HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, April 25, 1985*

The House met at 11 a.m.

Rev. Cecil Hazen, pastor, Pine Forest United Methodist Church, Dublin, GA, offered the following prayer:

Our Eternal Father, historic reminders of America's devoted patriots are all about us. Their lives of courage and commitment inspire us to continue the cause of freedom with vigor.

We are truly grateful for the freedom to govern ourselves. These distinguished Members of the House undertake this privilege seeking Your wisdom and counsel.

Grant them conviction born of courage and compassion, truth free of trivia, and consciences sensitive to their constituents and Creator. Through their daily labors and sacrifices may our Nation continue as the "land of the free and the home of the brave."

May their accomplishments become a complementary part of what You are doing in all nations to bring peace and freedom to this Earth. In His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FRENZEL there were—yeas 13, nays 62.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 177, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—216

Addabbo
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Bates
Bedell
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Boggs
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Borski
Boucher
Breaux
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Bustamante
Byron
Carper
Carr
Chappell
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Conyers
Cooper
Coyne
Crockett
Darden
Daschle
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
English
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Frost
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Heftel
Hertel
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hughes
Hutto
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lloyd
Long
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCurdy
McHugh
Mica
Mikulski
Mineta
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Panetta
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Price
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Reid
Robinson
Roe
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Sabo
Schumer
Sharp
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Wheat
Whitley
Whitten
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wright
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (MO)

NAYS—177

Archer
Armey
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Callahan
Campbell
Carney
Chandler
Chappie
Cheney
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Conte
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
Daub
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Eckert (NY)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Franklin
Frenzel
Gallo
Gekas
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Gregg
Gunderson
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hendon
Henry
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Huckaby
Hunter
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Kasich
Kemp
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McDade
McEwen
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mitchell
Molinari
Monson
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Myers
Nielson
O'Brien
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Penny
Petri
Porter
Pursell
Quillen
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Saxton
Schaefer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Stangeland
Stenholm
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tauke
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Towns
Vander Jagt
Walker
Weber
Whitehurst
Whittaker
Wolf
Wortley
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zschau

NOT VOTING—40

Ackerman
Applegate
Aspin
Badham
Beilenson
Boland
Bonker
Bosco
Boxer
Collins
Daniel
Davis
de la Garza
Dymally
Ford (MI)
Garcia
Gordon
Green
Grotberg
Jones (NC)
Kolter
Lehman (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Loeffler
McGrath
Miller (CA)
Moakley
Rodino
Russo
Savage
Scheuer
Schulze
Seiberling
Shelby
Smith (IA)
Traficant
Weaver
Weiss
Williams

□ 1130

Messrs. McEWEN, McCANDLESS, DREIER of California, COBEY, LENT, and PARRIS, and Mrs. BENTLEY changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. DREIER of California, PARRIS, THOMAS of California, BURTON of Indiana, and LUNGREN, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. STALLINGS changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PARRIS changed his vote from "nay" to "present."

Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PASHAYAN, and Ms. SNOWE changed their votes from "present" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

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

51-059 O-86-28 (Pt. 7)

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REV. CECIL HAZEN

(Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it was in 1954 that a young man came out of the great State of Pennsylvania to south Georgia. There his heart was captured by a young lady.

Mr. Speaker, Cecil Hazen attended the Emory University School of Theology, and Asbury College. He has done numerous ministries in the State of Georgia, in middle Georgia, and in south Georgia.

When you listen to Cecil Hazen he does not speak with the accent of a southerner. He does not sound like a southerner, but he is a southerner at heart. Above all of that, he is a great and dedicated and patriotic American.

Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to have had my pastor here this morning to give the opening prayer.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the program for the balance of this day and into next week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority leader will yield, the program for today is quite simply to adopt the rule and conduct the general debate on the State Department authorization bill.

We hope that will come now; it is an open rule, not a controversial rule, and we would like to hope that it would be adopted by a voice vote. If it is not adopted by a voice vote, it will be adopted, we hope, by a recorded vote, and then we will get into the general debate on that bill.

That concludes the legislative business for this week.

Mr. MICHEL. Might I interrupt the majority leader to inquire if we would proceed to read the bill until, or just simply conclude general debate, or would they begin to read the bill until there might be a rollcall or a controversial amendment that would have to be voted on.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is our hope and expectation, and to the degree that the gentleman would cooperate in that expectation, probably a reality, that there would be no further votes today.

The rule, as usually, provides that the bill shall be considered as read and open to amendment at any point, or they might—they will not get into the amending process today in any event. That is not the plan.

The plan would be that that would go over until Tuesday next. The plan is that on Monday next we meet at noon and have two suspensions. One amending the Panama Canal Act of 1979 and the other, accepting a statue of Jeannette Rankin, the Congresswoman from Montana who twice served in this body.

On Tuesday we would hope to meet at noon and we have no suspensions scheduled. I have, however, along with the Speaker, engaged in a colloquy of which I am sure the distinguished minority leader is aware, with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] in which we have agreed that someone from your side of the aisle would be recognized to make a preferential motion on Tuesday, the intent of such motion as I understand it, would be to vacate the proceedings in the matter concerning the recount in Indiana's Eighth Congressional District and to call for another election there.

That motion would be, of course, a preferential motion, and as I understand it the plan, and I want to express my appreciation for your having divulged to the leadership your intent to bring it at that time will be entertained.

If that is rejected, it would be our purpose then, after having dealt with the State Department and related agencies authorization bill and concluded it on Tuesday, on Wednesday then to take up the resolution from the House Administration Committee to seat the Representative from the Eighth District of Indiana.

Following that, we would go to the Foreign Assistance Act authorization. Meet at noon on Wednesday and at 11 o'clock on the balance of the week, and those are the things we have scheduled for next week, the things we anticipate; unless other business intrudes meanwhile of which we are unaware.

Mr. FRENZEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. FRENZEL. I would think with the announcement of that schedule for next week which calls for one vote on Tuesday on a resolution which would declare Indiana's Eighth District congressional seat vacant and a vote on Wednesday on a motion from the House Administration Committee calling for the seating of one of the candidates, it would not be necessary in the absence of some unusual substantive disagreement to have a vote on the rule today.

Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. MICHEL. It is my understanding it is a noncontroversial rule.

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. If I might inquire further of the majority leader, I have been asked on the suspensions Monday, would Members be advised to be here for recorded votes on those suspensions, or would they be——

Mr. WRIGHT. Well, we initially had suggested that Members should be here on Monday in order to be recorded on those votes.

Let me just say quite frankly, as to my friend the minority leader, that our purpose in asking Members to be present on those votes was to alert Members to the necessity to be here in the Chamber on that day in order that they might avoid being embarrassed by an absence, when an unexpected motion from the gentleman's side of the aisle might confront them.

Now, if the gentleman is prepared to give us assurances at this time that there will be no unexpected motions of that kind requiring votes, we could enter into a gentleman's agreement, I think, which Members on both sides might appreciate; to the effect that votes on those two suspensions might be postponed until Tuesday and taken on Tuesday. If we could have that kind of an assurance.

Mr. MICHEL. I am not altogether sure that the gentleman is prepared to give them that kind of assurance at this juncture, and would probably defer on that.

Mr. WRIGHT. In that event, I think Members all would be well-advised to plan to be present on Monday, and we will plan then to have votes on the two suspensions after the debate of the two.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would say, under the prerogatives of the Chair, to the leader of the Republican Party, Mr. MICHEL:

Mr. MICHEL, under the prerogatives of the Speaker, I would say that the two matters that would be on the floor, the two suspensions, under the prerogative of the Speaker, the vote will come on them on Tuesday.

That does not mean that there cannot be other rollcalls; for example, the approval of the Journal or something of that nature.

So in view of the fact that, Mr. Majority Leader, and since there has been general discussion of the general agreement on what the schedule will be, then the whip notice will be changed to say the votes on Monday on the suspensions will take place on Tuesday.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I trust the Speaker understood the response of the minority leader the same way I understood it; to the effect that he cannot give assurances that there will be no unexpected votes called for on Monday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that, but on those two particular votes, the Chair would not anticipate after the agreement that has been made that there would be any-

thing of any serious nature to come up, but of course Members can always call for a vote at the start of the day, but things are always subject to change without notice in a legislative body; you cannot tell the judgment of people and what they will do.

□ 1150

But that is the way it appears at this particular time, that there would be no serious rollcall if the gentleman had business back in his home area.

Mr. WRIGHT. In that case, Mr. Speaker, the plan would be——

The SPEAKER. Two suspensions.

Mr. WRIGHT. Debate the suspensions on Monday, vote on them on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Right.

Mr. WRIGHT. But Members need be advised that there might be some other vote on Monday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

May I say, after agreement with the Republican leadership, the motion pictures that were taken of the election task force hearing that took place for several hours, will be shown on in-house television on Monday of next week.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 29, 1985

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REQUEST TO DISPENSE WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Chair could tell me at what time the Journal vote began that was just cast.

The SPEAKER. It is the information of the Chair that the vote began at 11:05 and was completed about 11:35.

Ms. FIEDLER. I thank the Chair.

A DAY OF VINDICATION

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BIAGGI] was gracious enough to let me precede him on the 1-minute, because this is a thrilling, thrilling day for me. Indeed, this is a day of vindication for me. I have always been an activist. And to see the Republican Party begin to follow the activist techniques of H. Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael and Eldridge Cleaver is really magnificent. I was delighted to see you on the Capitol steps singing "We Shall Overcome." Of course, you did not know the words. And I would suggest that by the time you go to your next NAACP meeting in your districts, be sure to know the words to "We Shall Overcome."

This is a day of vindication for me to see the staid, old Republican Party begin to be true activists. That is magnificent.

Now, I have a few words of caution for you: The next time you use some activist techniques, be sure to raise the clenched fist in utter defiance, as was done in the past. Also, I should warn you that if you are an activist you should be prepared to go to jail, and I hope some of you will go to jail.

Finally, my newly found activist friends, I hope you will pursue this activism in your districts where racism and sexism abound.

RETALIATION FOR MURDER OF MAJ. ARTHUR NICHOLSON

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, news reports today indicate that the administration may expel a Soviet diplomat in retaliation for the murder of U.S. Army Maj. Arthur Nicholson.

I am all for it, and I would like to recommend that Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin be the one we send packing.

It may seem harsh, but if we are going to adopt a get-tough policy, we might as well start at the top.

I know the Ambassador has many friends in Washington who will miss him. But this is serious business.

Let's let the Soviets know once and for all that if they continue to murder our finest military men and shoot down civilian airliners, it's going to cost them more than an embassy clerk.

No one wants to go overboard. But this is the least we can do for the family of Major Nicholson and the honor and prestige of our great country.

A HIGHER STANDARD

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in New York City two police officers were arrested and another suspended over allegations that they tortured suspects under their control with devices such as electric shock guns. I commend the swiftness of the response of both Mayor Koch and the Queens district attorney in this matter.

As a police officer for 23 years in New York City and having been associated with law enforcement most of my adult life, it grieves me deeply each and every time there are allegations involving criminal misconduct against police officers. I am especially appalled when they involve brutality against civilians, which does so much to shatter the confidence and relations between the police and the community.

Mr. Speaker, there is a higher standard that police officers must adhere to both in terms of enforcing and upholding the law. There simply can be no compromising on these standards. When there is wrongdoing, it must be dealt with swiftly and with certainty. However, cases of criminal misconduct against individuals should not serve as an indictment against all of law enforcement. That would be wrong, for there are countless thousands of dedicated people in law enforcement who risk their lives on a daily basis to protect the people. They are more typical of our law enforcement personnel.

WHAT KIND OF FOOLS ARE WE?

(Mr. McCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the U.S. House of Representatives cast a tragic vote. Yesterday the House endorsed unilateral disarmament in the face of Communist aggression in Central America. By voting yesterday to deny any aid to the Contra freedom fighters against the Communist Sandinistas in Nicaragua, we eliminated the one weapon that was realistic that we had to contain the Communist expansionist intentions of the Sandinista Nicaraguans.

I submit to you that it is interesting to note that today, by our intelligence accounts, there are about 8,000 Cubans in some advisory capacity inside Nicaragua, and our intelligence says that about 2,000 or more are there in a military advisory capacity. As a gesture to show what kind of wonderful response we will get to this unilateral disarmament we voted yesterday, the leadership of the Sandinista Communists declared today that they are going to send home, on May 2, 100 of those 8,000 Cuban advisers.

What kind of fools are we?

REPRESENTATIVE LEON PANETTA COMMENDED FOR WORK ON TASK FORCE

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise on this occasion to commend our colleague, the gentleman from California, LEON PANETTA, for the outstanding work that he did heading up the task force on the question of the election in the Eighth District of Indiana.

I think it takes a great deal of courage for anybody to be able to do the work that LEON did in a nonpartisan, objective manner. And I believe that anyone reading the report from the House Administration Committee comes to the same conclusion that I have, that it was a very hard job but one done in a very objective manner.

I would like to comment from that report: No one regrets more deeply than does this committee the fact that the residents of the Eighth District were not more decisive in their choice of a Representative. Because of the closeness of the election, it has been suggested that a special election should be called. But for this House to reject the results of last November's election would be to reject the citizens who voted and the individual they elected. In our democracy, the person with the majority of the votes wins, regardless how slim that majority might be. If four votes is not enough, how many would be? Five or eight or ten? Or would it have to be 25, 38, or 50? This committee accepts the general principle that "nothing short of an impossibility of ascertaining for whom the majority of votes were given ought to vacate an election." We are not faced with that impossibility. We have a vote tally produced by the GAO under committee rules and direction, which is a valid tally, a fair, accurate, and complete tally.

A DISTINCTION WITHOUT A DIFFERENCE

(Mr. THOMAS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, pity the poor chairman of the Task Force on Indiana's Eighth District. Mr. PANETTA has been clinging to a distinction without a difference. He said, "Count some ballots, but not all the ballots." The reason? Out of the 6 months that the county clerk held the ballots, some of them made a 1-day trip to the precinct on election day.

Does Mr. PANETTA know that courthouses are precincts? One day out of six months; down the stairs, up the stairs. Count some, but do not count others. The recount director said the security was the same. Why did Mr. PANETTA count some and not others? He cites Indiana law. That is right. After the majority leader asked for and by a straight partisan vote, this House agreed to refuse to honor Indiana law, and seat the certified candidate. How sad.

The Democrat leadership's justification for overturning Indiana law, ignoring its citizens' choices, and changing the outcome of the election is based upon a distinction without a difference. Justified by, yup, you guessed it, Indiana law.

DECKARD CRITICIZES REPUBLICAN CLAIMS OF DEMOCRATS TRYING TO "STEAL" SEAT

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, former GOP Congressman Joel Deckard, saying his political bridges have been burned behind him, is critical of Republican cries that Democrats are attempting to steal the Eighth Congressional District seat.

It seems to me everything the recount commission has done has been open to the scrutiny of the public. I'd like to know how they (Democrats) are stealing it under those circumstances.

Republicans have been critical of the House's recount of the votes from the November 6 election for Democrat Frank McCloskey and Republican Rick McIntyre. They have accused the House of ignoring State laws and creating a process to guarantee a Democratic victory.

I recognize the problem of Indiana state law. That is a tough call to make, but this is a Federal election and up to this point there have been no changes. I don't believe thousands of votes should go uncounted.

More than 5,000 votes were disallowed in the county recounts of Eighth District votes because ballots did not meet requirements of the state laws.

I believe that many people, including myself, are sick to death with some of their comments. The people handling this recount cannot do anything without somone in the Republican Party crying "thief" at every turn.

Despite how the final ballots are counted—one or two votes either way—I believe a special election is the only way to resolve it.

THE DEMOCRATS HAVE ONLY BEEN ABLE TO CONSOLIDATE ON ONE ISSUE

(Mr. FRENZEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, we are beginning to hear the "Great Coverup for the Great Election Robbery of 1985." Yes, Congressman-elect McIntyre won the election; he was certified; recertified in a recount; and only after the House Democrats were able to dispense with Indiana law, invent rules of their own, count until they got a few votes ahead, and then throw out uncounted votes, were they able to declare McCloskey the possessor of more votes than McIntyre.

It is of great interest to me that the Democrat Party, one of our great parties in our two-party system, which is searching for its soul, which cannot agree on any issues, which could not pass a Nicaraguan bill yesterday, has been able to consolidate only on one issue in this whole year, and that is to steal an election from a duly elected Congressman.

WE SHALL PAY—AND PAY—FOR IT LATER

(Mr. TAUZIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, some headlines are trumpeting the story that Congress has reputated the policy of support for the Contras in Nicaragua. I challenge that interpretation of yesterday's House activities.

While we failed to approve the administration's proposal, and failed to finally endorse any proposal to amend the administration's policy, we are yet to define a majority-approved congressional policy position on Nicaragua.

If anything, we have delayed a resolution of the issue, and we have figuratively tossed the ball, for a time, into the Sandinistas court.

Those who have argued to give the Sandinistas another chance to change—to negotiate a peaceful return to democracy and pluralism for Nicaragua—to terminate their alliance with every international terrorist organization known to man; those who believe that this new Communist regime in the mainland Americas will let its democratic neighbors alone—will soon know the truth.

And the truth, I am afraid, will not change anymore than those Marxist Sandinistas will change.

The truth is that we have witnessed the growth of an awful cancer—an-

other extension of Soviet Communist colonialism into our back yard. And we will, for now, permit that cancer to grow and to spread, before we summon the will to effectively deal with it. To coin the old Fram oil filter commercial. We have in effect failed to pay for our filter today, and we shall pay—and pay—for it later.

HOW WAS IT FAIR?

(Mr. DEWINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. Speaker, someone once observed that "the one pervading evil of democracy is the tyranny of the majority, or rather of that party, not always the majority, that succeeds, by force or fraud, in carrying elections."

Today, the leadership of this body stands ready to carry, by their blatant use of power, the Eighth District of Indiana congressional election. They call this fairness, but their actions belie the words. How was it fair to leave the seat vacant for 3½ months? How was it fair to deny representation to the people of Indiana's Eighth District as long as the Republican was ahead? How was it fair to make up the rules for recounting ballots on party lines?

When the State of Indiana counted the ballots, Rick McIntyre won. It is the responsibility of the Indiana secretary of state to certify the election outcome. He did so.

Now the leadership of this body and those on the other side of the aisle—hardly a disinterested group—have in a creative recount found their candidate the winner.

I guess the only thing I'm surprised at is that they only gave their candidate a four-vote victory.

LET US RESPECT THE ORDERLY PROCESS OF THIS INSTITUTION

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, now that the House Administration Committee report has been published, it is clear that Frank McCloskey won the congressional race in the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana by four votes: the closest congressional contest in this century.

It is becoming increasingly clear that my Republican colleagues are disappointed with this outcome and disappointed with the fact that they have lost this contest. But it is interesting to note the tactics and rhetoric of my Republican colleagues in response to this outcome. Some Republican Members have threatened civil disobedience, guerrilla tactics, moving to expel one of our colleagues who served on the recount task force, physically restraining Members of Congress from voting, disrupting the orderly process of the House, and in the press, one Republican spokesman said that they may go so far as to chain themselves to this podium.

