

In 1983, however, the Soviets proposed another draft treaty in the United Nations which dropped this objectionable provision and called for the dismantlement of existing ASAT systems and for a ban on new ASAT systems.

The Soviets, in August 1983, proposed a unilateral moratorium on the deploying in space of any type of antisatellite weapon as long as other nations refrain from doing so.

The Soviets have also introduced this draft treaty as a working document at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

The President, in his March 31, 1984 "Report to the Congress on ASAT Arms Control," concluded that a comprehensive antisatellite weapons agreement is not verifiable and therefore has refused to resume bilateral negotiations with the Soviets to ban ASAT systems. The administration's intention is to continue participation in discussions on space arms control issues at the U.N. Conference on Disarmament.●

A TRIBUTE TO BILL TURNER

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Bill Turner, outgoing chairman for his accomplishments during the 53d Western Los Angeles Regional Chamber of Commerce.

During his unselfish commitment to the chamber, Bill organized an Olympic task force to provide Olympic information to member businesses. He also formed a West Los Angeles for Metrorail Committee to secure Federal funding for mass transit. In addition, Bill initiated the gold medal salute to Mayor Bradley installation dinner which was the chamber's largest event ever.

Under the leadership of chairman Bill Turner, several community service activities were instituted including a business watch program to aid the retail merchants in Westwood Village in averting crime; an internship program which places high school and college students in business settings, enabling both the business and the student to profit from the relationship; and a Westwood cleanup campaign.

I ask the Members to join the West Los Angeles Regional Chamber of Commerce and the community in honoring their retiring chairman for his many devoted contributions to the community.●

DONALD L. CUSTIS, M.D.

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, on May 13, Dr. Donald L. Custis, M.D., Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration retired from that position after a long and distinguished career in Federal medicine and in service to his country.

As chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care I would like to take this opportunity to state, first, that it is not without a certain amount of regret that those of us who serve on our subcommittee will accept the loss of one of the ablest medical administrators in the history of the Veterans' Administration. However, we cannot begrudge Doctor Custis a happy and productive retirement after his nearly 40 years in public service and his significant contributions to the health and well-being of the American veteran.

Dr. Custis joined the U.S. Navy in 1944 and retired in 1976 at the rank of vice admiral. A World War II veteran, he served in many positions within the Navy Medical Corps, from the front lines as commanding officer of the NSA Hospital, Da Nang, during the Vietnam war, to commander of Bethesda Naval Hospital, to the Navy's top medical post as Surgeon General. He joined the Veterans' Administration's Department of Medicine and Surgery in 1976 and was appointed Chief Medical Director in 1980 becoming the only individual ever to head two major health agencies of the U.S. Government. His expertise and influence has spread far beyond the Federal Government, however, through his positions with the American Medical Association and as a trustee of the American Hospital Association. In fact, it has been his goal, not only to raise the quality and quantity of VA health care services but, through these associations, bring the VA into its rightful place in full partnership with the broad spectrum of American medicine. This has been no easy task at a time of rising demand on the VA and continuing restrictions on available resources. But his determined insistence on quality health care services and his support for the VA's vital research, training, and education programs based on its affiliations with major medical schools and universities across the country have made this goal a reality.

Dr. Custis brought to the Veterans' Administration a careful mix of compassion and craft in directing the activities of its 225,000 medical employees. As an admiral he was able to lead

and to earn the respect of those who worked under him by standing up for them and for what he believed. As a surgeon he was able to translate the same healing skills, compassion, and understanding he had practiced on the battlefield in truly "caring for those who have borne the battle and for their widows and their orphans." We are all in his debt.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that there could be no better way to demonstrate to my colleagues the depth of commitment Dr. Custis had proven in his career than to include for the record his own remarks in farewell to the thousands of dedicated VA employees who enjoyed his leadership over the past 4 years.

DONALD L. CUSTIS, M.D.—FAREWELL REMARKS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY, APRIL 23, 1984

I trust by now word has reached most of you that I will soon retire. Please know that this was a rather sudden and difficult decision. Although a personal decision it was one not lightly made. I would, if I possibly could, have stayed with you awhile longer.

I labored over the weekend on what I might say to you. When the time has come for farewell, the compulsion for reflection becomes irresistible. Some start thinking about their memoirs—others are content with quiet soliloquies. Whichever the preference, the human mind will, mercifully, accentuate the positive. If you will indulge me, I am constrained to reference, briefly, what these past few years have meant to me.

My memories are made of this:

I'll remember Vietnam. The brave men who fought and so often died there remain indelible on my mind. Not that their sacrifice exceeded those in previous conflicts, but because there was so little unity of national purpose to sustain them. How sad. It was the poignancy of that recall which brought me into the VA as I left the Navy. How crass and cruel the accusation that we who care for him, who has borne the battle, do so without empathy!

But there were the good times.

I shall always recall with pardonable pride the quality and compassion of the medical care you render to our veterans and marvel at your dogged determination to do more and more, for increasing numbers of patients, with less and less resources.

There is about to be distributed an excellent documentary on the history and accomplishments of DM&S research. It tells another proud story that is well worth telling in its own right, but is also the beginning of a completion of the story that can never be completely told without it—of how research in DM&S is part and parcel of our total health care system; how it serves the veteran patient and how it serves the nation as a whole.

And because I came into the VA through its Academic Affairs Office, I suppose I will always hold a special affinity for our teachers who have created and continue to make DM&S a tremendous national resource for education in the health sciences. It reminds one of the Churchillian phrase that never have so few done so much for so many.

As I leave you now, I have every confidence in your future. We can all take satisfaction that, at a time when cynicism and disparagement had overtaken much of the country's health care industry, we in the VA closed ranks, took stock of ourselves, our environment and our future, and together designed the strategies and programs to handle the coming impact of the competitive medical market and the needs of the aging veteran. Those programs will carry you through the coming transition into a brighter tomorrow. The VA medical system is on the threshold of its greatest opportunity. You have the consensus and you have the momentum. Let nothing disuade nor divide you. I have an intimate knowledge of your tremendous talent, your creativity, your adaptability and resilience in the face of adversities. There will always be stress—we thrive on stress. Whether it be the Heritage Report of yesterday or today's Grace Commission, I know that your indomitable spirit will overcome the Alice-in-Wonderland illogic of our adversaries and that the saner judgment of our advocates will prevail.

Working with you has been an uncommon privilege. I appreciate all of your invaluable help and support without which I could have done nothing. In final reflection, and as an idealist, I wish I could have done more; as a realist it is enough to have had a part in our effort.

I have learned anew the elusiveness of goals and I'm grateful for such education. I have been reminded that really important tasks are never finished—interrupted perhaps—but never finished. The man who thinks he has achieved his goals has simply lost sight of them, or perhaps never saw them in the first place.

I take with me a new understanding of what Peter Drucker means by the complex interweaving of continuity and change. "For a nation," he said, "or an organization, buffeted by change, constantly faced with new threats to its safety, the only way to conserve is by innovating. The only stability is stability in motion."

"Civilization itself," said Toynbee, "is a movement—not a condition. Time is a voyage and not a harbor."

I close with gratitude to those, the many and the few, who have made these years for me most memorable. The language of the heart, which comes from the heart, is always simple, yet full of meaning. It requires no rhetoric—just one word: thanks.

Goodbye and fair sailing!●

A TRIBUTE TO ROBERT LAWRENCE APPLING

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen of my home State of Alabama and the entire United States of America.

Throughout our history we have had many great leaders. Men and women who were willing to step out from the pack in times of peace and war to lead others in the right direction.

Robert Lawrence Appling of Irvington, Ala., is that type of person and one who I am proud to call a friend. Robert is combat veteran, who served his country admirably from 1943 to 1948 in World War II. During the important Battle of the Bulge he was severely wounded and required hospitalization for over 5 years, which resulted in the amputation of a leg. To many this accident would have served as a handicap but to Robert, it gave him inspiration for the many outstanding accomplishments that he would make after the war.

Since that time Robert Appling has served as a Mobile County Sheriff's Deputy and court bailiff and has been active in numerous civic activities. He has been the recipient of numerous awards and honors including the 1973 Mobile Jaycee Outstanding Law Enforcement Award, the 1981 American Legion Governor's Alabama Veteran of the Year Award, and has been an active member in the National Fraternal Order of Police, which presented Robert with the "Mr. Fraternal Order of Police for the United States." This is one of the highest honors presented to a member.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the accomplishments Robert Lawrence Appling has made in his career of public service to the people of this Nation and want to wish him continued success in the future.●

WHERE'S THE PRICE INCREASE?

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, much discussion and debate is being generated over the advisability of extending the current Voluntary Restraint Agreement (VRA) between the United States and Japan when the VRA expires on March 31, 1985. The VRA will limit exports of automobiles produced in Japan to the United States to 1.85 million vehicles between April 1, 1984, and March 31, 1985.

U.S. Trade Representative William Brock recently stated that the United States should not renew the VRA for a fifth year because the agreement has resulted in "substantial" increases in automobile prices. Contrary to Mr. Brock's assertion, car prices have not risen in the proportion which he claims, and, furthermore, those automobile price increases which have occurred have not been directly attributable to the VRA. The fact of the matter is that since the restraints were agreed to several years ago, automobile prices have gone up by a lower percentage than the Consumer Price Index. In the case of small cars, where competition with the Japanese is greater, prices went up only half as much as car prices in total.

This point is underscored in a May 11, 1984, Washington Post op-ed column written by Mr. David N. McCammon, vice president-controller of the Ford Motor Co. Mr. McCammon

points out that claims that automobile prices have increased 35 percent since the Japanese agreed to the VRA 3 years ago and that the VRA has cost the car-buying public $5 billion more than it would have had to pay without the import restraints are clearly erroneous. He states that the statistics referred to by critics of the VRA are derived from a single study funded by the Japan Automobile Manufacturers Association and prepared by the Wharton Econometric Forecasting Associates. Mr. McCammon states that:

Since the restraints took effect in April 1981, the new-car part of the Consumer Price Index has risen about 4 percent a year—which is half a point below the CPI increase of 4.5 percent for all items.

Mr. McCammon adds that:

In the 4 years before restraints (April 1977-March 1981), the average price increase for new cars was about 7 percent. After restraints (April 1981-March 1984), the average price increase for new cars was about 4 percent.

As the debate continues as to whether the VRA should be extended for an additional year, I believe it is essential that we look at the facts as they are, and not the way a particular interest group would want them to be construed. I commend my colleagues to read Mr. McCammon's comments.

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1984]

AUTO PRICES HAVEN'T SOARED

(By David N. McCammon)

The debate on the impact of Japanese auto restraints has reached a crescendo in recent weeks. Unfortunately, more heat than light has been generated, and a lot of confusion has resulted—particularly regarding car prices.

The U.S. automobile industry has not "put one over" on the consumer. The American public has not been "had," as one prominent U.S. official has claimed.

Car prices have not risen 35 percent since the Japanese agreed to voluntary import restraints three years ago. Import restraints have not cost the car-buying public $5 billion more than it would have paid without restraints.