Otherwise honorable Members of the minority party have allowed their rhetoric to descend to the point where they have accused Democratic Members of being thieves, thugs, and slime. This display has strengthened the resolve of this Member and many of my fellow Democrats to follow the orderly process of this institution, to respect the history of this body, and not to bend to these shameful threats.

When the proud and distinguished history of the Republican Party is written, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can be assured that these sorry statements and threats will not be included.

□ 1210

PULLING THE RUG OF DEMOCRACY OUT OF INDIANA

(Mr. SHAW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, 24 years ago this country pulled the rug out from under some valiant freedom fighters at the Bay of Pigs in Cuba. Last night this House pulled the rug out from under some valiant freedom fighters in Nicaragua.

We have been told next week that the House Administration Committee is going to attempt to pull the rug of democracy out from under the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana.

I would hope before any of my colleagues, particularly on the majority side, cast their vote next week on that important issue that you ask yourself one question: Have you taken democracy out of the Democrat Party?

MINORITY AND MAJORITY SHOULD WORK TOGETHER

(Mr. COLEMAN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note that it was not the Democrats who defeated the bill last night alone. In fact, more Republicans, more Republicans percentagewise in this House, voted against sending a bill to the conference committee with the other body.

So when I hear Members state that, like the Eighth District of Indiana, it is the Democrats' fault, I only would say to the gentleman from Minnesota and those who have spoken with him this morning that all of us certainly bear a responsibility in trying to deal with that most serious problem in Central America. It is time now for all of us to understand that it is not only one country, it is the entire hemisphere that is at stake.

We should all work together in a bipartisan fashion in order to see to it that we address the true issue, the problem of Central and South America, as well as our neighbor to the south, Mexico, and their problems in a way that will be constructive and in our best interest.

I would hope that the minority party, along with the majority party, would begin to work together, beginning today, rather than showing us a display of what the rules call dilatory tactics.

"DO SVIDANIYA," SENOR ORTEGA

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, in Russia the term "Do svidaniya" means "Have a good trip," so I say "Do svidaniya, Senor Ortega. Your trip to Moscow today could not have been better timed. In fact, I predict your trip will be only the first in a series of celebrations by America's enemies over yesterday's decision by this House to, in my opinion, "abandon the cause of freedom in Central America."

The Soviets love to speak about the correlation of forces in international affairs. But I'm more impressed by the correlation of dates. This week, we have marked the 10th anniversary of our abandonment of Vietnam by setting the stage for another anniversary 10 years from now—our abandonment of Central America.

Now I know a lot of good Americans who oppose aid to the Contras, those who seem to listen to Mr. Ortega rather than our own President, thought that Mr. Ortega would respond by getting up early and building all those schools and hospitals he says Ronald Reagan has stopped him from building.

But I guess the man feels he's entitled to a vacation. Maybe a shopping spree for Soviet arms. And why not? For the Communists in Nicaragua, it's clear sailing from here on out, unless, of course, this House reverses the action it took last night.

DEFINITION TIME

(Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, it is definition time. The word is "War Wimp," noun, one who is all too willing to send others to war but never gets around to going to war himself.

The second term is "War Wimp Party," noun, singular, group of War Wimps.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that a majority of my friends on the Republican side are not wearing the lapel buttons displayed by others which say, "Thou shalt not steal," which is meant to suggest criminality on the part of honorable Members of this body. Our Lord God gave us Ten Commandments, and another of those commandments is, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

THOU SHALT NOT STEAL

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the house for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am wearing one of the green buttons as are many others in this room and it does read, "Thou shalt not steal."

That admonition, you might remember, Mr. Speaker, is one of the Ten Commandments, which most of us were taught to obey from our earliest years. We obeyed because it was the will of God.

We now face a crisis in this House because the majority is about to repeal at least one of these Commandments, the one on the button. That majority has cleared the way for stealing the congressional seat in the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana.

As a freshman, I couldn't believe my ears on the day that the task force was appointed. One of the most temperate, well-respected Members of this body, the Honorable BILL FRENZEL, of Minnesota stated that the appointment signaled that "They are going to steal the seat."

It is now clear that he was right and my illusions about fair play were wrong.

Now that the theft is almost complete, the majority has committed this body to the new Commandment that might makes right.

The rest of us will continue to adhere to the old Commandments. Those still include God's prohibition "Thou shalt not steal."

LET'S GUARD THE TREASURY

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, there is an awful lot of stealing going on from the Treasury and I think we need to talk about that. If you look at the morning paper, there is a mountain of documents that have come out about General Dynamics and many other of our military contractors who have really been out-and-out looting and raiding the taxpayers.

I think this is what we ought to act on if we want to talk about stealing because this stealing is right out of the taxpayers' pockets. If you noticed, in the House hearings held yesterday the auditors said they are having a terrible time getting the Department of Justice to prosecute or to act on the cases of fraud and waste they have.

It is time this body gets serious about real stealing, stealing of the taxpayers' money. I also find in U.S. News & World Report this week further evidence of it, that the chairman of the board of General Dynamics gave himself a 110 percent raise last year. I want to assure you he was not at the poverty line or anywhere near it before his raise.

The people making money out of the defense bill are not the guys in uniform or not the people whose lives are on the line, but the people who are really making a monetary killing are the defense contractors, and no one in the administration is doing anything about it. Let us get serious about the business at hand and let us guard the Treasury. Let us really go after stealing.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY?

(Mr. HILLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, what has happened to the Democratic Party?

Why has the party of Jefferson, Jackson, Roosevelt, and Kennedy—the party which has played such a significant role in the evolution of American liberty—become so morally bankrupt as to deny Rick McIntyre the seat to which he was elected?

Why has the Democratic Party chosen to cut the thread of fair play and political decency which forms the very fabric of the democracy under which we live?

Why have they chosen to use their numbers in this body to impose their will on a half million unrepresented Hoosiers?

And why has the leadership chosen to compromise the working relationship between the majority and minority parties in this House by making the Eighth District of Indiana a test of political macho?

In the end, you may seat your candidate, Mr. Speaker, but you cannot violate both principle and precedent without a price.

There may be no antidote to counter the poison which now stands as barrier between Republicans and Democrats and the work they need to accomplish in this Congress.

My last question, Mr. Speaker: Is all this really worth it?

CENTRAL AMERICA: DOSE OF REALITY—NO. 4

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration decided in 1981 to provide covert aid to stimulate a guerrilla campaign against the Government of Nicaragua. This decision was communicated in secret to the House and Senate Intelligence Committees in December of that year. Neither committee thought that the idea was particularly bright, but the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency assured one and all that this would be a small, limited-purpose operation.

The Intelligence Committees did not quite believe the assurances they were given. Accordingly, the committees agreed to allow aid to the so-called Contras, but explicitly limited the use of the funds to interdict arms that the administration claimed were being shipped from Nicaragua to rebels in El Salvador, this being the so-called Boland amendment. The committees also provided that none of the money could be used for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of Nicaragua. This proviso was secret, but President Reagan could have no doubt that the Congress very much opposed the idea of trying to carry out a guerrilla campaign against Nicaragua, for the same language was included in the Defense appropriations resolution for fiscal 1983—by a unanimous vote in the House.

Far from being a small, limited purpose effort, by the time of that December open vote in the House, the CIA had built up a 10,000-man Contra army, based in Honduras. The Contras never found any of the arms that they were supposed to be stopping, and as later events would prove, the operation was hardly one of interdicting arms. It was instead a campaign designed to overthrow the Sandinista government, notwithstanding what the law said. A few months after the adoption of the Boland amendment, the Contras, using CIA support vessels, advice, and materials, were laying mines in the harbors of Nicaragua. This was anything but an effort to interdict arms, and it was an operation of far greater scope than Congress had authorized. The blatant excesses and outright stupidity of the Nicaraguan operations infuriated even the most hawkish of hawks, who found themselves embarrassed and undercut by the violations of clear congressional policy, and the outright violation of the Boland amendment.

This is what the Boland amendment provides, and the language is the same in both the secret CIA authorization of 1982 and the publicly adopted defense title of the continuing resolution adopted later that year:

None of the funds provided in this act may be used by the Central Intelligence Agency or the Department of Defense to furnish military equipment, military training, or advice, or other support for military activities, to any group or individual, not part of a country's armed forces, for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of Nicaragua or provoking a military exchange between Nicaragua and Honduras.

But by that time, the Contra forces had already been built up far beyond what the CIA had said would be done, a force far larger than could be justified for the purposes the Intelligence Committees had authorized, and far larger than what would have been needed for the interdiction operations that CIA Director Casey had said they would be used for. The Reagan administration from the outset deceived the Intelligence Committees, and violated congressional policy, even when that policy had been adopted openly, by a 411-0 vote in the House. It was a reckless, lawless performance, proving that the Intelligence Committees had been right about their belief that the CIA could not be trusted to operate either covertly, with discretion, or cleverness—let alone be kept in reasonable control.

□ 1220

ELKS LODGES IN NORTH CAROLINA COMMENDED FOR PROGRAMS ON DRUG AWARENESS

(Mr. COBLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, today I express thanks to the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks in North Carolina for its contribution in the areas of drug awareness. Its target area is the youth enrolled in the fourth through the ninth grades. The objective is to increase their awareness of the adverse consequences of drug abuse so that they will decide for themselves to avoid drugs.

The program is under the direction of Byron Long, State president; Ernest Bell, national youth chairman; and James Green, State drug awareness chairman, who have taken great steps in not only informing our youth but their parents and teachers as well. The 41 Elks lodges of North Carolina have contributed greatly and are working to combat this crippler of the young. I salute the B.P.O.E. for its assistance in keeping our Nation strong by encouraging our next generation to avoid the use of drugs.

THE DO-NOTHING APPROACH TO CENTRAL AMERICA

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed in our actions of yesterday. First, we passed a genuine attempt on the part of some Members to not quit the region of Central America with the Barnes-Hamilton amendment. It was a pitiful, do-nothing, run-but-not-hide amendment which I could not support, but at least it was an attempt at some middle ground, a hands-on foreign policy.

Next we defeated the Michel amendment, which would have given some limited humanitarian support to the Contras. I supported this approach. It was the minimum action for our country, but it, too, failed. Then the Congress failed to send to conference any bill.

This final failure—and let us not be fooled by comments to the contrary—in my opinion, is the sole responsibility of those Members who gave the Hamilton-Barnes option a majority in the first place. Sadly, this truth has been belatedly revealed to middle-ground Democrats.

The moderate, reasonable, middle-ground Democrats have now discovered that many Democrats want no action in Central America, no military support, no humanitarian support, no support at all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask those good men and women who know we cannot be an ostrich in our foreign policy to join with us who want to do something and formulate a policy better than the President's and surely better than yesterday's do-nothing approach.

EL SALVADOR COMMENDED FOR ITS IMMUNIZATION PROGRAM

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I took to the well of the House to inform my colleagues of the exceedingly successful mass immunization program organized in El Salvador by President Jose Napoleon Duarte. I observed this great humanitarian effort firsthand over the weekend and feel this body should appropriately congratulate President Duarte and those involved.

The campaign was a model of good planning, effective management, and interagency cooperation. Key to the vaccine campaign's success was the participation by U.S. Agency for International Development, UNICEF, PAHO, and several other agencies and organizations. I am very proud of our Government's contribution to this humanitarian effort. Very proud. It underscores our commitment to the well-being and safety of the people of El Salvador, especially her children.

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely important that we recognize the direct leadership role President Duarte played in the immunization program. It is estimated that approximately 300,000 Salvadoran children were immunized and thereby protected from painful debilitating and even fatal diseases such as whooping cough, diphtheria, tetanus, measles, and polio. Tens of thousands more will be vaccinated in a followup effort. It is clear, though, that without President Duarte's leadership, there would not have been an immunization campaign in El Salvador.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the major obstacle to the immunization of all the world's children is not expense—it is relatively inexpensive—nor is it lack of interest on the part of volunteers and medical staff. Indeed, the El Salvador program benefited from more than 20 international and local organizations as well as more than 18,000 Salvadoran volunteers and medical staff.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, the chief problem lies in the lack of leadership at the highest echelons of governments. With proper leadership, like in El Salvador, millions of children could be saved. It is so sad and regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that only 20 percent of the world's families are aware of and taking advantage of the new low-cost immunization mechanisms which could protect their children. As a result, more than 5 million children die and a further 5 million more are mentally and physically disabled each year from these easily preventable diseases.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, President Duarte provided an inspiring example to the rest of the developing world, as to how to close the gap between available immunization services and children actually immunized in a country. In El Salvador, approximately 900,000 children were in need of vaccines to protect them from these chronic diseases, and now many are protected. Despite the war-torn status of his country, President Duarte had the compassion, vision, and commitment to lead a nationwide effort to protect his country's children. We must encourage other leaders in the Third World to emulate the El Salvador program.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report to my colleagues that few people in El Salvador were unaware of the national immunization campaign. With President Duarte leading the project, radio stations, churches, banks, health groups, and schools all participated in the promotion, as well as the completion, of the vaccine campaign. By establishing conveniently located vaccination points—over 2,000 in El Salvador—and by coordinating specific dates and times, President Duarte ensured that more parents would be aware of the immunization programs. Thus, thousands of El Salvadoran children were immunized and an overwhelming percentage of children returned to receive all three doses which

are needed for certain vaccinations to be effective.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that President Duarte's effort in El Salvador will serve as a model for similarly needed programs throughout the developing world. El Salvador is a success story, an inspiration, and an example to be duplicated elsewhere in the developing world. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution recognizing and applauding President Duarte for his foresight and effective leadership in this program. I am pleased that Mr. FASCELL, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as Mr. BROOMFIELD, the ranking minority of the committee, and Mr. YATRON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights, and Mr. SOLOMON, ranking minority of that subcommittee as well as several distinguished Members including Mr. KEMP, Mr. HYDE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. MCEWEN have joined me as original cosponsors of my resolution.

I urge all my colleagues in the House to join me in supporting this resolution.

BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD ON CENTRAL AMERICA

(Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I was dismayed by the vote last night also, that after 14 hours of debate we failed to produce a measure to address the problems confronting Central America, after 14 hours of debate on military strategy and political consequences, after 14 hours of debate in which the suffering of innocent civilians was grievously documented, and after 14 hours to say no to aid, with a postscript that we have no alternatives.

To my colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARNES], I would say they had a very good effort, and I supported that effort. There is clearly a need to bring stability and security to the region. Also it is in our power to provide humanitarian aid to solve problems brought about by such things as the polio epidemic that may well spread across Central America.

To those who say Hamilton-Barnes did nothing, I say you are wrong. To those who want no aid to the region, I say you are wrong also.

Mr. Speaker, there was an opportunity to nurture democracy throughout the region, but we have thrown out the baby with the bath water, and it is back to the drawing board.

ORTEGA CELEBRATES VICTORY, SCHEDULES MOSCOW TRIP

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the forces against U.S. involvement in Central America were triumphant last night, but I believe they can take little solace in their hollow victory.

The much-touted Barnes-Hamilton alternative to the President's policy failed even to retain a majority of the Members on the Democratic side of the aisle, and the transparency was given to the contention that there was any real majority support to do anything other than frustrate the President in his foreign policy initiatives.

Furthermore, for those who genuinely believe that the United States has been wrong in its involvement in Central America, let me offer you my strained congratulations. You may take great pride in the fact that your efforts were greeted with such enthusiasm by Sandinista Leader Daniel Ortega that he celebrated your victory with an immediate announcement of his intention to travel to Moscow to seek further instructions.

REAGAN URGED NOT TO VISIT BITBURG CEMETERY

(Mr. LEVINE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] for the amendment that we will soon pass urging the President not to visit the cemetery at Bitburg.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, in addition to the very significant moral and philosophical considerations that this visit raises, the judgment of this President and his advisers to visit this site of Nazi graves raises very fundamental questions on the competence of foreign policy conduct in this administration. It provides us with the potential for severe disruptions in our relations with our most trusted and loyal allies in Western Europe. It gives the Soviets the potential for further very significant propaganda gains throughout both Western and Eastern Europe and throughout the globe.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that a cross-section, on a bipartisan basis, of this House will join in sending both a respectful and strong message to the President of the United States urging him to reverse this outrageous decision.

QUESTIONS OF INTEGRITY AND CHARACTER RELATING TO THE CONTESTED INDIANA VOTE

(Mr. SILJANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, the Founding Fathers' idea in the Constitution for this austere establishment was an establishment of men and women of integrity and character. In the Eight District of Indiana, unfortunately, that basis of our Founding Fathers has been desecrated.

Is it integrity to create a bipartisan committee with two Democrats and one Republican? Is it integrity to throw out State law? Is it integrity to then turn around and use the State law when it is to your advantage? Is it character and integrity to count unauthorized ballots in Democratic counties and then turn around and not count unauthorized ballots from Republican counties?

Is it really integrity to literally create rules that guarantee your side victory? Is that fair play? And is it real character and integrity, as the Founding Fathers established for this institution, to count literally more votes in a precinct than there are registered voters? Is this the kind of character and integrity embodied in this institution?

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that we would reanalyze the Eighth District of Indiana on the basis of our integrity and character.

THE TOMMY HEARNS APPROACH TO INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

(Mr. LUNGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I think yesterday's vote in this House was a tragedy, a tragedy for the people of America, a tragedy for the people of Central America and for all of this hemisphere. But I find instructive some of the comments from the Members on the other side who suggested that the approach the President wanted was wrong. They said that would tend to have people gaze upon what the Contras are doing and not focus on what the Sandinistas are doing, that if we can just have people see what the Sandinistas are doing, world opinion will make them change.

I guess we would call that the Tommy Hearns approach to international relations. As Tommy Hearns was sitting there on his back seeing stars, he probably thought in his mind, "I may be knocked out, but, by God, that Marvelous Hagler, his arms sure are tired."

I guess that is all we have got to do. We keep getting knocked out and knocked out and knocked out, and, by God, those Sandinistas are going to fall over from sheer exhaustion in their victories.

□ 1230

BITBURG IS NOT YOUR PLACE, MR. PRESIDENT

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I address these remarks to our President for whom I have the deepest respect and the highest admiration.

Mr. President, do not go to Bitburg Cemetery. As cochairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, I believe I speak for all of our members when I say laying wreaths at Nazi graves would be a terrible debasement of the sacrifices of tens of millions of people you care about deeply:

American combat veterans and war dead—not only in that war, but in all wars to preserve freedom;

Holocaust victims, martyred or living, and their partners in conscience, all of us, committed to keeping that memory alive;

Europeans who fought against and suffered so much at the hands of the Nazi terror. Our current allies. But also, perhaps especially, the Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Yugoslavs, Ukranians, and, yes, even the Russian people. They would see Bitburg through the eyes of state-controlled television, which will be spliced with visions of the horrors they remember so well. All that we have gained in standing for human freedom will be lost in your unintended embrace of its enemies.

No, Mr. President; Bitburg is not your place. Don't go.

VOTE LAST NIGHT WILL LEAD TO MORE REPRESSION AND SPREAD OF REVOLUTION IN CENTRAL AMERICA

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this morning on "Good Morning, America" Steve Bell interviewed a Vietnamese young man who in the early seventies demonstrated here in America against the Vietnam war.