These are the claims being circulated widely, and they are just plain wrong. Much of the support for them is drawn from a single study, funded by the Japan Automobile Manufacturers Association and prepared by Wharton Econometric Forecasting Associates.

Here are the facts. Since the restraints took effect in April 1981, the new-car part of the consumer price index has risen about 4 percent a year—which is half a point below the CPI increase of 4.5 percent for all items. This is just the reverse of the conclusion reached by the Wharton Econometric study. I don't know where they got their figures. They haven't been able to explain them.

We got our figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which is known for its scrupulous care in gathering and reporting such statistics. Still, major newspapers and television networks have reported the Wharton study and have therefore given credence to the wrong numbers.

Another claim, that the rate of car price increases has accelerated since restraints began, is just the reverse of the truth. In the four years before restraints (April 1977-March 1981) the average annual price increase for new cars was about 7 percent. After restraints (April 1981-March 1984), the average annual price increase for new cars was about 4 percent.

Furthermore, the prices of American small cars, such as the Escort, that compete directly with Japanese imports, have risen only about 2 percent per year, or a total of only $400 a car over the last three years. This increase recovered less than half the cost of inflation.

It is wrong on the face of it, then, to contend, as some have done, that restraints have driven up the price of cars by $500 a unit or by $5 billion in total.

The most detrimental implication of Wharton Econometrics' study, then—that restraints have added $5 billion to the price tag of cars bought by the American public—is sheer nonsense.

Yes, customers are paying more for cars today. But this has nothing to do with the restraints. Normal inflationary pressures have pushed up prices of cars, but not as much as for the total of all goods and services.

At the same time, there has been a major shift in demand by consumers from smaller, less expensive cars to larger, more luxurious cars—as their concerns about fuel shortages declined, the fuel economy of larger cars improved and the economy turned around.

It makes no sense to treat the customers' shift to larger cars as a price increase—just as it would be senseless to conclude that the price of meat goes up when customers shift from Big Macs to filet mignon. The confusion results when individual car prices are not distinguished from the average price paid for all cars. This is apparently what the Wharton study failed to do; unfortunately it has been accepted uncritically.

The debate on the continuation of voluntary restraints has raised serious questions. I can certainly understand the public concern about these complex issues. My only plea is that we base our positions on fact, not fiction or political rhetoric.

The consumer has benefited from the money auto companies have been able to invest in new products, higher quality and improved fuel economy. As a result, American cars and trucks provide better value today, and thousands of American cars and trucks provide better value today, and thousands of American jobs have been saved. Corporate red ink was turned to black after three depression years, and employees of U.S. auto companies have shared the profits, a concept that we initiated at Ford.

High pricing did not cause the turnaround. The turnaround occurred largely as a result of major cost reductions, volume increases, and our new spirit of labor-management cooperation. I'd say that should be cause for national pride—not the bum rap the U.S. automobile industry is getting.●

NATIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICES WEEK

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of House Joint Resolution 566, which declares "National Neighborhood Housing Services Week" beginning on October 7, 1984. This resolution honors and strengthens a national network of neighborhood revitalization programs at work in 200 communities throughout the country.

Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS) is the largest neighborhood-based network of private-public partnerships at work in our country today. Their mission is to revitalize neighborhoods for the benefit of those currently living and doing business there. They have a 12-year track record of success generating over $2 billion in reinvestment into neighborhoods that were previously being abandoned. These neighborhoods are now being "turned around" by local Neighborhood Housing Services partnerships into vibrant, healthy places in which to live and do business.

At the heart of each NHS is a working partnership of residents, local business leaders, and local government representatives who contribute hundreds of volunteer hours each year. Since these programs are supported by voluntary contributions, broadened public awareness is critical for their expanded service. A "National Neighborhood Housing Services Week" would increase awareness of NHS work, while at the same time recognize and encourage the thousands of volunteers who contribute time, energy, and resources to improve the quality of life in communities throughout America.

I hope my colleagues will join me in designating the week of October 7, 1984, as "National Neighborhood Housing Services Week." Passage of House Joint Resolution 566 will significantly strengthen an effective neighborhood revitalization effort which is saving hundreds of neighborhoods—a priceless resource which billions of dollars could not replace.●

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION ACT OF 1984

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today our world is still tragically beset with military conflict, poverty, and hunger. As technology advances and trade increases, our world becomes ever smaller. In no time at all, a local military conflict can become a superpower confrontation. Like it or not, what happens out in the rest of the world does affect us. Unfortunately, conflict and suffering continue to play a major role in the world scene.

Congress, therefore, has a responsibility, through the foreign aid bill, to insure that our country's influence in world affairs remains strong and hon-

orable. It must protect allies and reward efforts for peace and human rights. It must also contain resources necessary to combat poverty and hunger.

I would like to comment on certain components of the bill:

CENTRAL AMERICA

I firmly believe we must place any military aid to El Salvador under conditions requiring passage of a congressional joint resolution. All military aid to El Salvador should be conditional on improvements in human rights and political developments in El Salvador. I supported the Studds amendment that would have done just that, and opposed amendments to circumvent our human rights objectives.

ISRAEL

I support continued strong and consistent aid to Israel. As a strong democracy and ally of the United States, Israel is a friend we must stand by. The fact that Israel is continually threatened by hostile nations in a volatile part of the world, makes our assistance all the more important.

I have, therefore, supported the foreign aid bill (H.R. 5119) which authorizes $2.5 billion in economic and military grants for Israel. These funds are essential if Israel is to maintain a viable economy and a strong national defense.

PLO

Because of my strong concern for Israel's security and my conviction that we must continue our fight against terrorism, I also strongly supported provisions of the foreign aid bill which deals with the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). These provisions prohibit U.S. funding for the PLO through international organizations or through the funding of programs that provide political benefits to the PLO.

I also supported this bill because it codifies existing U.S. policy prohibiting negotiations with the PLO so long as the PLO refuses to recognize Israel's right to exist, refuses to accept U.N. Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, and refuses to renounce the use of terrorism.

JORDAN

The foreign aid bill requires that before Jordan can obtain U.S. advanced aircraft, new air defense weapons systems, or other new and advanced military weapons systems, the President must certify that Jordan is publicly committed to the recognition of Israel and is prepared to enter into direct negotiations with Israel. I strongly support these conditions.

CYPRUS/TURKEY

I believe we must send a clear signal to Turkey through reduced aid, to emphasize our opposition to Turkey's intransigence on the issue of Cyprus. Turkey must renounce its recognition of the self-declared Independent Turkish State of Cyprus, and remove the Turkish troops that currently occupy that part of Cyprus.

I supported the Feighan amendment to the foreign aid bill, which reduced military aid to Turkey, and set conditions on part of that aid dependent on progress toward a settlement of the Cyprus dispute.

GREECE

The foreign aid bill which I supported authorized $500 million in foreign military sales guaranteed loans to Greece. The bill also provides funds for international military and education training assistance to Greece.

PHILIPPINES

We must make every effort to support improvements concerning human rights in the Philippines. Our foreign aid bill should make any aid to the Philippines conditional on their human rights progress. That is why I supported the Hall amendment to eliminate the $25 million in grant military assistance to the Philippines.

AFRICA

The situation in Africa is critical. I support the provisions in the foreign aid bill that authorize the necessary funds to bring relief to the millions of people who are suffering from drought and famine. The health problems are enormous, and must be addressed.

CHILDREN

The foreign aid bill establishes the Child Survival Fund and authorizes $25 million for programs dealing directly with the special health needs of children and mothers. Each day, 40,000 children die in Third World countries of diseases that could be prevented if the right resources were available. The Child Survival Fund would provide the resources necessary to help the tragic situation. Most of the children in the Third World die of dehydration. Fortunately, a new process called oral rehydration therapy is now able to help these children, and this program would be funded by the Child Survival Fund.

The foreign aid bill also provides $53.5 million for the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). UNICEF provides humanitarian and developmental aid to children and mothers in 115 countries. The main purpose of UNICEF is to insure that primary health care is available to afflicted children and mothers in the Third World. The children of the world deserve our attention and care. The foreign aid bill provides the funding so that we can act to help the needy children around the world.

The foreign aid bill represents America's role in the world, not only for today, but for the future as well. We must stand for what is right and just. The responsibility is great, but we welcome the challenge.●

NATION'S NURSING HOMES DESERVE OUR THANKS

HON. HAL DAUB

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, National Nursing Home Week presents us with an appropriate opportunity to recognize the outstanding services performed by the dedicated individuals who staff and administrate our Nation's nursing homes.

The modern nursing home is both an active community and an important link in the health care chain. This dual role presents the nursing home's staff with a dual challenge—first, organizing activities that run the gamut from bingo games to religious services and outings, and second, providing care that ranges from a helping hand in the middle of the night to intensive physical therapy.

Their work is both physically taxing and emotionally draining, and it takes a special and caring individual to daily provide these vital services to the handicapped and elderly residents of the home.

Our nursing homes deserve the strong support of the residents' families; a home that has that support and participation from the families can give even better care to their residents. Like our schools, family involvement can make the difference.

It is a privilege to take this opportunity to recognize our Nation's nursing homes, to commend their staffs and administrative personnel, and to thank them for their selfless hard work in behalf of countless older Americans.

THE NEED FOR THE MX MISSILE

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Representatives debated and voted on the MX missile, a subject that has been debated numerous times before in this body.

A number of amendments on the MX came up yesterday. The President had one proposal—40 MX missiles to be procured in fiscal 1985; the House Armed Services Committee another—30 MX missiles; Representative NICHOLAS MAVROULES wanted to delete funding completely; while Representative LES ASPIN offered a compromise in which 15 missiles would be procured, but only if the Soviets do not come back to the bargaining table. Considerable confusion arose as to whether or not a vote for the Aspin compromise

proposal was a vote for the MX missile or not.

I voted in favor of the amendment because it was the closest viable option to the recommendation of the House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member. I believe that we need the MX missile—to give the Soviets the incentive to negotiate, and if they do not, to counter the Soviets' relentless modernization and expansion of its strategic nuclear arsenal.

The Soviets walked away from the negotiating table. What could possibly convince them to come back when they see the Congress on the verge of canceling all the MX missiles? What do they have to negotiate?

In intercontinental ballistic missiles, the Soviets have 520 SS-11's with one warhead each; they have 60 SS-13's, with one warhead each; they have 150 SS-17's with four warheads each; they have 308 SS-11's with 10 warheads each; and they have 360 SS-19's. The Soviets are also building two new generations of ICBM's—the SS-X-24 and the SS-X-25. And the SS-18, 19, 24, and 25 all have greater accuracy than our Minuteman III. Without any corresponding Soviet concessions, this is a main reason for the need to press forward with the MX.

As my colleague and friend Representative KEMP said yesterday: "If we cancel the MX and the Soviets continue to build, that is not arms control; that is appeasement."

Some of my colleagues argue that the MX is a vulnerable system and does not enhance our security. I believe that the MX contributes to stability between the United States and the Soviet Union. The debate on the MX must be viewed in the context of the other legs of our strategic triad. The triad consists of the land-based ICBM's, the submarine-launched missiles, and the penetrating manned bombers.