After the war, he went back to Vietnam to help in the redistribution of wealth program. He told of some differences he had with the Communist government's policies and how they threw him into jail for 2½ years because of that disagreement.

He said prison is worse now than before, and the use of tiger cages still occurs.

He told of spying by neighbor on neighbor, with the withholding of food being used to control this spying. Those who complain are reported and many go to jail without a trial.

This is the Communist program used in the Soviet Union, Vietnam, Cuba, and Nicaragua.

Our vote last night to do nothing to stop these practices will lead to more repression and a spread of revolution in Central America, just as it did in Southeast Asia. There will then be many people like this Vietnamese young man—from the United States and Central America who will then see the light.

I pray it will not be too late.

THE ARROGANCE OF THE MAJORITY ON EIGHTH DISTRICT OF INDIANA ELECTION

(Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. There seems to be, Mr. Speaker, some genuine confusion on the Democratic side of the aisle. As a Member who is not yet willing to say that the phrase "decent Democrat" is an oxymoron, let me explain to you how deeply the Republicans feel about what we look at as the arrogance of the majority concerning the Eighth District of Indiana.

Look at the case. We do not ask much. We do not ask much. Two probably decent people have gone through very long months, but we believe that there has been a deliberate and conscious effort to take an election, that the people of that Eighth District are not being allowed to choose their representative and that the Democrats indeed are afraid to let democracy work.

It is, and I am reminded of the 1 minute speech by the gentleman from Maryland, it is the party of Lincoln that is activist and involved and some of us who do fight and have fought racism and sexism believe maybe the Democrats should agree that the fight against racism and sexism and for democracy should finally enter the doors of the House.

A COMMENDATION TO 46 COURAGEOUS DEMOCRATS

(Mr. RITTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, Democrats seeking to move their party back into the center, into the mainstream of American political life, received a severe setback in yesterday's vote. That was the vote to deny humanitarian nonlethal assistance to those fighting totalitarianism in America.

I would like to commend those 46 Democrats who had the courage to buck a conservative effort on the part of their leadership to whip their troops into line; from BARNARD to BENNETT to BEVILL to BIAGGI to STRATTON, TALLON, TAUZIN, THOMAS, and WILSON, we saw the real Democratic Party stand up, the Democratic Party of FDR, Truman, Kennedy, Humphrey, and Jackson.

In the weeks ahead there will be time for other more moderate Democrats to reevaluate their position, to reconsider the meaning of deserting freedom fighters right south of our border.

When in doubt, I urge my Democratic colleagues, bet on liberty.

DEMOCRATS HAVE CONTROLLED RECOUNT IN EIGHTH DISTRICT OF INDIANA

(Mr. KINDNESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, I know from personal experience and observation that there are at least 70 to 80 of our colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle who are not thieves, who are not dishonest, who do want to see the right conclusion of all this concern about the Eighth District of Indiana. Other people's observations may go beyond that. I am sure there are more.

Let me say that I am disturbed to hear the repeated misstatements by our colleagues from the other side of the aisle, such as one expressed today that the General Accounting Office conducted this recount in Indiana. That is not true.

The fact comes down to this. The Democratic Party has controlled who does the count. They hired people who happened to otherwise work for the General Accounting Office, but when you get right down to the end of the line, let us sweep away all the chaff. There were a group of ballots there. Someone counted. They were of the same category basically and some were not. You have lost your fairness argument. It is time for a special election.

CAPTURED RECORDS REVEAL COMMUNIST STRATEGY AND TACTICS

(Mr. LAGOMARSINO asked and was given permission to address the house for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, Daniel Ortega is celebrating what happened here yesterday by announcing

his decision to go to Moscow to seek additional aid. Some other people who are celebrating are El Salvador's Marxist guerrillas, because they believe the Sandinista success in crushing the Nicaraguan resistance would be decisive in their plans to bring down the Salvadoran Government.

According to documents captured last week by the Salvadoran Army, in a letter addressed to the Sandinista National Directorate date November 24, 1983, the four top Salvadoran guerrilla commanders also expressed support for Managua's diplomatic initiatives because they help President Reagan's opposition in the United States.

The Salvadoran guerrillas hail Sandinista diplomatic efforts because they "gain time to help opposition in the United States and to internationally isolate President Reagan's aggressive plans toward Nicaragua and El Salvador."

No other reason for their support of diplomacy was listed.

The guerrilla commanders dismiss the importance of their negotiating with the Salvadoran Government because "dialog does not play an important role in our diplomatic battles."

Rebel commanders also asked the Sandinista Directorate for "a much higher level of logistical assistance" since "coordination and cooperation" between the Salvadoran guerrillas and the Sandinistas is of the highest priority."

Mr. Speaker, I include the article by Roger Fontaine of the Washington Times, as follows:

CAPTURED RECORDS REVEAL COMMUNIST STRATEGY, TACTICS

(By Roger Fontaine)

El Salvador's Marxist guerrilla leaders believe a Sandinista success in crushing the Nicaraguan resistance would be decisive in their plans to bring down the Salvadoran democratic government, according to documents captured last week.

In a letter addressed to the Sandinista national directorate dated Nov. 24, 1983, the four top Salvadoran guerrilla commanders also expressed support for Managua's diplomatic initiatives because they help President Reagan's opposition in the United States. The letter and other documents seized by the Salvadoran army were obtained by The Washington Times.

Rebel leaders stressed "the internal consolidation of the Sandinista Popular Revolution is the "determining factor for our liberation process."

"At this time, the highest priority for the FSLN [Sandinistas] is to continue and aggravate the wearing away of the enemy forces"—the Nicaragua resistance—"which in turn will allow us to enter that situation with our political and military forces better developed and consolidated, and with a larger capacity to bog down the aggression if it were to happen."

The guerrilla commanders' statement refers to a pledge by the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front, or FMNL, to respond to the introduction of U.S. combat troops in Central America, according to one State Department official.

The guerrillas hail Sandinista diplomatic efforts because they "gain time to help opposition in the United States and to internationally isolate [President Reagan's] aggressive plan towards Nicaragua and El Salvador."

No other reason for their support of diplomacy was listed.

The guerrilla commanders dismiss the importance of their negotiating with the Salvadoran government because "dialogue does not play an important role in our diplomatic battles."

Important diplomatic "battles" listed in the letter included mustering "international pressure" to stop "U.S. intervention."

Rebel commanders also asked the Sandinista directorate for "a much higher level of logistical assistance" since "coordination and cooperation" between the Salvadoran guerrillas and the Sandinistas "is of the highest priority."

"We believe that present circumstances are favorable to take daring steps in this direction," they added.

The documents, according to State Department officials, constitute the richest haul of material detailing the inside workings of the Salvadoran rebels and their relationship with the Nicaraguan government since the capture of a diary belonging to the chairman of the El Salvadoran Communist party five years ago.

More documents are expected to be released shortly.

They were seized by the Salvadoran army in a raid on a guerrilla base camp last week in El Salvador's San Vicente province in which seven guerrillas were killed and a high-ranking political-military section chief, Nidia Diaz, was captured.

The camp, according to officials, belonged to the Central American Revolutionary Workers' Party (PRTC), one of five military factions that belong to the FMLN guerrilla coalition.

The commanders' letter was in reply to a Sandinista foreign commission report given them for comment. The report outlines Managua's diplomatic strategy.

The closeness of their working relationship, according to State Department officials, is demonstrated in the military commanders' letter.

The FMLN commanders who signed the letter included Shafik Jorge Handal, chairman of the El Salvadoran Communist Party, Joaquin Villalobos, head of the Popular Revolutionary Army, Roberto Roca of the Central American Revolutionary Workers' Party, and Leonel Gonzalez of the Popular Liberation Forces.

The guerrilla leaders, all headquartered in Nicaragua, stated their agreement was the Sandinista foreign affairs commission's report and its conclusions that the U.S. election period was "the appropriate moment to influence the American electorate."

"The Sandinista Popular Revolution and the Salvadoran Revolutionary Movement are the most sensitive points in Central America and they could bog down the present Reagan Administration," the letter said.

The military commanders underlined the importance of defeating "the aggressive policy of Reagan" through "the joint efforts of the Socialist Camp, the National Liberation Movements and all the Progressive Forces . . ."

Officials did not explain why the documents, available since last week, were only distributed Tuesday night during the House debate on funding for the Nicaraguan resistance forces. The rebel camp was captured on April 18.

Salvadoran rebel cooperation and assistance to the Sandinistas shows up in another captured document, the hand-written notes of an undated meeting between FMLN and Sandinista officials in which joint efforts were outlined, including contingency planning.

The minutes state that U.S. "aggression" against Nicaragua was inevitable and to be launched "within a few days." They affirm that the common interest of the Sandinistas and the Salvadoran rebels was the "defense of the Nicaraguan revolution."

According to the minutes, cooperation was more than rhetorical. Officials agreed that an FMLN military unit was to receive one month of intensive military training and then be deployed to a border area closest to Nicaragua.

The minutes disclose that "at the first shots" indicating a U.S. attack on Nicaragua, FMLN propaganda materials and funds are to be shipped from Nicaragua to El Salvador.

The document also indicated that this would be a joint decision of the Sandinistas and the FMLN.

Other captured documents show the Salvadorn rebels are dependent on other Soviet bloc states for training and instruction.

On a page of a captured guerrilla calendar for May 1984 are found names of guerrillas destined for instruction in Bulgaria, the Soviet Union and Vietnam.

Other foreign training was indicated in captured guerrilla personnel files. The cards list names, pseudonyms, sex, civil state, number of children, profession, schooling, military experience and physical problems.

The last line of each card indicates political and military training. In the file cards made available to The Washington Times, five showed instruction in Cuba, and another said simply "a military course in the exterior."

Another captured document—two pages of hand-written excerpts from a FMLN foreign affairs commission political analysis—reveals a preoccupation with the possibility of U.S. combat troops being deployed in the region.

In paragraph 17, the report says if aggression against Nicaragua begins, "the frontiers disappear."

It characterized the Reagan administration as the most aggressive in recent years and stated that its interventionism was aimed at Central America and Grenada.

Although the report is undated, it refers to "our tragic defeat in Grenada"—which one State Department official said indicates the FMLN's "full identification with the Marxists-Leninists in Grenada" and "reaffirms a common thread throughout the documents, which is the importance placed on communication and cooperation with other communist groups."

PARTY LINE VOTE OF TASK FORCE

(Mr. MONSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONSON. Mr. Speaker, in thier second hearing, when McCloskey was behind by 12 votes, the task force from House Administration voted to count 10 unnotarized absentee ballots.

In the final hearing, after McCloskey had moved into a three-vote lead, the task force decided on a 2 to 1, party line vote, not to count the other 32 unnotarized absentee ballots.

When the Committee on House Administration met to review the report of its task force, Mr. SHUMWAY, selected by the Democrats to supervise the task force recount, testified that the 32 unnotarized absentee ballots the task force refused to count had been afforded the same level of security as the 10 unnotarized absentee ballots the task force had previously voted to count.

Further questioning brought the following exchange:

Congressman THOMAS. If you agreed to count the first ballots, what would you have done in your professional position with the second set of ballots? Would you have counted them or not counted them?

Mr. SHUMWAY. Based on the security and handling, I guess we would have counted them.

□ 1240

COUNTING THE VOTES IN INDIANA'S EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

(Mr. COBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat what my distinguished colleague from Utah [Mr. MONSON] just mentioned because it bears repeating.

In a second meeting when McCloskey was behind by 12 votes, the task force voted to count 10 unauthorized absentee ballots.

In the final hearing after McCloskey had moved into a three-vote lead, the task force decided on a 2-to-1 party line vote not to count the other 32 unauthorized absentee ballots.

When the Committee on House Administration met to review the report of its task force, Mr. SHUMWAY, selected by the Democrats to supervise the task force recount, testified that the 32 unnotarized absentee ballots the task force refused to count had been afforded the same level of security as the 10 unnotarized absentee ballots the task force had previously voted to count.

Further questioning brought the following exchange:

Congressman THOMAS. If you agreed to count the first ballots, what would you have done in your professional position with the second set of ballots? Would you have counted them or not counted them?

Mr. SHUMWAY. Based on the security and handling, I guess we would have counted them.

THE 5 HOUR AND 45 MINUTE TAPE GAP

(Ms. OAKAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a 14-minute tape, paid for by the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, concerning hearings that the Task Force on Elections had regarding the McCloskey-McIntyre issue.

This 14-minute tape, based on hours and hours, more than 6 hours of one hearing, for example, was spliced and put together in such a way as to misrepresent what really happened. I call that the 5 hour and 45 minute tape gap.

Where have we heard that before? We remember in the Watergate situation there were a number of hours of tapes that were not there, and it created a national scandal.

I urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to take a look at all of the proceedings rather than this spliced 14-minute tape based on hours of the proceedings. Anyone can splice a tape to make it look any way they want.

Why are you afraid to look at the entire proceedings? You know why. Because Frank McCloskey did in fact win the election.

The GAO and the Director of Elections chosen by the Republicans, I might add, indeed found him to be the winner.

SHOWING OF TAPE OF ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS OF ELECTION TASK FORCE

(Mr. COATS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, just in reply to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] who just spoke previously, perhaps the gentlewoman was not present on the floor when the leadership discussed the agreement between the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL], and the majority leader as to the fact that the entire proceedings would be shown to all House Members who are interested on Monday over House television.

So in response to a resolution passed by the Republican conference we feel that all of the proceedings are open to be seen and we welcome that you watch the entire thing.

Ms. OAKAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COATS. I am happy to yield.

Ms. OAKAR. Is it not true that there is a 14- or 15-minute spliced tape that was shown to your side of the aisle, and that the manner in which it was spliced outraged individuals?

I can understand that when it is put together in a manipulative way.

Is it true you have a tape like that?

Mr. COATS. If the gentlewoman would yield back the time, absolutely it is true. We did not have at our conference the privilege of watching all 6 hours, and so we had an edited version. And all Members have also had the opportunity to see the entire version, and many have seen that and watched it.

Ms. OAKAR. I hope the responsible Members will see the entire proceedings.

Mr. COATS. I hope so, too.

SENSE OF CONGRESS RESOLUTION REGARDING THE PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time it would be my purpose to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution in the House.

That resolution would express the sense of Congress that:

First, the U.S. Government should pay honor to the memories of the millions of innocent civilians and hundreds of thousands of American and allied soldiers who suffered and died at the hands of the Nazis;

Second, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the end of the Second World War, it is fitting and appropriate for the President, in a gesture of reconciliation, to visit the Federal Republic of Germany, a country which has taken its place among the community of democratic nations and which is now a friend and ally of the United States;

Third, the President should recognize the importance of the relationship between our Nation and the Federal Republic of Germany by paying tribute to appropriate symbols of that Nation's current democracy; and

Fourth, the President should reconsider the inclusion of the Bitburg Cemetery in his forthcoming trip to the Federal Republic of Germany.

THE PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO BITBURG CEMETERY

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, today, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has stated, it is his intention to bring up a resolution urging the President to reconsider his visit to Bitburg.

It has been told to us that the whip on the other side will object to bringing this resolution before us. I would beseech that whip, the good gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] not to do that.

This is an issue that transcends party politics. Many people, including the good gentleman from Mississippi, have spoken out against the President visiting Bitburg.

I cannot tell you, sir, in my district, which has more Holocaust survivors than any other in the country, the depth of the anguish felt about the President continuing on this course.

He does not intend to do wrong, but he is doing wrong. He is making a large segment of the American people feel that their suffering went in vain.

These are people who love America, who are proud of America, as we all are. And yet when the President visits a Nazi cemetery where SS members are buried, he is slapping them in the face.

Please, I say to the gentleman from Mississippi, do not object, and let this resolution go through.

VOTE FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION IN INDIANA'S EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, last night there were 47 Democrats, I believe, who showed great courage in voting for what they believed in, in order to save freedom in Central America. They resisted pressures from within their own party and resisted pressure from many organized groups, and they did what they thought was right.

Next Tuesday there will be an opportunity to vote for a special election in Indiana. In a situation so totally muddled that there is not a single newspaper in the country that is endorsing the Democratic leadership effort to seat one person by a 4-vote margin out of 234,000, I would hope that every Democrat will look at the example of the 47 last night and will show us a step toward bipartisanship and toward an opportunity to have a rational rest of the session by voting for a special election and not voting for the leadership position. And, indeed, possibly even convincing the leadership to change their mind and vote for a special election.

THE PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO BITBURG

(Mr. TORRICELLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to speak with the regret that this House today will not be able to address the President and give him the advice that he needs to receive.

We have all admired the President in his ability to communicate, to seize symbols.

In his coming visit to Germany he will seize the wrong symbol. That is an error of many dimensions.

It should not become a partisan issue. We should not be divided in giving the President the advice that he must receive.

We do not say the President should not seek a symbol of reconciliation with the people of Germany. But there are many symbols. This is the wrong one. Bitburg is a symbol of German soldiers who led American troops to a clearing and murdered them. It is a symbol of the SS who conspired to construct a death machine unprecedented in the world. And it is an opportunity for the Soviet Union to use as propaganda the wrong symbol of America seizing back into the past.

□ 1250

THE EIGHTH DISTRICT OF INDIANA ELECTION DISPUTE

(Mr. MYERS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the gentleman from Missouri, our colleague, praised the task force from the House Administration Committee for its great job which it did in the Eighth District of Indiana in conducting the recount. And the task force did direct that recount. But the gentleman from Missouri did ask the question: If four votes is not enough, how many is enough? How many are enough? I would remind the gentleman, and I know he has left the floor, that 34 votes majority was not enough on January 3 when it was for the Republican candidate; 417 majority was not enough on February 7 when, again, they cast their votes for the Republican candidate. But in some way four is enough now.

During that earlier vote I heard several of the majority party Democrats speaking about, "Yes, it is a hot issue here, the election in Indiana, but not in our districts."

Well, let me tell you, I spoke last night in Virginia to a churchmen's group. I spoke about the spiritual aspect of Members of Congress, about our prayer group that many of us do participate in weekly. I did not talk about politics.

I spoke about 15 minutes.

The last 15 minutes I left open for questions and answers.

The very first question, the second, third, and fourth questions asked of me had nothing to do with activities of this House, as far as economic problems of the country.

In Virginia they asked about what is happening to that stolen election in Indiana? Well, if you think it is not an issue in your home district, you may be fooled. It will be if it is not now, I can assure you.

THE VISIT OF THE PRESIDENT TO BITBURG

(Mr. WYDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in my 1-minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] that I think it is very unfortunate that the American people are not going to have a chance to debate and have an opportunity to hear this resolution which is of a very mild nature. The resolution asks only that the President reconsider his position to go to the Bitburg Cemetery. That decision has brought pain to millions of Americans. It has brought pain to thousands of World War II veterans who left their youth on the battlefields of Germany and Eastern Europe in the fight to end Nazi terrorism and preserve freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of thought.

It has brought pain to the families of those thousands of other courageous Americans whose lives were taken from them in the same noble endeavor.

The resolution that we seek to debate today does not condemn the President, it does not even request that he cancel his visit, it asks only that he reconsider his decision and look at other options.

There are many other options where the President could honor non-Jewish German nationals who fought the Nazi terrorism. We hope he would do so.