There is a synergistic effect between the three legs of our triad. Each leg has certain properties that are not the same, and that is very important. We cannot abandon the land-based leg of that triad while the Soviets continue to build, build, build. Once the Soviet Union is able to channel its resources on only one leg of the triad, the vulnerability of that leg increases. That is what increases the chances of a first strike, not modernizing the land-based leg of our triad.

The amendment that was passed offers the Soviets the carrot as well as the stick; we are putting them on notice that we want to negotiate, and are eminently reasonable and willing to make concessions if they negotiate in good faith. But those are our intentions. The Soviets were the ones that walked away from the bargaining table. They have devoted great resources modernizing the land-based leg of their strategic nuclear forces, while we have deployed no new land-based strategic missiles for the last 10 to 15 years.

We must give the Soviets the incentive to negotiate. In the face of the relentless Soviet buildup, we must modernize our forces to preserve deterrence, making certain that war will never occur. That is the great strategic paradox: To prevent war, we must convince our adversaries that they will not profit from conflict. This applies to the conventional as well as the nuclear arenas.

No aim is more important to me than securing a truly equitable and verifiable nuclear arms reduction treaty that does not jeopardize our own security. I will continue to support those initiatives and national policies which, I feel, seek to strengthen security and, at the same time, allow us to reduce in a meaningful and realistic manner the chances of a nuclear war. It gives us the best chance to negotiate real reductions with the Soviets, and get rid of as many of these weapons as possible—on both sides. This is why I voted for the carrot-and-stick approach on MX last night.●

MARGUERITE G. COURSON: CITY CLERK, CITY OF BUENA PARK

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding service given by Marguerite G. Courson throughout her tenure as the city clerk for the city of Buena Park. As the congressional representative for the city, I have appreciated the many hard-working and capable people at city hall to whom I have turned for assistance. Mrs. Courson is one such person, and she is further distinguished by her long record of public service.

May 18, 1984, marks her 30-year anniversary of dedicated service to the city, and it is a fitting tribute that the city of Buena Park has chosen to honor her tonight before city leaders, city staff, and other guests. Mrs. Courson began her career as a secretary to the city manager. Early on, her abilities were recognized and she was promoted to the position of deputy city clerk. Just as quickly, she again was promoted to city clerk where she has served with honor since 1956. Her advancement came as a surprise to her because she had never set her sights on attaining this prestigious role.

During her 30 years of service, she has seen her city grow from a population of 10,221 to its present size of over 64,000. City hall has also grown to meet the demands of its citizens from its original staff of only a dozen employees to well over 500. Mayor Don R. Griffin also recalls this rapid change and pays tribute by noting:

> Marguerite has overseen 15 municipal elections and has worked with a total of 30 different council members and 11 city managers. She has literally kept this city together through many changes of administration.

He also cites that Marguerite is the first employee to reach this 30-year milestone.

Mrs. Courson notes one of the most challenging times of her career came during two recall elections, and it was her responsibility to insure the elections ran smoothly and without error. It is because of her professional integrity that citizens are better able to work together, despite their differences, in the spirit of community improvement.

Mrs. Courson has served with great distinction, loyalty, commitment, and competence. It has been my pleasure to represent her in Congress, and I offer her my warmest thanks and congratulations for the recognition she will be receiving on this, her 30th anniversary with the city of Buena Park.●

FRESNO: A PROUD CITY

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, a recently conducted, and unfortunately well-publicized survey of the Nation's 277 largest cities by a State University of New York professor has ranked Fresno, Calif., as the worst city in the United States in which to live.

I would like an opportunity to rebut this study's findings, although my defense of Fresno should not be necessary—in fact, Fresno is an outstanding city, and the achievements of the community and the many proud Fresno residents are what should be publicized. The survey which unfairly labeled Fresno as the worst city in the Nation was based on statistical data, and the attitudes of 1,122 upstate New York residents. With all due respect to my colleagues from New York, one small group of people from that State is not, and should not be interpreted as representative of 220 million Americans.

The city of Fresno is the eighth most populous city in California, and has grown to the 65th largest in the United States. The county's growth rate of 20 percent certainly is not a result of a public perception as Fresno being a bad place to live. Located in the heart of the San Joaquin Valley,

Fresno also offers access to the beauty of the Yosemite, Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, the Pacific Ocean, and the business and cultural centers of San Francisco and Los Angeles—all, just a few hours drive away.

Fresno, however, does not live in the shadows of its neighbors. The residents of the San Joaquin Valley recognize Fresno as their major center for business, education, transportation and cultural needs. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Science and History was just recently opened in the downtown area. California State University, Fresno continues to grow, and receive recognition for its many contributions to academic progress. The growth in the city's population is expected to be accompanied by an ever-expanding employment demand for both manufacturing and service industries. And of course, Fresno continues to be the agribusiness capital of the world.

True to their spirit and community pride, Fresnans are not letting this label as the worst of the worst get the best of them. The citizens of Fresno, after having their hometown so unfairly characterized, are resolved to show the Nation just how great a community Fresno really is. That should not be too difficult, as Fresno offers much to be proud of.●

RECOGNITION OF THE CELEBRATION OF ITALIAN HERITAGE MONTH IN AUBURN, N.Y.

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would like to take this opportunity to commend to your attention the Italian Heritage Month celebration taking place in my congressional district. This celebration highlights the contributions which the Italian-American community has made to the growth and development of our Nation.