THE "GOOD" INTENTIONS OF THE NICARAGUAN GOVERNMENT

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we received a lot of assurances on the floor about the "good" intentions of the Nicaraguan Government. I would like to show some of those statements by reading from the RECORD here, a statement from yesterday.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, under rule XVI does the gentleman have permission to quote from the RECORD?

Mr. WALKER. I do not.

PERMISSION TO READ FROM CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent under rule XVI to quote from the RECORD.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move that I be permitted under rule XVI to quote from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is whether under rule XXX the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] should be permitted to read.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 351, nays 14, answered "present" 6, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—351

Ackerman
Addabbo
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Barton
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Biliraki
Bliley
Boehlert
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Borski
Boucher
Boulter
Breaux
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappie
Cheney
Clay
Clinger
Cobey
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Conte
Cooper
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Craig
Crane
Crockett
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Eckert (NY)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fawell
Feighan
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Fowler
Franklin
Frenzel
Fuqua
Gallo
Gaydos
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hawkins
Hayes
Heftel
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Long
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McCurdy
McEwen
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Molinari
Mollohan
Monson
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Myers
Natcher
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Sabo
Saxton
Schaefer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schumer
Sharp
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strang
Stratton
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)

NAYS—14

Donnelly
Dornan (CA)
Durbin
Fascell
Kindness
Lehman (FL)
Livingston
Mitchell
Oberstar
Pepper
Petri
Rahall
Sensenbrenner
Zschau

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6

Conyers
Frank
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Obey
Studds

NOT VOTING—62

Anthony
Badham
Bartlett
Bateman
Boggs
Boland
Bonker
Bosco
Boxer
Chappell
Coats
Collins
Daniel
de la Garza
Duncan
Dymally
Fazio
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frost
Garcia
Gephardt
Goodling
Green
Grotberg
Hall, Sam
Hatcher
Hefner
Huckaby
Jones (NC)
Kolter
Latta
Lehman (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Loeffler
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McDade
McGrath
Miller (CA)
Moakley
Moody
Murtha
Neal
Rodino
Roe
Rostenkowski
Russo
Savage
Scheuer
Schulze
Seiberling
Shelby
Smith (IA)
Stallings
Stangeland
Traficant
Weaver
Wise

□ 1310

Messrs. KINDNESS, LIVINGSTON, PETRI, DORNAN of California, and ZSCHAU changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LEATH of Texas and Mr. PANETTA changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. OBEY and Mr. STUDDS changed their votes from "yea" to "present."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROBINSON). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

The RECORD of April 24, 1985 on page 9222, has this statement:

> The Hamilton substitute adopts a carrot-and-stick approach that makes clear congressional concern about the Sandinistas' close links to Cuba and the Soviet Union, their violations of human rights, and their efforts to destabilize the region. These are specified along with removal of a military adviser and the offer of economic and development programs.

That was used to say that the Hamilton substitute was tough.

I do not think that Mr. Ortega was listening. He headed for the Soviet Union.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 130, EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration in the House of a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 130) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the President's visit to the Federal Republic of Germany in May 1985, which I send to the desk.

If consent is granted, I would yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] and reserve 15 minutes to myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understood that the policy that had been announced by the Speaker was that the House was directed that it was not in order to bring up legislation by unanimous consent unless that request had been cleared with the leadership on both sides, to wit: it also says that should include the majority and minority floor leadership, and committee and

subcommittee chairmen and ranking minority members.

I was not notified. I am under the impression the gentleman from Texas, the majority floor leader, was not notified, and, therefore, I presume that the Speaker, the Chair, in this case, would not recognize this unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman from Florida advise the Chair what clearance he has?

Mr. FASCELL. If the gentleman would yield——

Mr. LOTT. Further reserving the right to object, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. FASCELL. The matter was cleared on our side.

Mr. LOTT. Was it cleared with the majority leader on your side, the majority floor leader?

Mr. FASCELL. And it was cleared on your side, with your leader, and ranking member of the full committee. Well, I am not sure who the leader is over there. And also with the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. LOTT. Further reserving the right to object, now, Mr. Chairman, let's don't start that kind of stuff.

Mr. FASCELL. I am trying to give the gentleman, as I gave my colleagues on the committee and the leadership on the minority side, absolute assurance, because the Speaker would not take this matter up until I had given him that assurance. I got that assurance on your side. After getting that done, you came on the floor and objected. I respect your position, and I assume you are part of the leadership and you have a right to object if you want to. But do not question my integrity when I say it was cleared.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am going to respond to that. Further reserving the right to object, it says, on page 476, House Rules and Manual:

> The Chair has established a policy of conferring recognition of all Members to permit consideration of bills and resolutions by unanimous consent only when assured that the majority and minority floor leadership * * *.

I am under the impression that the majority leader was not notified.

Is the Chair prepared to rule on whether or not this is going to be recognized for a unanimous-consent request, based on that?

Mr. FASCELL. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

It seems to me that the gentleman is on his feet either to object or not object, and I wish he would go on and do something.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, it is not in order, based on this rule, that I understand is in place, and I am inquiring if the Chair is going to rule that way itself. It would not be necessary for anybody else to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair feels there is sufficient assurance of clearance.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2068, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY, AND BOARD OF INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING AUTHORIZATIONS, 1986 AND 1987

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 137 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2068) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Board of International Broadcasting, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5(a) of rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections, and each title shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

□ 1320

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TAYLOR], for purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 137 is a 1-hour open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2068. The Department of State Authorization Act for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, with the time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The rule also waives points of order against the bill for violations of clause 5(a) of rule XXI. Clause 5(a) prohibits appropriations in a legislative bill. This waiver is necessary because a number of provisions in the bill allow new uses of already appropriated funds, or could otherwise be interpreted as appropriations.

The rule also provides that the bill shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections, with each title considered as having been read. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for one motion to recommit.

The purpose of H.R. 2068 is to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Board for International Broadcasting (which makes grants to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty). Included are funds for the administration of foreign affairs, international organizations and conferences, migration and refugee assistance, for the modernization of Voice of America, and for the National Endowment for Democracy.

This legislation is essential to maintain the day-to-day operations of our foreign policy throughout the world. I would like to commend the Committee on Foreign Affairs for its expeditious action on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there was no controversy concerning this rule in the Rules Committee. Both the Republican and the Democrat representing the Foreign Affairs Committee asked for this procedure, and the Rules Committee agreed.

This rule provides 1 hour of general debate and an open amending procedure for the bill authorizing the State Department, the USIA, and the Board of International Broadcasting. The Board of International Broadcasting includes both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

The rule includes a waiver of the prohibition against appropriations on a legislative bill. The waiver protects two sections of the bill which technically could allocate previously appropriated funds for a new purpose.

Mr. Speaker, this State Department authorization bill was originally reported as H.R. 1931. Because two of the sections of that bill fell within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, the Committee on Foreign Affairs decided to bring a new bill to the Rules Committee. The new bill, H.R. 2068, is identical to the old except that the two provisions within the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee have been dropped.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of the Rules Committee meeting, the administration sent a policy statement sup-

porting the State Department authorization only if it is amended.

Mr. Speaker, under this open rule procedure, necessary improvements may be made on the bill. I support the rule in order to give the House an opportunity to make necessary improvements in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 2068, the State Department authorization. As my colleague from Ohio has explained, it is an open rule allowing for 1 hour of general debate.

This rule allows any germane amendments, and although I strongly support the committee bill, I do plan to support the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Florida and myself, to reduce the authorizations contained in the bill to the fiscal year 1985 spending level. This amendment would reduce funding for the Voice of America modernization and for the National Endowment for Democracy by a total of $27.353 million, thus bringing the total funds authorized by the bill to the same amount funded in fiscal year 1985.

I want to congratulate my colleague from Florida [Mr. MICA] for the outstanding leadership he provided on this legislation. He has done an excellent job in working with all members of the committee, and has produced a bill that addresses a number of important issues. I also want to commend my colleagues on the committee and subcommittee for their value contributions to this legislation. The bill we reported gives important policy direction to the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Board for International Broadcasting. I believe it is responsive to the concerns and views expressed to us by Secretary Shultz and other officials of the administration, and has strong bipartisan support from the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

It is important to note that the bill we originally reported from committee was only $27.353 million over the fiscal year 1985 level, which is a clear indication that the committee did a good job in controlling expenditures. The amendment, which those of us on the committee will urge you to support, would simply make two further adjustments, to bring the bill in at the same level as fiscal year 1985.

Mr. Speaker, I will go into further detail on this legislation during general debate. I hope the Members will support the rule, and then support the amendment to freeze spending. I urge Members to then approve H.R. 2068.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 2068, which will authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Board for International Broadcasting.

This legislation contains few new initiatives or authorities. For the most part, it funds existing and tested programs. It is a nuts and bolts, no frills piece of legislation which provides close to minimum funding levels for these agencies to adequately carry out their duties and missions.

We are asking for a rule that will allow all those concerned to participate in the discussions of the merits of this legislation and if they see fit, try to effectuate change. It is a good rule, it is a good bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT].

Mr. LOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any objection to this rule. It is basically an open rule. We will get to the general debate, and perhaps a whole series of amendments on the State Department authorization. I hope my colleagues will look at it very closely, because as we enter this time when we are trying to find ways to reduce the deficit and to save money or to freeze the expenditures at the previous year or go below that, I think that a lovely place to start would be the State Department authorization.

If you cannot save a little money in the State Department, I just wonder where in the world we are going to save it. I am speaking as a Representative of the Fifth Congressional District of Mississippi; not necessarily on behalf of the leadership, but I think we should scrutinize the State Department authorization very closely to make sure there is not one dime in there that could be saved.

I just wanted to get that frame of thinking in the mix, during the rule, and early so that we will all go over it very carefully. Now, I have to give credit to the committee. Fortunately, they have honed it down pretty good, and I have been looking around for a place to put some amendments, and it has been hard to find them, but I think we ought to all start this year off by analyzing very closely every piece of legislation. A good place to start would be the State Department authorization.

□ 1330

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOTT. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make the point that when we addressed this legislation initially we had an agreement with majority and minority staff that we would do everything we could to bring this bill to the floor at the request level of the President, or below the President's request level.

As a matter of fact, that was our goal and we attained that goal by bringing in the 2-year authorization for $40 million less than the President requested. I might point out that in doing that, we think we addressed the concerns that both sides share in the modernization efforts of Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America, and we still made the cuts and we still made the adjustments in a way that had total bipartisan support in the committee.

So that was our goal, continues to be our goal, and even after we reduced the $40 million this gentleman will introduce a freeze amendment that will further cut the entire legislation to last year's level.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, if I may reclaim my time, that is a question that I was going to ask the gentleman.

I understand that this authorization is still over the fiscal year 1985 appropriation level; is that correct?

Mr. MICA. It is over, but it will not be when the freeze amendment is offered.

Mr. LOTT. There will be an amendment that will freeze it at last years level?

Mr. MICA. yes.

Mr. LOTT. I think that would certainly help my feelings for it. We certainly should not be allowing the State Department authorization to exceed the 1985 level. If we are going to move forward with our effort to freeze all these bills or go below the freeze, we should not let this one get by.

Mr. MICA. I would just remind the gentleman that within this legislation obviously, and this is an issue that every single Member of this body is concerned with, lies funding for security in our embassies around the world, lies a great deal of the money that we added at a time when we had some concerns.

So we tried to make those reductions and still address it, and indeed we have.

Mr. LOTT. I appreciate the gentleman saying that, but you raise a good point. I am familiar with some of the embassies around the country and some of the funds available to our Ambassadors in various countries. There are some very sensitive, dangerous places in the world where there is unbelievable terrorism and we should take whatever actions are necessary to protect them.

There are some embassies, though, in situations that are nothing of that kind, and I think if we would look at some of those budgets of our embassies, we could make some savings. Security, yes. Entertainment, no.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make mention of a couple of other amendments that will be offered in the course of deliberation of the bill that we will have before us.

One of those amendments will seek to utilize our embassies around the world as a focal point for attempting to achieve freedom of the press in some of the countries that do not allow free press access. There is considerable question as to how you operate in a democracy when you are inundated with disinformation from countries that do not allow the United States or anybody else to have true free press access in their country.

So an amendment will be offered to the bill that will attempt to assure that we get our embassies' cooperation in getting fundamentally more free press access in those countries around the world.

The second amendment that will be offered—and I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SILJANDER], the ranking member on the African Subcommittee, will offer this, and I certainly want to cosponsor it with him—will be an amendment to mandate the Sullivan principles on our Embassy in South Africa.

Many of our businesses doing business in South Africa operate under the Sullivan code, designed to end discrimination, designed to assure that black workers in South Africa are treated with proper respect and given training and make certain that they are given the opportunities. At the present time, our Embassy is one of the worst employment situations in South Africa and it is, I think, incumbent upon this body to do there whatever we can to remedy that situation.

So we will be offering an amendment that would say in South Africa that the Embassy of the United States ought to abide by the Sullivan principles.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I also have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 383, nays 0, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

YEAS—383

Ackerman
Addabbo
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Barton
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Biliraki
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Boucher
Boulter
Breaux
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappie
Cheney
Clay
Clinger
Cobey
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Craig
Crane
Crockett
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Eckert (NY)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank
Franklin
Frenzel
Fuqua
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Heftel
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McCurdy
McEwen
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Molinari
Mollohan
Monson
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Sabo
Saxton
Schaefer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strang
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NOT VOTING—50

Anthony
Badham
Bartlett
Bateman
Boland
Bosco
Boxer
Chappell
Coats
Collins
Daniel
de la Garza
Dingell
Dymally
Ford (TN)
Frost
Garcia
Green
Grotberg
Hefner
Horton
Jones (NC)
Kindness
Kolter
Latta
Lehman (CA)
Lipinski
Loeffler
Lowry (WA)
Martin (NY)
Mazzoli
McDade
McGrath
Miller (CA)
Moakley
Moody
Murtha
O'Brien
Quillen
Richardson
Rodino
Rostenkowski
Russo
Savage
Scheuer
Schulze
Seiberling
Traficant
Weaver
Whitten

□ 1350

Mrs. SCHNEIDER and Mr. HILLIS changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALKER moves to reconsider the vote just taken on House Resolution 137.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to lay on the table offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 157, answered "present" 1, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—212

Ackerman
Addabbo
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Annunzio
Applegate
Aspin
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Boggs
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Boucher
Breaux
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Bustamante
Byron
Carper
Carr
Chappell
Clay
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Conyers
Cooper
Coyne
Darden
Daschle
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
English
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gray (PA)
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hawkins
Hayes
Heftel
Hertel
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Jacobs
Jenkins
Jones (OK)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Leath (TX)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lloyd
Long
Luken
Lundine
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCurdy
McHugh
Mica
Mikulski
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murphy
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Panetta
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Price
Rangel
Ray
Reid
Richardson
Robinson
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Sabo
Schroeder
Schumer
Sharp
Shelby
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (MO)

NAYS—157

Archer
Armey
Barton
Bentley
Biaggi
Billirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boulter
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Callahan
Campbell
Carney
Chandler
Chappie
Cheney
Clinger
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Conte
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
Daub
Davis
DeLay
DeWine
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Eckert (NY)
Emerson
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Franklin
Frenzel
Gallo
Gekas
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Gregg
Gunderson
Hammerschmidt
Hartnett
Hendon
Henry
Hiler
Hillis
Hopkins
Hyde
Ireland
Jeffords
Johnson
Kasich
Kemp
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Leach (IA)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Monson
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Myers
Nielson
Oxley
Parris
Pashayan
Petri
Porter
Pursell
Regula
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Rogers
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rudd
Saxton
Schaefer
Schneider
Schuette
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Siljander
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snyder
Spence
Stangeland
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tauke
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whittaker
Wolf
Wortley
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zschau

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Holt

NOT VOTING—63

Andrews
Anthony
Atkins
Badham
Bartlett
Bateman
Boland
Bosco
Boxer
Coats
Collins
Crockett
Daniel
de la Garza
Dickinson
Dymally
Edwards (OK)
Ford (TN)
Frost
Garcia
Gray (IL)
Green
Grotberg
Hansen
Hatcher
Hefner
Horton
Howard
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Kolter
Latta
Lehman (CA)
Lipinski
Loeffler
Lowry (WA)
Martin (NY)
McDade
McGrath
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Moakley
Montgomery
Murtha
Nowak
Packard
Quillen
Rahall
Rodino
Rostenkowski
Russo
Savage
Scheuer
Schulze
Seiberling
Shuster
Solomon
Traficant
Weaver
Whitehurst
Whitten
Williams
Wright

□ 1410

Mr. BROWN of Colorado changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FRANK changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO CORRECT THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. WEBER: MR. WEBER moves to correct the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by striking out on page 2281 the remarks beginning with the words "We" down to and including the word "confederation" and inserting the word "are" before "a".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not believe the motion as offered by the gentleman states a question of privilege.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. FOLEY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to lay on the table offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 200, nays 156, answered "present" 1, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

YEAS—200

Addabbo
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Annunzio
Applegate
Aspin
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Boggs
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Boucher
Breaux
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Bustamante
Byron
Carper
Carr
Chappell
Clay
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Conyers
Cooper
Coyne
Darden
Daschle
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
English
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gray (PA)
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hawkins
Hayes
Heftel
Hertel
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Jacobs
Jenkins
Jones (OK)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kildee
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Leath (TX)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lloyd
Luken
Lundine
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCurdy
McHugh
Mica
Mikulski
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murphy
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin

Ortiz
Owens
Panetta
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Price
Rangel
Ray
Reid
Richardson
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Sabo
Schroeder
Schumer
Sharp
Shelby
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (MO)

NAYS—156

Archer
Armey
Barton
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boulter
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Callahan
Campbell
Carney
Chandler
Chappie
Cheney
Clinger
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Conte
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
Daub
Davis
DeLay
DeWine
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Eckert (NY)
Emerson
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Fiedler
Fields
Franklin
Frenzel
Gallo
Gekas
Gilman
Gingrich
Gradison
Gregg
Gunderson
Hammerschmidt
Hartnett
Hendon
Henry
Hiler
Holt
Hopkins
Hunter
Hyde
Ireland
Jeffords
Johnson
Kasich
Kemp
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Leach (IA)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Monson
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Myers
Nielson
Oxley
Parris
Pashayan
Petri
Porter
Pursell
Regula
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Rogers
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rudd
Saxton
Schaefer
Schneider
Schuette
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Siljander
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stangeland
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tauke
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whittaker
Wolf
Wortley
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zschau

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Robinson

NOT VOTING—76

Ackerman
Andrews
Anthony
Atkins
Badham
Bartlett
Bateman
Biaggi
Boland
Bosco
Boxer
Coats
Collins
Crockett
Daniel
de la Garza
Dickinson
Dymally
Edwards (OK)
Fish
Ford (TN)
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gibbons
Goodling
Gray (IL)
Green
Grotberg
Guarini
Hall, Sam
Hansen
Hatcher
Hefner
Hillis
Horton
Howard
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Kleczka
Kolter
Latta
Lehman (CA)
Lipinski
Loeffler
Long
Lowry (WA)
MacKay
Martin (NY)
McDade
McGrath
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Moakley
Montgomery
Murtha
Nowak
O'Brien
Packard
Quillen
Rahall
Rodino
Rostenkowski
Russo
Savage
Scheuer
Schulze
Seiberling
Shuster
Snyder
Traficant
Weaver
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wright

□ 1430

Mr. BEREUTER changed his voted from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to lay the appeal on the table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 817. An act to authorize appropriations under the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and Science and Technology.

S. 818. An act to authorize appropriations for activities under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention in this 1 minute to go over the circumstances that have led us to this unfortunate circumstance in the conduct of business on the floor of the House of Representatives, but it is clear to me, and I think to most of our Members, that further effort to proceed with the authorization bill for the Department of State is not going to be possible this afternoon, at least in an orderly and effective way.

I regret that, because this is an authorization bill for one of the principal departments of Government, supported by the administration and brought to the floor at their request. But at least for the moment I think that the business for this day and this week has been ended for any constructive purpose.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 201, nays 153, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—201

Addabbo
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Annunzio
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnes
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Boggs
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Boucher
Breaux
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Bustamante
Byron
Carper
Carr
Chappell
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Conyers
Cooper
Coyne
Darden
Daschle
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
English
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gray (PA)
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hawkins
Hayes
Heftel
Hertel
Holt
Horton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Jacobs
Jones (OK)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Leath (TX)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lloyd
Long
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lundine
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCurdy
McHugh
Mica
Mikulski
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Murphy
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Panetta
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Price
Rangel
Ray
Reid
Richardson
Robinson
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Sabo
Schroeder
Schumer
Sharp
Shelby
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (MO)

NAYS—153

Archer
Armey
Barton
Bates
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Callahan
Campbell
Carney
Chandler
Chappie
Cheney
Clinger
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Conte
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
Daub
Davis
DeLay
DeWine
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Eckert (NY)
Emerson
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Fiedler
Fields
Franklin
Frenzel
Gallo
Gekas
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Gregg
Gunderson
Hammerschmidt
Hendon
Henry

Hiler	Meyers	Shaw
Hopkins	Miller (OH)	Shumway
Hunter	Miller (WA)	Siljander
Ireland	Molinari	Skeen
Jeffords	Monson	Slaughter
Johnson	Moore	Smith (NE)
Kasich	Moorhead	Smith (NH)
Kemp	Morrison (WA)	Smith (NJ)
Kindness	Myers	Smith, Denny
Kolbe	Nielson	Smith, Robert
Kramer	O'Brien	Snowe
Lagomarsino	Oxley	Solomon
Leach (IA)	Parris	Spence
Lewis (CA)	Pashayan	Stangeland
Lewis (FL)	Petri	Strang
Lightfoot	Porter	Stump
Livingston	Pursell	Sundquist
Lott	Regula	Sweeney
Lowery (CA)	Ridge	Swindall
Lujan	Rinaldo	Tauke
Lungren	Ritter	Taylor
Mack	Roberts	Thomas (CA)
Madigan	Rogers	Vander Jagt
Marlenee	Roth	Vucanovich
Martin (IL)	Roukema	Walker
McCain	Rowland (CT)	Weber
McCandless	Rudd	Whittaker
McCollum	Saxton	Wolf
McEwen	Schaefer	Wortley
McKernan	Schneider	Young (AK)
McKinney	Schuette	Young (FL)
McMillan	Sensenbrenner	Zschau

NOT VOTING—79

Ackerman	Gray (IL)	Mineta
Andrews	Green	Moakley
Anthony	Grotberg	Montgomery
Badham	Guarini	Mrazek
Barnard	Hall, Sam	Murtha
Bartlett	Hansen	Nowak
Bateman	Hartnett	Packard
Biaggi	Hatcher	Quillen
Boland	Hefner	Rahall
Bosco	Hillis	Rodino
Boxer	Howard	Rostenkowski
Clay	Jenkins	Russo
Coats	Jones (NC)	Savage
Collins	Jones (TN)	Scheuer
Crockett	Kastenmeier	Schulze
Daniel	Kolter	Seiberling
de la Garza	Latta	Shuster
Derrick	Lehman (CA)	Snyder
Dickinson	Lent	Stokes
Dymally	Lipinski	Traficant
Edwards (OK)	Loeffler	Traxler
Fish	MacKay	Weaver
Ford (TN)	Martin (NY)	Whitehurst
Frost	McDade	Whitten
Fuqua	McGrath	Wright
Garcia	Michel	
Gibbons	Miller (CA)	

□ 1440

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 29, 1985, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1118. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Research and Engineering), Department of Defense, transmitting the annual report on the defense industrial reserve covering calendar year 1984, pursuant to the act of July 2, 1948, chapter 811, section 5 (87 Stat. 618); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1119. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on NATO conventional defense: Status reports and assessments of allied performance in selected improvement areas, pursuant to Public Law 98-525, section 1002(d)(1) (98 Stat. 2575); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1120. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting a copy of final regulations for the National Institute of Handicapped Research, pursuant to GEPA, section 431(d)(1) (88 Stat. 567; 90 Stat. 2231; 95 Stat. 453); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1121. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting a copy of final regulations of final funding priorities for centers for independent living, pursuant to GEPA, section 431(d)(1) (88 Stat. 567; 90 Stat. 2231; 95 Stat. 453); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1122. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the fiscal year 1984 annual report of the Asbestos Hazards School Safety Task Force; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1123. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's report on the Toxic Substances Control Act for fiscal year 1984, pursuant to Public Law 94-469, section 9(d); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1124. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to terminate the Public Telecommunications Facilities Grants Program of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration in the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1125. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a report of political contributions by John Arthur Ferch, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary-elect to the Republic of Honduras, and members of his family, pursuant to Public Law 96-465, section 304(b)(20); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1126. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting a report of the Board's activities under the Government in the Sunshine Act during calendar year 1984, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1127. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management Operations, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting a notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to the act of August 7, 1953, chapter 345, section 10(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1128. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management Operations, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting a notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to the act of August 7, 1953, Chapter 345, section 10(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1129. A letter from the National President, National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, transmitting reports and financial audits for the years ending February 29, 1984, and February 28, 1985, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1130. A letter from the Secretary General, U.S. Olympic Committee, transmitting a report on activities and finances of the Corporation, pursuant to the act of September 21, 1950, Chapter 975, Section 113(a) (92 Stat. 3049); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1131. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act to allow use of moneys in the Saltonstall-Kennedy Fund for marine fishery resource programs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1132. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to provide for a short-form confidential disclosure system for nonpublic filers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1133. A letter from the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, transmitting a report of actions taken from July 1 to December 31, 1984, on complaints of unfair trade practices by foreign governments, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2416, 2413; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1134. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the transfer of the Metropolitan Washington airports to an independent airport authority; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, the District of Columbia, and Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. APPLEGATE (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PEASE, and Mr. COYNE):

H.R. 2220. A bill to provide for the tax treatment of certain amounts received as a settlement of claims for postretirement medical insurance coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2221. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to administer a program of construction and revitalization of public housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 2222. A bill to reduce tax rates in a manner that is fair to all taxpayers and to simplify the tax laws by eliminating most credits, deductions, and exclusions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. KINDNESS, and Mr. FISH):

H.R. 2223. A bill to amend section 504 of title 5, United States Code, and section 2412 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to awards of expenses of certain agency and court proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAZ:

H.R. 2224. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nonimmigrant alien crewmen on fishing vessels to stop temporarily at ports in Guam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAZ (for himself and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 2225. A bill relating to the customs treatment of certain wearing apparel produced in the insular possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONER of Tennessee:

H.R. 2226. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for rates of duty on imported bicycles and bicycle parts consistent with those rates of duty maintained by the principal exporting nations of bicycles and bicycle parts to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDGAR (for himself and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

H.R. 2227. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to conduct demonstration projects for the purpose of evaluating the cost effectiveness of providing chiropractic care to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Iowa:

H.R. 2228. A bill to extend for 3 years the existing suspension of duty on sulfapyridine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.R. 2229. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to authorize cooperative banks which receive a charter as a Federal savings and loan association to retain all powers which they were granted under their State charter; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HUCKABY:

H.R. 2230. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Saline Bayou in Louisiana for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER:

H.R. 2231. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to promote competition and efficiency in the transmission of electric energy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McKINNEY (for himself, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. FISH, Mr. GREGG, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. WEISS):

H.R. 2232. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for the therapeutic use of marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (by request):

H.R. 2233. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise veterans' eligibility for health care from the Veterans Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOODY:

H.R. 2234. A bill to amend title 49 of the United States Code to exempt the transportation by motor vehicle of frozen foods from the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MOODY (for himself and Mr. WEISS):

H.R. 2235. A bill to encourage States and units of general local government to use amounts received under the Community Development Block Grant Program and the Alcohol and Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services Block Grant Program to provide housing counseling and related services for individuals before their release from residential facilities for the mentally ill and periodic evaluation of the appropriateness of their housing after release; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 2236. A bill to provide for the financing of reclamation and other remedial actions with respect to mill tailings at active uranium and thorium processing sites; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. MADIGAN):

H.R. 2237. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the program for the National Health Service Corps; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 2238. A bill to extend for 5 years the existing suspension of duty on stuffed dolls, certain toy figures, and the skins thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUDDS:

H.R. 2239. A bill to extend daylight saving time; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. LENT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. McKERNAN):

H.R. 2240. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for a lower rate of duty for certain fish netting and fish nets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2241. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude certain service performed on fishing boats from coverage for purposes of unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TORRES (for himself and Mr. MARTINEZ):

H.R. 2242. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide a system to compensate individuals injured by exposure to hazardous substances; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Public Works and Transportation, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself and Mr. MADIGAN):

H.R. 2243. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of assistance for health maintenance organizations and primary health care centers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 2244. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to remove the prohibition against stating in the labeling and advertising of a drug that it has been approved under that act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2245. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1986 for the National Endowment of the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. GOODLING):

H.R. 2246. A bill to extend and improve the National Institute of Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. LOWRY of Washington):

H.R. 2247. A bill to amend the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to repeal provisions respecting the disapproval of proposed deferrals of budget authority, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. WIRTH (for himself, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. LELAND, Mr. BATES, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 2248. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DIOGUARDI:

H.J. Res. 260. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate January 25, 1986 as "Turkish Brigade Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLORIO (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CONTE, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RUSSO, and Mr. TORRICELLI):

H.J. Res. 261. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning June 9, 1985, as "Italian American Heritage Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SILJANDER:

H.J. Res. 262. Joint resolution condemning the brutal treatment of, and blatant discrimination against the Turkish minority by the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and Mr. GILMAN):

H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the President's visit to the Federal Republic of Germany in May 1985; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAY (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BATES, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DYSON, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFNER, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. LELAND, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. McCURDY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. OLIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WHITLEY, and Mr. WISE):

H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should establish a task force to address the long-range concerns of the U.S. agricultural industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Res. 143. Resolution to give special recognition to the achievements of John James Audubon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA (for himself and Mr. MADIGAN):

H. Res. 144. Resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Rural Electrifica-

tion Program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BARNES, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MICA, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KEMP, Mr. HYDE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. COURTER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. MACK, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HENDON, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. GREGG, Mr. ROE, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. HILER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. COBEY, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCEWEN, and Mr. MCCOLLUM):

H. Res. 145. Resolution to commend President Jose Napoleon Duarte and the participating international humanitarian organizations for their compassion, vision, and leadership in carrying out the recent vaccination campaign in El Salvador; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII.

91. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Federal energy tax credits; to the Committee on Ways and Means. April 25, 1985.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

Mr. LENT introduced a bill H.R. 2249 for the relief of the Laka Tool & Stamping Company Inc., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 21: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 236: Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 512: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 526: Mr. STRANG, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. ROSE, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.R. 537: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 880: Mr. WHITTAKER.

H.R. 1090: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, and Mr. SWIFT.

H.R. 1339: Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. COATS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. GALLO, Mr. HENRY, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. STRANG, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 1375: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1376: Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 1398: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 1436: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 1464: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 1465: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 1466: Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 1524: Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. COELHO, Mr. TORRES, Mr. FRANK, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 1550: Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 1715: Mr. DIXON, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 1746: Mr. REID, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. FISH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1808: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. FROST, Mr. WILSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 1818: Mr. RALPH M. HALL.

H.R. 1856: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 1939: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1978: Mr. BATES.

H.R. 1993: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. GROTBERG, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WILSON, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 2158: Mr. HYDE, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HENDON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. ROTH, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. DREIER of California, and Mr. STUMP.

H.J. Res. 145: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH.

H.J. Res. 161: Mr. DYSON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. GALLO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. OLIN, and Mr. DASCHLE.

H.J. Res. 182: Mr. DYSON, Mr. DAUB, Mrs. HOLT, and Mr. NATCHER.

H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. AUCOIN.

H. Con. Res. 90: Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WILSON, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Con. Res. 124: Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MCGRATH, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. SABO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. MANTON, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ROE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. ROBINSON, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MINETA, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LELAND, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H. Res. 74: Mr. PORTER, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. LENT, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MOORE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. ROE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H. Res. 110: Mr. LATTA.

H. Res. 120: Mr. LATTA.

H. Res. 127: Mr. OWENS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. SHAW, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. DURBIN.

H. Res. 135: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. WIRTH, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. DONNELLY.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

89. The Speaker presented a petition of the town board, Town of Brookhaven, Patchogue, Long Island, NY, relative to H.R. 360—grants for providing alternative water supplies to replace contaminated ground water; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

SENATE—*Thursday, April 25, 1985*

(Legislative day of Monday, April 15, 1985)

The Senate met at 11:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Our prayer will be offered by the Reverend Father Jerome L. Cummings, St. Bruno's Church, Whittier, CA. He is sponsored by Senator PETE WILSON of California.

PRAYER

The Reverend Father Jerome L. Cummings, St. Bruno's Church, Whittier, CA, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Heavenly Father, 120 years have passed since the guns fell silent at Appomattox. It was altogether fitting that they did so, in a place devoted to the cause of law. For You gave us, Father, the power to birth this Nation, and endow it with law for personal freedom, justice, and liberty. We came so close then, in our civil division, that we nearly destroyed it.

Little did we know, scarcely did we realize, that America would once again stand upon the brink, not just of national dismemberment, but within a world family that chose to approach the brink of nuclear extinction. Some would approach this brink by disarmament alone, letting history take the consequences. Others would approach that brink only with sheer superiority of arms. Still others would approach that brink by equity of measurable strength. None would however, cease to approach the brink. And so the brink came.

Our prayer, Father, is for those who labor for peace in this room. We ask a threefold blessing and our own anthem of resolve: Give them a sense of their dignity as lawmakers. The purpose of law is justice. Justice seeks no confrontation. Thus no one is threatened. Bless them with a clarity of vision for truth alone. In it there is nothing to fear, and relieves that narrowness of mind that is partisan, greedy, and selfish. Grant them courage to work only for the freedom of each human being, his right to have it, and the liberty to express it.

If You grant this blessing, then the peace and serenity of Appomattox will endure, and the vindication of these lawmakers will lie not in knowing they were right, but in the fruits of peace obtained for another generation and an age as yet unborn. To this purpose, let them resolutely dedicate themselves once more to pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. This time, they dare not fail.

Father, this is our prayer. May there be peace in this land. Make us a people of peace. Let it begin with me. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, under the standing order, the two leaders have 10 minutes each and then special orders not to exceed 15 minutes each for Senators PROXMIRE, WALLOP, and MURKOWSKI, followed by routine morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 1 p.m. with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

Following routine morning business, it will be the intention of the majority leader to begin consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the budget resolution, under a statutory time limitation of 50 hours.

I would indicate to my colleagues or members of their staffs that we can expect rollcall votes today and tomorrow. As I have indicated, there will be no Saturday session. It would appear that we could expect rollcall votes on Monday and throughout all of next week. There are going to be, I would guess, depending on how everything hangs together, or whatever, rather late sessions next week and perhaps a fairly late session tonight.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO SENATOR THURMOND

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I would also take this opportunity to thank the distinguished President pro tempore, my colleague and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for his kind and thoughtful remarks concerning my experience 40 years ago in Italy, which appears in the RECORD of April 24, 1985, on page S4681. I thank my colleague for his friendship and for the recognition indicated therein.

Mr. President, I reserve the balance of my time.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). Under the previous order, the acting Democratic leader is now recognized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Democratic leader's time be reserved for his later use.

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

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

HOW SUPERPOWERS HAVE FAILED TO BUILD ARMS CONTROL ON PAST SUCCESSES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on previous days I have detailed two requirements for the achievement of a successful arms control policy for this country. The third requirement is to recognize that arms control must build on past successes. The fundamental objective of arms control is to establish a lasting prevention of nuclear war. We can only achieve that objective if we use successive arms control treaties as a continuing process aimed steadily at stopping the arms race.

What real hope is there that we can do this? The framework for precisely that kind of progress was established by two superpower nuclear weapons treaties. But, to date, we have kicked away the golden opportunity that offered to advance the cause of peace.

The 1963 Test Ban Treaty gave the superpowers the clearest commitment to stop the arms race at its heart. In the preamble to that treaty, the United States and the Soviet Union subscribe to the following language:

> Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, determined to continue negotiations to this end (the signatories) have agreed as follows.

In the 1974 treaty between the two superpowers the pledge is even more explicit and is moved out of the preamble right down into the articles of agreement. Paragraph 3 of article 1 of that treaty reads as follows in its entirety:

> The parties shall continue their negotiations with a view toward achieving a solution to the problem of the cessation of all underground nuclear weapons tests.

Now, Mr. President, that is about as explicit and absolutely unmistakable commitment as the officials of two na-

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

tions could possibly make. It is a firm, unqualified pledge to continue negotiations to end nuclear weapons testing. The United States and the Soviet Union are in conspicuous violation of that promise. The two superpowers made it not once in a treaty, but twice. They promised in two treaties. The pledge was made 20 years ago in 1963, and again 11 years ago in 1974. The agreement recognized in both treaties that the partial limitations on nuclear testing would make little real progress toward peace unless the superpowers kept their word. The superpowers gave their word. Since then, both superpowers have turned their backs on their commitment. And what is the result? The result is that while the treaties began the critical process of ending the arms race, the failure of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to keep their promise has made that historic beginning a virtual nullity. What possible alibi can there be for this refusal to keep the promise of 1963, so emphatically repeated in 1974? Were there developments in nuclear weapons technology that made the promise impossible or even more difficult to observe? No. Quite the contrary. Our seismologists tell us that the present 150 kiloton limit on underground nuclear weapons explosions by no means sets the limits on the ability to verify nuclear explosions. They have asserted that we could successfully monitor virtually any test explosion that would have any real military significance. Is verification of such a ban on nuclear weapons testing actually more practical than it was when these pledges were made? The answer is: "Yes." There are two reasons why the commitments of 1963 and 1974 are not less, but more practical today—in 1985 than they were 22 years ago, or 11 years ago. First the seismic technology which was excellent at the time of the two treaties and could have reliably monitored explosions well below the limit set in 1974 has actually improved since. Second, there have been repeated indications that the Soviet Union with the immense advantage it possesses as a closed society in resisting verification would—if negotiations were pressed—agree to the placement of a number of monitoring stations, perhaps 10 or more, within the Soviet Union to assure this country that we could verify Soviet nuclear weapons test explosions down to a single kiloton or less.