The month of May has been designated as Italian Heritage Month by the citizens of Auburn, N.Y. This celebration, which involves the entire community, includes a month-long exhibit in the Cayuga County Museum of History and Art, special lectures, films, entertainment, slide shows, and other events detailing the contributions of local Italian Americans.

Italian Americans comprise one of the largest ethnic groups in Auburn, N.Y. Their leadership, dedication, spirit, and sacrifice have, in no small way, played an important role in the strength of their community. It is with great pleasure that I join my constituents in recognizing the importance of the Italian American community and the significance of their contributions and achievements.●

THE SOVIET BOYCOTT OF THE OLYMPICS

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as one who believes that politics and the Olympics should never be mixed, I deeply regret the recent Soviet decision. Let us hope that they will reconsider and participate.

I have always felt that talented athletes should not be denied opportunities to participate in great international athletic events because of political concerns. For this reason, I opposed President Carter's decision not to participate in the 1980 Olympics. I fully understand that his decision was brought about by the tragic Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan the previous year. I clearly advised the administration at that time that all nations should separate politics from athletics.

The recent Soviet decision appears to be a purely political one, however. Our country obviously did not engage in any international activities comparable to the illegal occupation of an independent country. The Soviets' requests regarding their Olympic programs were fully met.

Our Government permitted the Soviets to bring in a cruise ship for their athletes, and gave special landing rights to the Soviet Airline Aeroflot.

The Olympic planners were extremely sensitive to Soviet security concerns. Extensive discussions on this topic were held. The Soviets still claimed that the safety of their athletes could not be guaranteed. I understand that the Kremlin was concerned about the possibility of Soviet athletes defecting. They wanted our Government to guarantee that no defections would occur. I know for a fact that the question of security received much attention by the Olympic planners and by our Government. Countless hours of planning and millions of dollars have already been spent.

I personally believe that the Soviet accusation about inadequate security is absurd. I think that the Soviet decision to boycott the Olympics was purely a political one.

I hope that the Soviets reconsider their decision. The spirit of the Olympics must be preserved free from political manipulation.●

TRIP TO CHINA

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, recently our newspapers and airwaves were full of stories about President Reagan's trip to the People's Republic of China (PRC). By most accounts, the President's mission to China was successful, and improved the ties between our Nation and that of the PRC. Despite this increased attention and diplomatic activity our country has devoted to China, we must not forget our longtime friend and ally Taiwan, who has not yet resolved its differences with the PRC.

We have enjoyed fruitful relations with Taiwan for many years, relations that have proven mutually beneficial. Although the basic realities of today's world dictates an improving of our relations with the PRC, it should not be at the expense of a reliable and strong ally in the same region. We should always keep in mind that attempts to balance our foreign policy toward the two Chinas should not jeopardize the security of Taiwan in the process.

Soon, President Chiang Ching-kuo will be sworn in for a second term as President of the Republic of China. To congratulate the President for the conclusion of his first term, and to wish him good fortune in his next years in office, many Members of Congress have cosigned a letter to President Chiang Ching-kuo. We are fortunate in that a good personal friend, Dr. Nathan Mao of Shippensburg University in Pennsylvania, will be able to personally deliver the letter to the President on a journey to Taiwan this week.

In our world community we are often uncertain as who will support the United States in times of trouble and who will not. It is certainly reassuring to know that we can depend on the friendship of our strong ally Taiwan, and as we have stated in the letter to President Chiang Ching-kuo, we hope that "the bonds of respect and friendship between our two peoples will be strengthened as never before."●

UNITED STATES-BRITISH RELATIONS

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, in the past, some of us in Congress have expressed disappointment that Western European officials have not made a better

case for stronger ties with the United States, particularly during recent months when an anti-American mood seems to have swept across Europe. That is why I was pleased to hear that Britain's Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, in a speech about relations between Europe and the United States, sent an extremely important message to her countrymen.

Prime Minister Thatcher recognizes that strong ties between our two nations are fundamental to good United States-European relations and, ultimately, the solidity of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. She stressed her belief that Europeans cannot go on drawing on American good will and generosity without trying to understand American concerns and the burdens which fall to Americans. Despite doubts by some about the wisdom in maintaining strong ties with Great Britain, I was encouraged by Prime Minister Thatcher's remarks, for they demonstrated not only leadership but a willingness by Great Britain to improve its partnership with the United States. That message is good news for the United States, as well as all people throughout the world who share our dream for a prosperous, free world.

The following is an extract from the speech made by Prime Minister Thatcher to the Conservative Party in Perth on May 11, 1984.

EXTRACT FROM A SPEECH MADE BY MRS. MARGARET THATCHER TO THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY IN PERTH ON MAY 11, 1984

Once we settle Europe's internal problems, Europe can look more to its global responsibilities. We are part of the free world. We must act with the free world. And that means, first and foremost, that we should work with our great ally across the Atlantic, the United States. Where would Europe have been in that most difficult and dangerous period after the last war without America? Where would we have been since without America's massive contribution to freedom and security of Europe?

We cannot go on drawing endlessly on American goodwill and generosity without ourselves trying to understand their concerns and the burdens which fall to them. For they are the champions of all the beliefs and ideals which we cherish most deeply.

I believe profoundly that the alliance between Europe and the United States is vital to the defence of the free world. Conservatives will work for a Europe which is a strong partner of the United States and which uses its experience and an increasing part of its resources, to reduce the areas of tension and conflict, to improve the prospects for the poorer countries and to defend and spread beliefs and ideals which are shared by the Western democracies. That is our vision for Europe.●

U.S. TAX DOLLARS USED TO SUPPORT CANDIDATE IN CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, it was reported last week that $2.1 million in U.S. tax dollars were used to influence an election in Central America, and not even used in support of the staunchest anti-Communist candidate.