Now, Mr. President, keep in mind what is at stake here. If the superpowers should agree to keep their clear and solemn pledge to negotiate a total "cessation of all underground nuclear weapons tests," the most critical element in the nuclear arms race will be achieved. When I stated these series of speeches I said that—

The failure of the superpowers even to try to comply with that promise to cease all nuclear weapons testing represents the most significant lost opportunity for peace of the last 25 years.

No matter what other progress we might make on arms control, without an agreement to cease all nuclear weapons tests, the achievement of the end of the arms race will slip through our fingers like quick silver. We can ban every single nuclear weapon: Intercontinental ballistic missiles, cruise missile, intermediate missiles, and every tactical nuclear weapon in the arsenal of the United States and the Soviet Union. Would that end the arms race? No way. Both superpowers would do exactly what they have been doing since the first arms control limitation was achieved. They would be researching and testing to develop new nuclear weapons, probably more devastating than either superpower carries in its arsenal at present, but outside the limits proscribed by the arms control agreements. Only a full and comprehensive ban on all nuclear testing can go to the heart of the arms race: That heart is the testing essential to the development of new nuclear weapons.

The superpowers have solemnly not once, but twice in treaties promised to do precisely what we need to do to stop the arms race. There is little hope of arms control if with such a clear and absolute commitment we cannot build on that solid beginning. If ever this great country should keep its word, this is the issue and this is the time.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on another subject, today marks the 70th anniversary of one of the most atrocious acts in history, the slaughter of over 1 million Armenians by the Turkish Government during World War I. It was these brutal acts that first lead Raphael Lemkin to term the phrase "genocide."

Just as in the case of the Holocaust and the current German Government, there is no implication of guilt for the Armenian Genocide to the present Turkish Government. Yet the Turkish Government is attempting to deny the genocide. Mr. President, the Armenian genocide must not, and cannot be forgotten. It cannot be forgotten because news reports of the day provide a shocking portrait of the murder of the Armenians.

People may disagree with the editorial policy of the New York Times, but I know of no one who questions its integrity and the honesty of its reports.

On March 20, 1915, the New York Times reported that "the whole plain of Alacgend is virtually covered with the bodies of men, women, and children" and that "the Red Cross fund says there are 120,000 destitute Armenians in the Caucuses."

The news got worse as time went on. A Reuters report from August 20, 1915, states that "in one village 1,000 men, women, and children are reported to have been locked in a wooden building and burned to death."

The most shocking report comes from the September 16, 1915, New York Times in which a correspondent reports that, "It is the official intention that this shall be a campaign of extermination involving the murder of 800,000 to 1,000,000 persons."

Mr. President, in standing by and saying nothing while the history of the Armenian genocide is rewritten, we indeed may make Hitler's question of "Who still talks of the Armenian genocide?" mere rhetoric.

That was made, incidentally, in 1938 in the middle of Hitler's extermination of the Jews when he was defending his position and arguing that the international community did not care.

However, the correspondent also reported that "Christians could escape death by embracing Mohammodanism, in which case all of the female members of the convert's family of marriageable age—wife, sisters, or children—are distributed around to other Turks, making the conversion to Christianity in the future practically impossible."

Mr. President, we must commemorate the Armenian genocide, particularly in face of the effort to deny it. But to remember is not enough; we must act. We must act to see that genocide is ended now and forever. We must ratify the Genocide Convention.

FINANCIAL HOLDINGS AND INCOME TAX RETURN OF SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Finally, Mr. President, in 1963, 1965, 1967, and 1970, and yearly since 1972, I have submitted for the record a history of my financial holdings from the time I was first elected to the Senate in 1957 until May 1984. In order to bring the full record up to date, I submit herewith the history of my financial holdings since May 1984.

My assets include ownership of a home in Madison WI, on which I owe a mortgage to the former owners; ownership of my home and furnishings in Washington, DC, on which I owe a mortgage to the Perpetual American Federal Savings of Washington, DC; ownership of a 1980 automobile; ownership of one checking account in a Washington, DC, bank, one checking account in a Madison, WI, bank and one savings account in a Madison, WI, bank. I hold State and municipal bonds totalling $70,000.

I estimate my net worth to be about $563,000.

To the best of my knowledge, this is an accurate record of my financial holdings and obligations.

I herewith submit a balance sheet showing my net worth and how it was arrived at and a copy of my 1984 Federal income tax return.

I paid $34,214 to the Federal Government in taxes on my 1984 income. In addition, I paid $11,487 to the State of Wisconsin on 1984 income.

I ask unanimous consent that the balance sheet and copy of my 1984 Federal tax return be printed in the RECORD.

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

Net worth of Senator William Proxmire as of Apr. 23, 1985

Municipal and State bonds	$70,000
2 checking and 1 savings account:	
National Bank of Washington checking	1,246
Madison, WI, checking	1,458
Madison, WI, savings	7,445
Shearson Lehman money market account	37,684
Certificate of deposit, Chevy Chase S&L	5,334
1980 Buick Regal (blue book retail value)	5,125
3097 Ordway St., NW., Washington, DC:	
Assessed value	365,545
Mortgage value	−53,121
Furnishings	20,000
118 Bradford Lane, Madison, WI:	
Assessed value	48,500
Mortgage value	−33,125
Cash deposit in Civil Service retirement	87,224
Total	563,315

U.S. INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RETURN, 1984, WILLIAM AND ELLEN H. PROXMIRE

INCOME

7 Wages, salaries, tips, etc., $132,691.

8 Interest income (also attach Schedule B if over $400), $2,911.

9a Dividends (also attach Schedule B if over $400), $931.

12 Business income or (loss) (attach Schedule C), $20,750.

18 Rents, royalties, partnerships, estates, trusts, etc. (attach Schedule E), $3,297.

22 Other income (state nature and source—see page 11 of Instructions) New England Hosp., $750.

23 Add lines 7 through 22. This is your total income, $154,736.

ADJUSTMENTS TO INCOME

25 Employee business expenses (attach Form 2106), $7,263.

26a IRA deduction, from the worksheet on page 12, $2,000.

30 Deduction for a married couple when both work (attach Schedule W), $3,000.

31 Add lines 24 through 30, $12,263.

ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME

32 Subtract line 31 from line 23. This is your adjusted gross income, if this line is less than $10,000, see "Earned Income Credit" (line 59) on page 16 of Instructions. If you want IRS to figure your tax, see page 12 of Instructions, $142,473.

TAX COMPUTATION

33 Amount from line 32 (adjusted gross income), $142,473.

34a If you itemize, attach Schedule A (Form 1040) and enter the amount from Schedule A, line 26, $34,308.

35 Subtract line 34a or 34b, whichever applies, from line 33, $108,165.

36 Multiply $1,000 by the total number of exemptions claimed on Form 1040, line 6e, $4,000.

37 Taxable Income. Subtract line 36 from line 35, $104,165.

38 Tax. Enter tax here and check if from Tax Rate Schedule X, Y, or Z, $34,274.

40 Add lines 38 and 39. Enter the total, $34,274.

CREDITS

45 Add lines 41 through 44. These are your total personal credits, $60.

46 Subtract line 45 from 40. Enter the result (but not less than zero), $34,214.

50 Subtract line 49 from 46. Enter the result (but not less than zero), $34,214.

OTHER TAXES

56 Add lines 50 through 55. This is your total tax, $34,214.

PAYMENTS

57 Federal income tax withheld, $39,133.

58 1984 estimated tax payments and amount applied from 1983 return, $13,140.

64 Add lines 57 through 63. These are your total payments, $52,273.

REFUND OR AMOUNT YOU OWE

65 If line 64 is larger than line 56, enter amount overpaid, $18,059.

66 Amount of line 65 to be refunded to you, $18,059.

SCHEDULE A—ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS

Medical and dental expenses

2a Doctors, dentists, nurses, hospitals, insurance premiums you paid for medical and dental care, etc., $1,929.

c Other (list—include hearing aids, dentures, eyeglasses, etc.) eyeglasses, $400.

3 Add lines 1 through 2c, and write the total here, $2,329.

4 Mutiply the amount on Form 1040, line 33, by 5% (.05), $7,124.

5 Subtract line 4 from line 3. If zero or less, write -0-. Total medical and dental, 0.

Taxes you paid

6 State and local income taxes, $19,045.

7 Real estate taxes, $4,350.

8a General sales tax (see sales tax tables in instruction booklet), $903.

10 Add the amounts on lines 6 through 9 Write the total here. Total taxes, $24,298.

Interest you paid

11a Home mortgage interest you paid to financial institutions, $4,505.

13 Other interest you paid (list) NBW & 1st Wiltn, $2,782; DC Nat, $1,450, $4,232.

Add the amounts on lines 11a through 13. Write the total here. Total interest, $8,737.

Contributions you made

15a Cash contributions. (If you gave $3,000 or more to any one organization, report those contributions on line 15b.), $1,285.

18 Add the amounts on lines 15a through 17. Write the total here. Total contributions, $1,285.

Miscellaneous deductions

21 Tax return preparation fee, $1,250.

22 Other: Senate office exp, $111; see attached 2106, $2,027, $2,138.

23 Add the amounts on lines 20 through 22. Write the total here. Total miscellaneous, $3,388.

Summary of itemized deductions

24 Add the amounts on lines 5, 10, 14, 18, 19, and 23. Write your answer here, $37,708.

25 If you checked Form 1040 (Filing Status box 2 or 5, write $3,400; Filing Status box 1 or 4, write $2,300; Filing Status box 3, write $1,700), $3,400.

26 Subtract line 25 from line 24. Write your answer here and on Form 1040, line 34a. (If line 25 is more than line 24, see the Instructions for line 26 on page 22.) $34,308.

SCHEDULE B—INTEREST AND DIVIDEND INCOME

Part I. Interest income

2 Other interest income (list name of payer): Chevy Chase S&L (H), $514; DC Natl Bk (J), $337; United Bk 271-601 (H), $1,097; United Bk 176-014 (H), $963.

3 Add the amounts on lines 1 and 2. Write the total here and on Form 1040, line 8, $2,911.

Part II. Dividend income

4 Govt Investors (W), $34; Shearson Dailey (H), $897.

5 Add the amounts on line 4. Write the total here, $931.

10 Subtract line 9 from line 5. Write the result here and on Form 1040, line 9a, $931.

SCHEDULE C—PROFIT OR (LOSS) FROM BUSINESS OR PROFESSION

Services

Part I. Income

1a Gross receipts or sales, $20,600.

c Subtract line 1b from line 1a and enter the balance here, $20,600.

3 Subtract line 2 from line 1c and enter the gross profit here, $20,600.

5 Add lines 3, 4a, and 4b. This is the gross income, $20,600.

Part II. Deductions

25 Taxes (Do not include Windfall Profit Tax here. See line 29.) $100.

31 Add amounts in columns for lines 6 through 30i. These are the total deductions, $100.

32 Net profit or (loss). Subtract line 31 from line 5 and enter the result. If a profit, enter on Form 1040, line 12, and on Schedule SE, Part I, line 2 (or Form 1041, line 6). If a loss, you must go on to line 33, $20,500.

Literature

Part I. Income

1a Gross receipts or sales, $400.

c Subract line 1b from line la and enter the balance here, $400.

3 Subtract line 2 from line 1c and enter the gross profit here, $400.

5 Add lines 3, 4a, and 4b. This is the gross income, $400.

Part II. Deductions

19 Legal and professional services, $150.

31 Add amounts in columns for lines 6 through 30i. These are the total deductions, $150.

32 Net profit or (loss). Subtract line 31 from line 5 and enter the result. If a profit, enter on Form 1040, line 12, and on Schedule SE, Part I, line 2 (or Form 1041, line 6). If a loss, you must go on to line 33, $250.

SCHEDULE E—SUPPLEMENTAL INCOME SCHEDULE

Rental and royalty income

3a Rents received, $4,680.

Rental and royalty expenses

8 Insurance, $179.

9 Interest, $4,975.

13 Taxes (Do not include Windfall Profit Tax here. See Part III, line 37), $1,233.

17 Total expenses other than depreciation and depletion. Add lines 4 through 16, $6,387.

18 Depreciation expense (see instructions) or depletion, $1,590.

19 Total. Add lines 17 and 18, $7,977.

20 Income or (loss) from rental or royalty properties. Subtract line 19 from line 3a (rents) or 3b (royalties), −$3,297.

22 Add properties with losses on line 20, and write the total (losses) here, −$3,297.

23 Combine amounts on lines 21 and 22, and write the net profit or (loss) here, −$3,297.

25 Total rental or royalty income or (loss). Combine amounts on lines 23 and 24, and write the total here. If Part II, III, and IV on page 2 do not apply to you, write the amount from line 25 on Form 1040, line 18. Otherwise, include the amount in line 39 on page 2 of Schedule E, −$3,297.

Part IV. Summary

39 Total income or (loss). Combine lines 25, 29, 31, 35, and 38. Write total here and on Form 1040, line 18, −$3,297.

SCHEDULE W—DEDUCTION FOR A MARRIED COUPLE WHEN BOTH WORK

Step 1. Figure your earned income

1 Wages, salaries, tips, etc., from Form 1040, line 7. (Do not include nondisability pensions or annuities): (a) You $72,600; (b) your spouse $60,091.

2 Net profit or (loss) from self-employment (from Schedules C and F (Form 1040), Schedule K-1 (Form 1065), and any other taxable self-employment or earned income): (a) You $20,750; (b) your spouse $750.

3 Add lines 1 and 2. This is your total earned income: (a) You $93,350; (b) your spouse $60,841.

Step 2. Figure your qualified earned income

4 Adjustments from Form 1040, lines 25, 26a, 27, and any repayment of sub-pay included on line 31. (See instructions below): You $3,000; your spouse $6,263.

5 Subtract line 4 from line 3. This is your qualified earned income. (If the amount in column (a) or (b) is zero (-0-) or less, stop here. You may not take this deduction): (a) You $90,350; (b) your spouse $54,578.

Step 3. Figure your deduction

6 Compare the amounts in columns (a) and (b) of line 5. Write the smaller amount here. (Write either amount if 5(a) and 5(b) are exactly the same.) Do not write more than $30,000, $30,000.

7 Percentage used to figure the deduction (10%), 0.10.

8 Multiply the amount on line 6 by the percentage on line 7. This is the amount of your deduction. Write the answer here and on Form 1040, line 30, $3,000.

Name: Senator William and Ellen Proxmire. SSN: (H) [redacted].

Address: 118 Bradford Lane. SSN: (W) [redacted].

City, State, ZIP: Madison, Wisconsin 53714.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that I was in travel status in the Washington, D.C., area, away from my home in my home state of Wisconsin, in the performance of my official duties as a Member of Congress for 224 days during the year 1984 and that my deductable living expenses while in such travel status amounted to $3,000.

WILLIAM PROXMIRE
(Signature of Member).

NOTE.—If such living expenses exceeded $3,000, the deduction is limited under section 162(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to $3,000.

EMPLOYEE BUSINESS EXPENSES

William Proxmire

Part I. Employee Business Expenses Deductible in Figuring Adjusted Gross Income on Form 1040, Line 32

2. Reimbursed and unreimbursed meal, lodging, and other expenses while away from your tax home, $3,000.

6. Add lines 1 through 5, $3,000.

8. If line 6 is more than line 7, subtract line 7 from line 6. Enter here and on Form 1040, line 25, $3,000.

Ellen H. Proxmire

Part I. Employee Business Expenses Deductible in Figuring Adjusted Gross Income on Form 1040, Line 32

3. Reimbursed and unreimbursed car expenses from Part II, $4,263.

6. Add lines 1 though 5, $4,263.

8. If line 6 is more than line 7, subtract line 7 from line 6. Enter here and on Form 1040, line 25, $4,263.

Part II. Car Expenses (Use either your actual expenses or the mileage rate)

A. Number of months you used car for business during 1984: 12 months.

B. Total mileage for months on line A: 7,000 miles.

C. Business part of line B mileage: 4,900 miles.

Actual Expenses (Include expenses on lines 1 and 2 only for the months shown on line A, above)

1. Gasoline, oil, lubrication, etc., $800.
2. Other, $5,004.
3. Total (add lines 1 and 2), $5,804.
4. Divide line C by line B, above, 70 percent.
5. Multiply line 3 by line 4, $4,063.
7. Business parking fees and tolls, $200.
8. Add lines 5 through 7. Also enter in Part I, line 3, $4,263.

DEPRECIATION AND AMORTIZATION

Section C.—Depreciation of nonrecovery property

6 Other depreciation (see instructions), $1,590.

Section D.—Summary

7 Total (Add deductions on lines 1 through 6). Enter here and on the Depreciation line of your return (Partnerships and S corporations—Do not include any amounts entered on line 1.), $1,590.

DETAIL DEPRECIATION SCHEDULE

Description of property: 118 Land. Date placed in service: 11/22/80. Cost or other basis: $11,500.

Description of property: 116 Bradford. Date placed in service: 11/22/80. Cost or other basis: $31,800. Depreciation allowed or allowable in earlier years: $5,035. Method of figuring depreciation: SL. Life or recovery period: 20/00. Federal depreciation for this year: $1,590. State depreciation for this year: $1,590.

INVESTMENT INTEREST EXPENSE DEDUCTION

Part II. Interest on investment debts incurred after September 10, 1975

5 Interest expense on investment debts incurred after September 10, 1975, $4,975.

7 Total investment interest expense (add lines 5 and 6), $4,975.

8 (a) Individuals enter $10,000 ($5,000 if married filing separately), $10,000.

10 (a) Total net investment income (amount from line 4 if Part I is used), $5,520.

(b) Line 7÷Line 7 + Line 15 + Line 27 × Line 10(a), $5,520.

11 Excess expenses from "net lease property," $1,707.

12 Limitation on deduction (add lines 8(a), (b), 9, 10(b) and 11), $17,227.

13 Allowable investment interest deduction—Enter the smaller of line 7 or line 12 (see instructions), $4,975.

WILLIAM AND ELLEN H. PROXMIRE—NET INVESTMENT INCOME AND QUALIFIED NET INVESTMENT INCOME SCHEDULE

Description	Gross rent/ royalty	Straight line Deprec./ cost depletion	Non-tax pref. Depec. and Depletion	Other allow. invest-ment expenses	Net invest-ment income loss.	Qualify net invest-ment income loss
Dividends, net					$931	$931
Mad, WI, 118 Brad	$4,680	$1,590	$1,590	$1,412	1,678	−3,297
Interest income, net					2,911	2,911
Total, net investment income					5,520	
Total, qualified net investment income						545

ELLEN H. PROXMIRE (FORM 2106—SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE)

Employer name: Wash Whirl-around.
Other auto expenses car 1, $5,004.
Total to part II, Line 2, form 2106, $5,004.