This is an outrage. If an American politician accepted any foreign money for campaign purposes, it would be a criminal offense and he would find himself in jail.

No wonder our prestige and respect around the world suffer. By what right do we feel we can attempt to influence covertly elections in other nations? This was not even done with a consensus—it was carried out covertly and illegally.

It is morally wrong to be meddling at all, but even if meddling in other elections were proper, by whose authority do we pick the candidate? Why were the other candidates rejected outright? It borders on pure arrogance on our part to think we have the right and the obligation to interfere with the free elections of another nation.

This was all done in the name of human rights. But the other candidates also claimed to pursue policies designed to protect human rights. I would like to know when all the demagoguery will end, and the human rights of the American taxpayers and the security of this Nation will determine U.S. foreign policy.●

REMARKS OF JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1984

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present for the RECORD remarks by Hon. John O. Marsh, Jr., Secretary of the Army at the Virginia Chamber of Commerce's 36th Annual Virginia Congressional Dinner which was held on April 30, 1984. Secretary Marsh has a distinguished record of public service which includes the four terms he served as the Representative of the Seventh District in Virginia from 1963 to 1971. Secretary Marsh's remarks follow:

WHAT'S AT STAKE?

(By John O. Marsh, Jr.)

This coming June the 6th marks the 40th anniversary of the invasion of Normandy.

As Virginians, we should remember in the initial assault on Omaha Beach, there were only two National Guard units, both were from Virginia. The 116th Infantry, the Stonewall Brigade, from the Valley, Central and Southside Virginia, and the 111th Field Artillery from Richmond, Fredericksburg, and the Tidewater.

D-Day should teach us we have an interest in what happens in the rest of the world. Because what happens there can help or hurt us.

It is to our advantage this planet be a stable place, and that it be a place of peace, with freedom under law.

To that end, we must understand there is a direct relationship between defense. Your security, and your economic endeavors.

I was asked to speak to you this evening about National Defense.

It is my hope that I can give you some background that will enable you to better understand the reasons for the President's program.

The Commonwealth of Virginia has played a great role in the building of the Republic. We have a great responsibility for its preservation.

When compared to other national capitals, in the words of "America the Beautiful," Washington seems to be the city of the patriot's dream which "gleams undimmed by human tears."

But for much of the planet Earth, it is a world of tears, of turmoil, and conflict.

The stakes are high. America, with its material and human resources, finds its leadership challenged and its vital interests threatened.

This century has seen the birth of a new colossus. One driven by an alien ideology. It draws its strength from the force of arms. It has waged ruthless aggression on its neighbor States. From its Eurasian power base, the Soviet Union now leap-frogs its power to the four corners of the globe, and threatens the peace of an insecure world.

Virginians have a respect for history. We know lessons of the past cannot be ignored. Neither in dealing with the Soviet Union can we ignore:

That in 1939 they entered into a nonaggression pact with the Nazis to partition Poland. In that same year they invaded Finland.

In 1940 they seized Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia.

In 1948 they tried to blockade Berlin.

In 1950 they supported the North Korean invasion of South Korea.

In 1953 they put down the popular uprising in East Germany.

In 1956 they brutally crushed the Hungarian Revolution.

In 1961 they built the Berlin Wall.

In 1968 they occupied Czechoslovakia to suppress the freedom being manifested there.

In 1979 they invaded Afghanistan.

And, the most recent flagrant example of their disrespect for human life and rights occurred last September when they shot down an unarmed Korean airliner, taking 269 lives. For those who feel this was a mistake—who think they have remorse or regret—I point out earlier this month, a senior official of the Soviet Government, in a public statement in Moscow, hailed the downing of the Korean Airliner

The Soviets have made Cuba into a Caribbean arsenal. Their intelligence collection station at Lourdes, near Havana, is the second largest they operate in the world.

They are the primary source of arms going into Nicaragua.

Cuban combat troops are their proxies in Angola and Ethiopia.

Soviet military representatives numbering about 20,000 are in nearly 30 nations as a part of their foreign military sales program.

They have supported both Iran and Iraq in a war that could destabilize the Persian Gulf. In the Middle East, they are responsible for the enormous military force developed by Syria.

Approximately 90,000 students from the lesser developed nations of the world study in the Soviet Union, the Bloc countries, or Cuba. Included are 14,000 from Central and South America. They will return to their countries to spread Marxist/Leninist doctrine, and they will be anti-American.

Why do we need a strong defense. Because the world is not at peace. There are 20 to 22 conflicts and insurgencies being waged in the lesser developed countries of the world. There are at least 15 other countries that are politically unstable which might destabilize and become insurgencies.

Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, Southwest Asia and Southeast Asia—these are targets of Soviet intrusion. Adventurism, and trouble making. These are areas vital to U.S. and free world interests.

To support these aggressive aims the Soviets have built a gigantic war machine and industrial complex to fuel it. Their army consists of 194 divisions. Ours has 24 with 8 in the National Guard.

In the last 25 years they have built a blue water navy for the projection of power to every ocean of the world. This month they conducted the largest naval exercise in their history in the North Atlantic and Norwegian Sea.

They have the world's largest military air force.

They have 371 submarines of which 64 can launch ballistic missiles. Our total submarine force is 133.

We are not dealing with a country with an ox cart technology. There are areas in which they have a technological lead over the United States.

It is estimated they have a 10-year lead in the casting of titanium, enabling them to build a submarine with diving depths well below conventional operations.