EMPLOYEE BUSINESS EXPENSES OTHER THAN TRAVEL

	Federal	State
Dues and publication	$608	$608
Entertainment	1,419	1,419
Total to itemized deductions	2,027	
Total to part I, line 5, form 2106	0	2,027

WILLIAM AND ELLEN H. PROXMIRE—EARNINGS

	Gross	Fed. WT	FICA	St. WT	City WT
U.S. Senate (H)	$72,600	$27,018	$2,533	$6,322	
Wash. Whirl-Around (W)	60,091	12,115	2,533		
Total	132,691	39,133	5,066	6,322	

ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS—CONTRIBUTIONS

	50 pct.	30 pct. Cap. gain	30 pct. Other	20 pct.	Non-cash	Total
By check (H)	$935					
By check (W)	350					
Total	1,285					$1,285
Carryover	0					0
Allowable	1,285					
Allowable contributions to sched. A, line 18						1,285

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

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR WALLOP

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP] will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

AID TO NICARAGUA

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, history will record that the Carter administration began to aid those who wanted to stop the Sandinistas from turning Nicaragua into a totalitarian ally of Moscow, and that in the Reagan administration such aid stopped. That is the bottom line.

History will record that the Democratic Party, almost united, convinced the Reagan administration again and again to reduce the size and scope of its requests for support to the Nicaragua resistance, and to make those requests with ever less conviction. Indeed only by great efforts, and by the President's intervention, was the administration dissuaded from joining in sponsoring a congressional resolution that would have sealed its own defeat. Now as congressional Democrats step forward to accept the thanks of the Communist dictator Daniel Ortega, the hemisphere's new Cuba faces a much less complicated future.

Yet blame does not lie alone with congressional apologists for the Brezhnev doctrine. Our 535 "secretaries of state" have been aided and indeed urged on by an indecisive administration.

This Senator watched with growing dismay as representatives of the State Department and CIA explained this administration's policy toward Nicaragua in the absurd terms of "interdicting the flow of arms" to El Salvador. This Senator was astonished when the administration helped to quash opposition to the Boland amendment. This Senator listened with disgust as spokesmen for the administration prided themselves on supplying the Nicaraguan resistance with enough to fight and die, but with not enough to win. This Senator winced when the Sandinista government broadcast William Casey's public statements that the Contras could not possibly win.

This Senator noted that the administration's requests to the Congress on the Contras' behalf were accompanied neither by threats nor by the usual inducements. Indeed, Secretary Shultz' latest letter ostensibly in support of the President's request never even mentioned that request, much less supported it. The paper explaining so-called U.S. policy in the area was not even on anyone's letterhead. Neither the State Department, the CIA, nor the NSC would sully their reputations with it. Last fall, before the Senate voted by a margin of 15 votes in favor of the Nicaraguan resistance, the Department of State advised this Senator that the vote count in the Senate was negative, and refused to supply even a routine letter of support. Far from refusing to take "no" for an answer, this administration has courted it.

When anyone asks why so many in the Congress and the administration are so eager to disassociate themselves from the fate of the Nicaraguan resistance, we hear one word: Vietnam—we want to avoid another experience like that. Yet, this obfuscation of moral judgment, this abandonment of freedom-loving people to Communist rule after half-hearted effort is precisely what we did in Vietnam. The arguments of the so-called best and brightest on the liberal side today are almost in form to those we heard 20 years ago. We have to force the Contras into a deal with the Communists, for the sake of peace, they say—just like they spoke of the need to force the South Vietnamese into the deal we worked out with the Communists in Paris in 1973. "And if they don't we'll cut off their funds." Thus do our good liberals, Democratic and Republican alike, dangle the American taxpayers' money in front of people who are fighting for their lives and freedoms, and put themselves in greater danger. If they refuse, they are threatened with being thrown to the wolves. If they agree, they can hope that the liberals, in the Congress and the administration, will at least preserve their lives, even as their cause goes down the drain. Is this the way to avoid Vietnam? In Heaven's name, no. This is a recipe for repeating the experience of helicopters lifting off embassy roofs, say in Honduras and El Salvador, as U.S. marines with rifle butts smash the fingers of our "brothers" climbing over the walls.

But despite the similarities, there are vast differences between Southeast Asia and Central America. Yes, just like in Southeast Asia, as soon as we abandon our friends and the Communists win their civil war, they will take over neighboring countries, have bloodbaths, and provide military bases for the Soviets. But unlike in Southeast Asia, there is no ocean between this tragedy and our border. The refugees will come more quickly and in greater numbers. But something far more ominous will come soon: The sounds of Mexico accommodating itself into a vast, anti-Yankee alliance.

Today does not mark the end of our troubles with Central America—it is the beginning. Within weeks we will see bloody battles as the Sandinista regulars, many with Soviet Spetznatz training, move into free-fire zones to kill the resistance. Then perhaps in a year or two or three we will see the attack on Honduras and El Salvador, whose leaders will try in vain to accommodate. Throughout these dramas, the American people are going to want to know who is responsible. They will ask each one of us "whose side are you on in this fight?" They will do so all the more pointedly if our President, Democratic or Republican, does his duty and sends American troops to save one of those countries. "Who made all this necessary? Who destroyed the resistance forces that were holding the Soviet coalition at bay in Nicaragua?" Then the American people will look at how each of us voted today and they will have the answer.

I am genuinely sorry for my country, because the administration and the Congress seem ready to betray people our President has called brothers. Brothers deserve better. The peoples of the world, friend and foe alike, are sure to ask themselves, if the Americans treat their brothers this way, how will they treat others? It is at least one saving grace that we do it openly by rollcall vote. I am happy to stand where I do, in favor of putting weapons, yes I say guns, into the hands of people who want to live democratically, and who want to shoot at the Soviets, Cubans, Vietnamese, Libyans, and PLO soldiers who have invaded the North American Continent. I say to those who will vote on the other side, go ahead, put your name on that list. America will regret it. So perhaps one day will you, too.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAXALT). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(During the quorum call, the chair was occupied by Mr. CHAFEE.)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR DANFORTH ON U.S. TRADE POLICY

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Missouri, Senator DANFORTH, today spoke before the National Press Club on the timely topic of the U.S. trade policy.

I know that every Member of the Senate is aware of Senator DANFORTH's energetic work as chairman of the International Trade Subcommittee of the Finance Committee. Both on the committee and on the trade subcommittee, I have worked closely with Senator DANFORTH on any number of issues affecting international trade. I commend Senator DANFORTH's remarks to my colleagues as an insightful discussion of U.S. trade policy, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be included in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN C. DANFORTH TO THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB ON U.S. TRADE POLICY

Next week, in Bonn, the leaders of the free world will call for a new round of multilateral trade negotiations. If Congress does not extend the President's fast track legislative authority beyond its expiration date in early 1988, a new round would lead nowhere. Without fast track authority, the Tokyo Round could not have been implemented in 1979. Without an extension by Congress, a new round could not be implemented in the late 1980's.

There is no guarantee that Congress will extend fast track authority. Certainly. Congress should not agree to an extension without a thorough study of what has gone wrong in international trade and what the administration intends to do about it.

For years, trade policy has been the poor stepchild of our Government. It has been shoved to the back of the line, behind foreign policy and tax policy, behind antitrust policy and export controls, and behind any number of other considerations. For the sake of our own people as well as the international trading system itself, the era of second-class status must be brought to an end.

Today, I offer three propositions which should be debated before Congress gives the green light to a new round of trade negotiations.

Proposition I. An effective international trading system, fostering the principles of free trade, is clearly in the best interests of the United States and of the world.

Proposition II. The international trading system, as it exists today, is malfunctioning. Unless the system is made to work, it is doomed.

Proposition III. Congress needs to know that something is being done to fix the system before it grants new negotiating authority to the President.

That free trade is in the best interest of our country is so obvious to me that it went unstated in the first draft of these remarks. However, so many commentators have raised the specter of protectionism that a clear statement of principle is in order.

A return to protectionism would be a disaster for our country. It would threaten the jobs of one sixth of our work force, and it would destroy our farmers. It would increase consumer prices and reduce consumer choice. It would ruin our economy and the economies of our trading partners.

The Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act did contribute to the Great Depression. To repeat the same mistake more than half a century later would be an act of gross stupidity. The goal of the United States should be to open markets, not to close them.

The benefits of an open trading system to the rest of the world are no less obvious. In the past 2 years alone, America's open markets have been the main engine of world growth.

To insist that international agreements be enforced, and that unfair trade barriers be removed, is not protectism. The reason for negotiating international agreements and enacting enabling legislation is to provide a system for conducting world trade. Section 301 of the Trade Act gives the President the tools to open markets closed by unfair trade practices. It gives our people an opportunity to enjoy the benefits of free and fair competition. Clearly, a system that fosters such competition deserves all the support we can give it.

The second proposition is that the international trading system is malfunctioning. Our Government has neglected it. Other countries have abused it. What is happening today was never intended when GATT was established in 1947.

GATT was intended to operate for the mutual benefit of all its members. All were to benefit by the rules of free trade. All were to have access to world markets. All were to seek the benefits of comparative advantage.

In 1947, on one could have anticipated that a single country would run a $123 billion trade deficit in a single year. Nor could one have guessed our trade deficit's geometric rate of escalation since the beginning of this decade, up from $40 billion just 2 years ago.

The nature of our trade deficit has been changing as rapidly as its size. In the 1970's, we were importing fuel and raw materials. Last year, 72 percent of the deficit was manufactured goods. Nor are we offsetting the merchandise trade deficit by exported services and by returns on foreign investment as we were as recently as 1981. Last year, we ran a current account deficit of over $100 billion.

A number of causes have been cited for these ballooning numbers: The United States was first to recover from a worldwide recession, making our market far more lucrative than those of our trading partners. Huge debt obligations led Third World countries to restrict imports and subsidize exports. American business and labor are pricing themselves out of the world market. But two causes deserve special attention, neither of which was anticipated when GATT was establish: Floating exchange rates and the proliferation of nontariff barriers to trade.

When the world trading system was created, it did not anticipate a dollar which would rise or fall by the hour, which would change as money managers move billions overnight to a perceived safe haven, which would go up with U.S. interest rates and down with the closing of saving and loan associations in Ohio. It did not envision appreciations in currency which would effectively tax U.S. exports and subsidize U.S. imports.

Today, we are told that the overvalued dollars has the same effect as a 25-50 percent foreign tariff on American products, that it is the most important single cause of the trade deficit, and that the rules of international trade provide no way of relieving the problem. So, imports stifle economic recovery. Recovery bypasses key sectors of the economy, including agriculture, manufacturing, and mining. Import-sensitive and export-competitive industries fail or move offshore, and America's economic base is eroded forever.

No trade agreements, however sound, no trade laws, however well enforced, will give Americans a fair chance to compete in the international marketplace if an overvalued dollar has the same effect as a 25-50 percent tariff. To say this is not to belittle trade agreements. Rather it is to state the absolute necessity of dealing effectively with the exchange rate issue. One way or another, this problem must be solved.

The trade deficit is one of several reasons we must succeed in getting the Federal budget under control. The budget is the subject before Congress today, and no suggested trade measure should divert our attention from the goal of a $50 to $60 billion reduction in the budget deficit. To those who argue that the present furor over unfair trade practices is a distraction from the real problem of the budget, I repeat: Nothing can be allowed to distract us from the budget. The Federal budget must come first.

Yet there are those who argue that a serious reduction in the budget deficit will not reduce the value of the dollar, will not reduce it sufficiently or that it will have the opposite effect—that it will inspire even more confidence in the United States as a safe haven for foreign investment.

If this is so, if conventional wisdom about the link between the budget and exchange rates does not prove correct, then an unconventional way must be found to offset the effect of a high valued dollar.

Several unconventional ideas have been suggested. They include a strategic currency reserve, import surcharges, tax incentives for savings, a value-added tax and capital controls. I am not prepared at this time to endorse any of these ideas, especially since the better and more cautious suggestion of a reduced budget deficit has not been tried. I do say that no trade policy can work if the exchange rate problem is not resolved. I do say that if the dollar cannot be reduced by a budget resolution, then it must be offset by some other method.

Resolving the exchange rate problem is the sine qua non of effective trade policy. Yet even if we were to reduce the dollar, Americans would still not have access to other markets when nontariff barriers to our exports spring up faster than we remove them. Therefore, we must proceed on two tracks at the same time. We must deal with exchange rates, and we must remove unfair barriers to American exports.

When tariffs were the principal means of excluding imports, free trade seemed an attainable goal. Tariffs are visible, measurable, and easily reduced.

But today protectionist countries do not need to rely upon tariffs. Other, more subtle and equally effective barriers are at hand. These range from discriminatory standards to licensing to bureaucratic delay to restrictions on investment.

Much of our attention is on Japan, but it is not the only country with import barriers. We have them. Canada and Europe have then, and, with increasing significance so do developing countries.

What sets Japan apart is this: No other nation contributes so little to the open trading system in relation to its gains from that system. International trade cannot function effectively when the world's second largest economy abdicates its responsibilities to the system.

Today, our efforts to stop unfair trade practices are embarrassingly ineffective. It is embarrassing to watch the President of the United States plead with the Prime Minister of Japan. It is embarrassing to see one negotiating delegation after another return from Tokyo with hopeful announcements and no new sales. It is ineffective when our exports to Japan grow by 2 percent while our imports grow by 38 percent. Our efforts are embarrassingly ineffective, and, I submit, they are dangerous as well.

To the best of my knowledge, the United States has never used section 301 of the Trade Act to retaliate against Japan. Now retaliation is a nasty word. It suggests a loss of temper, a desire to strike back. Critics expressed that view when the Senate Finance Committee voted to retaliate against Japan.

But retaliation is not synonymous with a loss of temper or a desire to strike back in rage. Rather, section 301 gives the President authority for a measured response to unfair

trade practices, in total conformity with GATT.

The strongest argument we use against our own protectionists—against, for example, advocates of domestic content legislation—is that American protectionism would lead to retaliation abroad. It would hurt our own people. We tell our own people that, when it comes to trade barriers, there is no free lunch.

Yet, by our inaction, we tell our trading partners that there is a free lunch. We tacitly let them know that they are free to impose whatever restrictions they like to imports from the United States and that we will do nothing. We will not use section 301 to retaliate no matter what.

At the present time, there is no practical disincentive to Japanese protectionism except the volume of rhetoric turned up by the Congress. A controlled response as provided by international rules and by our law is placed off limits by the administration. Therefore, uncontrolled rhetoric is all that remains. I think this is dangerous.

It is dangerous to the total relationship between the United States and one of its closest frields. For despite lively economic competition, we are close friends. We share common interests in a peaceful and prosperous world. We share a commitment to democratic government and free enterprise economics. It is hard to imagine a promising future for either country without the friendship and cooperation of the other.

Every time there is a vote in the Congress on a matter relating to trade with Japan, the claim is made that we are sending the Japanese a message. I am increasingly of the view that the Congress of the United States should not be in the business of sending messages to Japan. At best, messages which never lead to action are easily ignored. More seriously, messages sent in rage create long-term ill will. The role of Congress is to legislate, not to send messages to other countries.

In the long run, acquiescence to Japanese protectionism is no favor to either country. For both countries, and, indeed, the trading system itself are dependent on a strong American economy. America is no longer the dominant giant, towering over a struggling and self-protecting Japan. We no longer have the economic margins to tolerate the infant industry protectionism that brought about Japan's dominance in consumer electronics and automobiles. In no sector—such as computers and telecommunications—where the United States still maintains a competitive edge, can such Japanese protectionism be tolerated. There is no question that we are being hurt by Japan's trade practices, and when we are hurt, so is the rest of the world.

The 1984 Trade Act was an effort by Congress to find an effective way of removing unfair trade barriers without resorting to idle messages or verbal abuse. Congress strengthened section 301 of the 1974 act and created a systematic way of first identifying and then removing barriers to U.S. exports. In sum, the President was given added leverage to open markets which have been closed.

Nontariff barriers to trade multiply like mushrooms. They create a problem which can never be solved by inaction, which characterizes the administration, or by overreaction, which characterizes the Congress. The problem will only be solved by putting in place a system in which the President responds to barriers in a measured and practical way. The 1984 Trade Act was intended to create such a system.

No country in the free world can afford to see the trading system destroyed. But the system is doomed if it is not credible, and the only way to make it credible is to enforce our existing law, our existing rights.

Now to the third proposition: Congress should insist on clear plans for rectifying the exchange rate problem and for enforcing our rights under existing agreements as conditions for granting the President fast track authority for implementing a new negotiating round.

To the administration, a new round of multilateral negotiations is the first priority in the trade area. To me, a new round of negotiations belongs somewhere farther down the list. Indeed, since trade agreements cannot deal with the bloated dollar, I do not see how they can improve the position of Americans trying to compete in world markets. Also, I do not understand the wisdom of negotiating rules of international trade if there is no intention of enforcing the rules we negotiate.

It would be unreasonable for Congress to ask the impossible. But if deficit reductions do not start the dollar on a steady decline, then we should be prepared to use other options to deal with exchange rates now and in the future. Now is the time to begin the careful study of those options should they later be needed. In addition, the President must implement the reciprocity title of the 1984 Trade Act, and put in place an ongoing mechanism for identifying and removing unfair barriers to American exports. These matters are far more important than a new round of negotiations.

Nearly every discussion of the trade deficit yields the comment that the problem is of our own making. It is said that we don't try hard enough—that we can't produce attractive products at competitive prices. I close by saying that I don't accept those comments for a moment. I don't accept the view that America is soft, and lazy, and over the hill. If we continue to compete, I believe we will succeed. In many key sectors, we can compete anywhere in the world, but only if the dollar is fairly priced and only if our trading partners are made to play by the rules.

Government cannot do everything in America, but there are some things it can do. It can get its economic house in order. It can enforce the law. It can give American producers a fair chance. And Congress must insist that we do so before another round of negotiations get underway.

IS THERE AN ARGENTINA IN OUR ECONOMIC FUTURE?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the other day I received in the mail an interesting letter which I found most provocative and very timely.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in full at the conclusion of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WARNER. The letter was about government spending, about government deficits, and about inflation.

Attached to this letter was a 1 million peso note issued by the government of Argentina. The author of this letter wrote, "This million peso note had a value in U.S. currency in 1962 of more than three-quarters of a million dollars. As of June 1984, the value of the note was $2.50."

The reasons for Argentina's hyperinflation and tremendously devalued currency are twofold:

First, the spirit of free enterprise has been taxed away; and second, the federal government of Argentina has embarked on an excessive program of spending and expansion which killed all incentive for work and thrust that nation deeper and deeper in debt.

As a result, Argentina has no choice but to print more and more money in an effort to meet its government's and its citizens' spending needs.

For the present, we do not face this condition in the United States.

But indeed the possibility exists.

The United States today enjoys one of the lowest rates of inflation and one of the highest rates of economic growth ever experienced in its history.

But the United States is also experiencing the largest national debt, and the largest Federal deficit in its history—a history that saw 200 years pass before its first trillion dollar debt was accrued, but only 6 years to accumulate the second trillion dollar debt.

These conditions are compounded by a growing unwillingness on the part of many not to pay their legally owned taxes.

In 1981, the last year for which verified figures are available, some $90 billion in anticipated tax revenues were lost through either tax avoidance or taxpayer noncompliance schemes.

The Senate Finance Committee and the Internal Revenue Service estimate that this tax gap—the difference between what should be coming to the U.S. Treasury and what is actually received based on the numbers of working citizens and businesses—could be as high as $150 billion in 1985.

Collection of these taxes alone could begin to wipe out the national debt.

That's a reason for Congress to begin serious work on tax simplification legislation.

Remember, America's tax system works—primarily—because of the good faith of its citizens in complying with the law.