They are pressing ahead in the development of nuclear weapons. For example, they have operational 1,398 silo launches. Their ICBM's are considered to be at least as accurate as our Minutemen III's. Many of these missile systems have multiple reentry vehicles, each of which is a separate atomic projectile. Their SS-18's can carry 10 MIRV's and their SS-19's can carry 6. Our modern Minuteman has three. The SS-18's can neutralize 80 percent of our land-based ICBM's using two strikes per silo. This imbalance is why the President's MX program for a modern missile is so important.

To those who advocate a nuclear freeze, it should be pointed out that our stockpile today is one-fourth less than what it was in 1967.

They have about 50,000 tanks. We have nearly 12,000. Each year they out produce us by 1,600.

For effective deterrence it is not necessary we match the Soviets man for man, or tank for tank. But there are steps we must take to strengthen our defenses.

Significant gains have been made in recent years in the readiness of all of our forces. I can tell you there has been a quantum jump in the readiness of your Army. More remains to be done. These things that remain to be done are at the heart of the President's defense request.

Additionally, to help meet this threat, the NATO Alliance is vital, as well as our participation in it. This alliance has preserved the peace in Western Europe longer than any time since the Roman Empire.

There is another important dimension to national security. Economic stability is essential for a secure world, and it is necessary for a prosperous America.

For example, the oil embargo of 1973 had a worldwide impact. It contributed to instabilities in the Third World. It helped spawn insurgencies. This has been true in Central America.

Central America comprises the countries of Belize, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Panama. As President Reagan has observed, the objective of the insurgency there is the entire region, not just El Salvador. The insurgent leaders also have said as much.

Backed by Cuba and the Soviet Union, Nicaragua is building the largest military force in Central America. More than 2,300 Cuban military advisers are in Nicaragua. About 7,000 other Cuban advisers are there to help the Sandinistas impose control on Nicaragua—to aid the infiltration of arms and equipment to El Salvador and other areas in the region.

Central America is not half a world away. It is on our doorstep. It is a vital area where nearly one-half of all U.S. foreign trade transits the Panama Canal and the Caribbean Sea.

We are citizens of an interdependent world. Vessels moving to and from the Old Dominion with raw materials and manufactured products have ports of call on every continent of the Earth.

For evidence of the enormous contributions Virginia ports make, look at the "Virginia Port Authority Foreign Trade Annual Report for 1983." The report states the total activity of the Port of Hampton Roads generated revenues of $1.8 billion. All Commonwealth port activities created 155,000 jobs, $3 billion in wages, and $307.5 million in tax revenues.

We are inexorably linked to far away places because there are 40 minerals and metals on which a modern industrial society depends. Without them you cannot have assembly lines or manufacture products.

The United States is more than 50 percent dependent on foreign sources for 23 of 40 critical materials essential to the U.S. economic and national security. However, of the same 40, the Soviets are completely independent for 35.

Freedom to transit the oceans of the world—to fly the airways that link continents is essential for reasons not directly related to defense. It is American foreign policy, backed by a strong defense policy that assists a Virginia businessman to move about the face of the Earth, to negotiate for raw materials, to sell manufactured products, and to engage in financial transactions that yield vast economic dividends for the Commonwealth.

Part of that defense policy is reflected by the fact that through alliances more than 42 percent of your Army is stationed overseas in strategic areas.

What really is at stake is not just Soviet military power—a threat we cannot ignore. Rather, it is the ultimate resolution of key social and political issues.

The conflict we are in, but did not choose, is a challenge of ideas and contrasting values.

What is at stake is personal freedom and liberty, the same stakes that Patrick Henry addressed in St. John's Church in Richmond. Governance in the 20th century is a struggle between the free society and the police state. Do we choose our leaders or are they chosen for us?

Therefore, how do we become more active players in the arena of national security affairs?

How can we better compete in the challenge of ideas?

First, the most powerful force in a democratic society is an informed public opinion.

Second, America is strong. We have available to us an abundance of material wealth and resources.

Third, untapped in the private sector, we have a vast array of human skills and talents that when marshaled are more than equal to the task.

I would like for you to consider two programs which the Virginia Chamber could lead in implementing. They are interrelated.

First, I urge you to sponsor in cooperation with other civic and trade associations in the Old Dominion, the "Virginia Forum on National Security." Perhaps this might be done in several places across the Commonwealth.

This Forum would assemble a cross section of key leaders for a 1-day seminar on Defense issues including economic concerns as well as national values.

The Chamber sponsored such a forum in the sixties where the Governor was a keynote speaker to an audience of about 600 blue ribbon members.

Secondly, in just over 2 years, America will mark the beginning of the Bicentennial of the Adoption of the Constitution and the Founding of the Republic. These will be events of enormous consequence, nationally and internationally. This bicentennial will attract worldwide attention. I urge this organization to play a key role in its commemoration.

Through the study of national security issues, essential to our survival, and the reexamination of our value system as expressed in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, perhaps, we can forge an American strategy for human freedom, with an enlightened policy of economic development as we move to the year 2000.

In slightly more than 15 years, we end a century and close an age.

The die for the image of society in the year 2000 could well be cast in these few intervening years. Shall it be in the image of the American Republic with individual liberty, economic opportunity, and the pursuit of happiness, or shall it mirror the police state with regulated economies and totalitarian control of people?

How shall we start the third millennium?

Virginia is the cradle of freedom. Of the year 2000 I believe some historian in another day, and another age, shall write that in a time of national peril, when freedom was again threatened, citizens of America's oldest Commonwealth accepted the leadership that was their heritage, and through courage, dedication, and sacrifice, insured their country and its blessings of liberty would be not just the legacy of their children and their children's children, but the birthright of all mankind.●