Let's simplify before we lose that good faith.

The simple fact of the matter is that our current tax laws, either because of their complexity or because of their perceived unfairness, are fostering this tax gap.

If this situation is not addressed, and addressed soon, we could very well find ourselves in the same situation as Argentina.

The Government could literally find itself in the position of having to print money and borrow even more than it already does to meet its spending requirements.

I never want to see a million dollar U.S. piece of currency devalued so severely.

To illustrate my point, let me share with you part of an article written by Roscoe Egger, Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, on the subject of tax reform.

Comparing two types of taxpayers—those involved in limited partnerships and a typical family of four with no tax shelters—Mr. Egger wrote:

> The average 1983 gross income of individuals in limited partnerships was $193,000.
>
> But their total income tax represented less than 5 percent of their gross income, while their losses—all legal under the present tax code—represented more than 90 percent of their gross.
>
> By comparison, a typical family of four with income of $45,000 and no tax shelter losses would pay $6,272 or more than 15 percent of their income in taxes.

According to a recent IRS survey, 75 percent of taxpayers believe their taxes are too high for what they get, and about two-thirds believe they pay more than their fair share.

Even worse, a whopping 80 percent of the taxpayers in this country believe the present system benefits the rich and is unfair to the ordinary working man and woman.

So what is the answer to this dilemma?

The President and I believe the answer can be found in tax reform * * * in the adoption of a plan that promotes fairness and simplicity.

We are joined in that belief by 80 percent of America's taxpayers.

Yet the Treasury's tax simplification proposal of last November was severely injured by Washington's special interest groups before it had traveled the short mile from the Treasury to Capitol Hill.

Nonetheless, I remain hopeful that a tax reform plan which benefits all Americans, which is fair and understandable, and which produces no more tax revenue than the present tax system, were there full taxpayer compliance, can be crafted and adopted this year.

Let's go to work and earn our pay, Congress.

Finally, Mr. President, we must put the lid on Government spending.

We must continue promoting economic growth.

And we must rewrite our tax laws so that they are fair, so that they promote taxpayer compliance, so that they provide the receipts needed to enable the Government to operate without printing and borrowing excessively to meet its obligation.

For truly, if we are not to become a Nation committed to Argentina's destiny, these tasks must be accomplished.

EXHIBIT 1

GRIFFIN AND BRAND OF MCALLEN, INC.,
McAllen, TX, January 29, 1985.

Hon. JOHN W. WARNER,
Russell Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNER: Following is a copy of a letter I sent to the President and all members of Congress:

We, in general as the American people, are very much concerned about the increasing Federal deficit and its impact upon the national economy. We are also concerned very much about our national trade deficit.

I am enclosing to you a million peso note which is legal tender in Argentina. This million peso note is a very dramatic demonstration of the impact of our concern expressed above, in Argentina. This same million peso note had a value in U.S. currency in 1962 of $769,230.77. As of June 1984, the value of the note was $2.50.

Argentina is continuing to experience hyper inflation. This inflation is a result of excessive Federal expenditures. The areas of expenditures which are uncontrolled are the expansion of government, the social welfare program, government subsidies and excessive military expenditures. I believe the parallel is obvious.

It appears that the time has come for all of us, including those in public office, to recognize that we are on a road that many other nations have traveled and the end of the trip has been economic chaos. We believe that the solution to our Federal deficit spending will require courageous and sound economic non-political decisions.

The four areas which require immediate attention, in regard to reducing the deficit and ultimately the balancing of the Federal budget, very simply requires more efficient use of government funding and a reduction in the cost of government, social welfare programs and in the various subsidies, including those in agriculture, and certainly requires a reduction in military expenditures.

It is our prayer that you, the Senate and the House approach this New Year in an economically realistic manner and attitude and that there not be "politics as usual."

Briefly, concerning our trade deficit, my experience in more than 40 years of foreign trade and my observations while traveling throughout the world, of the loss of markets by the United States in many areas of industry, farm machinery, automobiles, chemicals, are very simply that management, government and organized labor together have created a wage level in major industry that has priced the American products out of the world marketplace and has opened up our country for an invasion of foreign made products.

There is much to be said and done if our nation is not to follow the course of nations such as Argentina. Argentina exceeded its capacity to borrow and turned to the bank of last resort, the printing press. Argentina is a government out of control economically.

I believe the people of this nation are willing to support the sort of leadership and effort that I have alluded in this brief letter. I am one of your supporters, an Eagle Republican, and your campaign manager in Hidalgo County, Texas in the recent election. I have great confidence in your leadership and please accept this letter in that spirit.

Very truly yours,

OTHAL E. BRAND,
Chairman of the Board.

P.S. I am sending a similar letter to each member of Congress and a few other selected persons. I hope you will frame this million peso note and keep it in a conspicuous place as a reminder of this great danger to our nation.

WE MUST BEAR WITNESS

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I have read over and over the memorable words written some time ago by Elie Wiesel: "For the dead and the living, we must bear witness." During this week, which marks the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the Nazi concentration camps, those words are most appropriate. The American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors which recently took place in Philadelphia along with other ceremonies worldwide has helped to fulfill the charge of Mr. Wiesel's words.

Unlike the survivors or the liberators, I do not have the vantage point of having personally witnessed the death camps or the slave labor camps. My perceptions of the Holocaust have been framed from books and conversations with liberators and survivors, and from watching films and documentaries. In that sense, I am like the overwhelming majority of Americans who were not eyewitnesses to the hell holes in Germany, Poland, and other Nazi controled areas. The list is long. Dachau, Auschwitz, Bergen-Belsen, Majdanek, Sobibor, Treblinka, and on and on. Six million grandparents, parents, and children in all. The number is unfathomable.

When I pick up a book on the Holocaust or when I watch a film with actual footage and photographs, I instinctively want to turn my eyes away. Nobody wants to look at the piles of corpses and at the individuals, the Jews, who were dying in inhumane agony. My mind cannot comprehend the horror and the terror of assembly line exterminations, the tortures, and the deaths. Any words that I could use to express my shock and revulsion and outright disbelief would be gross understatements of what we all feel inside. Yet we must look at these pictures and read these books if we are to keep the Holocaust experience fresh in our minds. The Holocaust has left an indelible scar on the integrity of the human race, and civilization will never be able to shake its responsibility for the calculated deaths of the millions of our brothers in the human family. The damage has been done, and for those who are to this day haunted by the cold memories of the Holocaust, the damage is still being done.

While we cannot change history, we can and must learn from it. We must learn that the value of each and every human life must never be depreciated. Can something like the Holocaust happen again? It is unthinkable but the unthinkable has happened once. We must leave this day of commemo-

ration with that thought. We should resolve ourselves to prevent the Holocaust from ever being remembered as simply a dark moment in history. We should know better. We have seen again in more recent history, the depths to which the souls of man can plunge during times of war. And we've seen again in recent times how those in power can rationalize and justify even the most brutal forms of political change. We must vow never to forget the force of evil which engineered the Holocaust and which slaughtered multitudes of innocent Jews and others. We are charged with the responsibility of making sure that this dreadful force of evil never rears its head again. That is why we must always remember: "For the dead and the living, we must bear witness."

THE 375TH ANNIVERSARY OF HAMPTON, VA, FIRST FROM THE SEA, FIRST TO THE STARS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, this summer the citizens of Hampton, VA, will celebrate the 375th anniversary of that community's founding.

On July 9, 1610, colonists from Jamestown formally established the city of Hampton, creating what is today the oldest continuous English-speaking settlement in America.

Throughout its life, both before its formal founding and since, Hampton has played numerous important and historic roles.

In 1609, it was the site of America's first outpost, Fort Monroe.

It was the site of America's first trading company, the first Anglican parish, the first free school, and it was the first community in which an organized effort was made to teach blacks.

Hampton has long been a city vital to our national defense.

It was in this community that the British and Americans first engaged one another in Virginia during the Revolutionary War.

The first planned land battle of the Civil War took place in Hampton.

The Civil War ironclads, the *Monitor* and the *Merrimack*, first clashed near Hampton.

President Theodore Roosevelt's great white fleet called Hampton its home port, and today Hampton is the testing ground for the Navy's modern day submarines, and headquarters for the Army's Training and Doctrine Command and the Air Force's Tactical Aviation Command.

Throughout much of its life, Hampton has been referred to as first from the sea, because of the landing in 1607 of the ship *Godspeed*, at what would later become Hampton and because Hampton served as the headquarters to the first Virginia Navy and the first shipyard in America.

But Hampton was also the first to the stars, by being the first home for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, now known as NASA, home to the first seven Mercury astronauts and the central training site for all subsequent astronauts, including the Apollo crew members who walked on the Moon, and today's space shuttle astronauts.

To commemorate the city's 375th anniversary, Hampton's citizens are planning numerous events including a visit by the *Godspeed* during its reenactment voyage.

This is indeed a momentous occasion for the people of Hampton and for all Americans as well.

The Senator from Virginia and others extend to these citizens our best wishes.

May the next 375 years be as rich and glorious as the last 375 for Hampton, VA, "first from the sea, first to the stars."

SOUTH CAROLINA LAW DAY SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE ALEXANDER M. SANDERS, JR., CHIEF JUDGE OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, each year the South Carolina School of Law holds its annual law day banquet in Columbia, SC. This event is attended by students, alumni, members of the State and Federal judiciaries, and other distinguished practitioners of law. This year one of the keynote speakers was the Honorable Alexander M. Sanders, Jr., chief judge of the South Carolina Court of Appeals. Judge Sanders is a former State representative and State senator and has held a number of other public positions in the State.

Unfortunately, I was out of the country with majority leader BOB DOLE and other Senators for official defense discussions with our NATO allies when this event took place.

I have read a copy of Judge Sanders' remarks and was greatly impressed by the inspirational nature of his speech. I thought my colleagues might enjoy reading his address, since he has, in a very short time, distinguished himself as a very able and dedicated judge with great insight.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Judge Sanders' speech be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

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

SOUTH CAROLINA LAW DAY—SPEECH BY CHIEF JUDGE SANDERS

Thank you, Harry. All things considered, I believe that was the worst introduction I ever got since Marion Gressette introduced me to the Senate. Dean Harry McKinley Lightsey. My classmate. LLB, JD, Phi Beta Kappa. Aspirant to the presidency of Clemson College, emeritus. We're proud of him. Doctor Harry McKinley Lightsey. Doctor of veterinary medicine. The only law school dean in America qualified to give rabies shots. We're proud of him.

Speaking of Phi Beta Kappa, did you see where the Wofford Chapter just made Chief Justice Littlejohn and Bill Rone honorary members? It was an unprecedented departure from tradition. The first time intellect has ever been recognized on an honorary basis. We're proud of them. Bill Rone is the editor of the State newspaper. His counterpart Kent Krell, the editor of the record, said Phi Beta Kappa made them members as part of an affirmative action program. Of course, I don't subscribe to that as to our distinguished chief justice. He really is smart, not just honorary smart. Still, you have to wonder. What do you suppose, they'll do for Woody Brooks. After all, he said he was smarter than the chief justice. What have they got against him.

I myself was recently honored by a visit from another distinguished member of our Supreme Court. It was just after I had written another opinion with a poem in it. It was a personal visit, so his name will remain anonymous. I'll call him Justice A. Although, his real first initial is B. "DON'T EVER DO THAT AGAIN." He suggested. And I agreed not to ever do it again. Put a poem in an opinion. I have too much respect for the poetic art form. To see it quashed. Of course, when I said I wouldn't ever do it again, I wasn't under oath.

Senator Baker, Mr. Chief Justice, distinguished justices of the Supreme Court, my colleagues on the court of appeals, President Holderman—a great leader of a great institution, Dean Lightsey D.V.M., distinguished faculty and students of the law school, Mrs. Thurmond, ladies and gentlemen.

I am seriously honored to be your substitute speaker of this evening, chosen when F. Lee Bailey couldn't come. When Strom Thurmond couldn't come. When Floyd Spence couldn't come. When John Jenerette couldn't come.

I was reading yesterday an article recently published in Trial Magazine by Judge Lawrence Grey, of the Ohio Court of Appeals. The title of the article is "Intermediate Court Creativity." When I read that title I thought to myself "intermediate court creativity". A paradox, a classic oxmoron, a self contradicting phase. An intermediate court, is of course a court of limited authority. Judicial creativity, and creativity, by definition expands the circle of human knowledge and experience. It cannot be intermediate, which means between limits. But then I was reminded of Goethe's maxim: "It is by working within limits that the true master reveals himself." So I thought that I would briefly share with you this evening a few thoughts along these lines.

The judges of the S.C. Court of Appeals are, of course, required to follow the decisions of both the United States Supreme Court and the South Carolina Supreme Court. Let me first assure you, that the judges of the S.C. Court of Appeals are well aware of the limits within which we operate. But, at the same time, let me also say as Professor Leflar has observed, "judges on an intermediate court are bound, but not gagged, by the supreme courts. In this regard, at least, we can be as creative as our minds allow us to be. As creative as we are moved to by the compelling ideas lawyers bring before our court.

Regrettably, much of what we do is dreadfully repetitious. Many cases are routine. To the parties, however, and to their lawyers, each is unique, and each is entitled to care-

ful attention. The backlog in South Carolina the appellate courts is not due to the time judges spend on the precedent-setting case, but rather on the tedious but necessary time spent on the routine cases.

Lawyers should remember, however, that we did not become judges for the tedium, but for the excitement, for the enthusiasm that comes from dealing with important legal questions.

While we are the court of last resort for the routine case, we know that the important case may be only passing through us on its way up. That is the most important limit. Nonetheless, while we may not have the final say in such a case, we have the opportunity to write the most persuasive commentary on it. When a party on appeal asks the court to look at a new rule, or to view an old rule in a new light, we have the opportunity to write an opinion so well thought out, so persuasive, so analytically sound that supreme court review can be almost obviated, reduced to a procedural ritual. The limits on creativity of intermediate appellate judges lie not in the cases or the higher courts, but only in our capacities to think.

Do not confuse what I am saying with the age-old debate on judicial activism versus judicial restraint, because each in its own way is a substitute for judicial thinking. A judge who extols the virtues of judicial restraint may be so dedicated to precedents that he does not contribute. He presumes that judges who preceded him must have known more than he about what the law is and what it ought to be. Since such a judge is so afraid to think. His presumption about himself may be well deserved.

The activist judge has it easy: He not only does not have to read the cases: He does not have to think at all. He already knows the answer and can fashion an opinion to fit it. If his research then is not helpful in achieving his preordained result, he can always rely on Holmes's famous quote: "It is revolting to have no better reason for a rule of law than that so it was laid down in the time of Henry IV."

Judicial activism and judicial conservatism are only reverse sides of the same coin, and both result in a flip-of-the-coin type of justice. I know of no good judge who would not be offended were either appellation attached to him because good judges realize the need for analysis in each case—the need to reaffirm good old ideas and the need to reject ideas that have outlived their usefulness.

Consider, for example, the right to jury trial and illegitimacy. Two legal concepts that have their roots in the middle ages. Even though the necessity or utility of jury trials has been questioned regularly, jury trials are still highly regarded as important to the contemporary legal process. Illegitimacy, on the other hand, is on the way out. The supreme court has ruled repeatedly that there is no rational basis or state interest to be protected by distinguishing children this way.

We accept the concept of trial by jury because it still works, and we reject the concept of illigitimacy because it does not. The infusion of ordinary people into the judicial system as the ultimate arbitrators of fact is still effective in achieving just results. On the other hand, only under primogeniture must a society have illegitimacy, a system for determining which child is first born. Having done away with primogeniture. The idea of illegitimacy is withering away.

For a judge, the "why" of a case is what is important. Holmes was hardly rejecting all rules laid down in the time of Henry IV: he was writing about the reasons for rules. Following a rule because it is old is "revolting," but no more revolting in my opinion than rejecting it because it is old. Today's judge must know why judges in Henry IV's time laid it down, and what interest of society was being protected. Only then can he or she decide if it is still applicable—if society still wishes that interest to be protected.

Perhaps I am being too esoteric here, but unless a rule is understood in terms of its cultural and historical context, one cannot understand the value, or perhaps the danger, of the rule. Consider the common law defenses of lack of privity for products liability, charitable and sovereign immunity, and contributory negligence. These concepts were perfected in the nineteenth century. The age of the robber barons, when the goal of America was to accumulate wealth and power. These rules were, for their time, good and useful. They permitted the concentration of capital and heavy investment and reinvestment in capital goods in both the public and private sectors and the rapid industrialization of the United States. To be sure, many injuries went uncompensated, and many people were left cruelly destitute, but such were the values of the times.

But times change. Novelists like Upton Sinclair portrayed inequities of the system. Sociology was only in its infancy when "lawyer" Brandeis filed his famous brief, and "Judge" Cordozo wrote his famous opinions that products do injure the ultimate consumer even though there is no privity. The ex contractu ideas of the nineteenth century were supplanted by the ex delicto ideas of the twentieth.

Ideas are compelling. There may be no force like that of an idea whose time has come, but some ideas are timeless. In 100 A.D., Pliny the Younger was appointed governor of Bithynia in Asia Minor by the Emperor Trajan. Pliny regularly wrote to Trajan, and in one letter he asked how to react to an anonymous accusation that someone was a Christian. Trajan wrote, "anonymous informations ought not to be received in any sort of prosecution. It is introducing a very dangerous precedent, and is quite foreign to the spirit of our age."

And almost exactly 1,900 years later the S.C. court of appeals—embracing the principle of the Emperor Trajan passed down to us by Pling and John Locke and Thomas Jefferson—wrote "the right of an accused to be confronted by a witness against him is perhaps the most important right given to innocent people. It is so important that it must be also given to those who may be guilty."

How should the judge who wrote the opinion in which these words appear be viewed? Is he a bleeding heart liberal more concerned about the rights of a criminal than the rights of society. Or is he a reactionary conservative relying on a principle that was already centuries old when the middle ages began.

I submit that from the judicial perspective, the terms liberal and conservative—judicial activism and judicial restraint—should be meaningless.

Good judges want just results, and just as Potter Stewart knew obscenity when he saw it, good judges know injustice when they see it. They will preserve those rules that accomplish just results, no matter how ancient. A judge can be as creative in maintaining a good old rule in the face of adverse public opinion. As in seeking new rules for new problems.

Judicial creativity is the continuing juxtaposition of old and new ideas alongside old and new values. This is critical in understanding the appellate process. Judges are less like artists and more like museum curators. Some of the finest works of human creativity were produced during the Ming dynasty. But the Ming dynasty also produced many mediocre artifacts. Likewise, today many works of art are produced, but only some have value. Good judges, like good curators, preserve the best traditions, but also like curators, are open to the newest creativity in our society. They judge not that it is Ming, or postmodern, but only that it is good or bad.

What do these comparisons have to do with the practicing lawyer? They give insight into judicial creativity: They point the way for the practicing lawyer's participation in it.

Having a common-law system, judges tend to be content to follow an old rule and loath to write a new one, so how are new rules established? As I said before, "ideas are compelling." Let me rephrase that. "Ideas are so compelling, even judges can be moved." An effective lawyer moves a judge by talking about the ideas behind a rule. Every rule of law is a "good" one because it promotes and protects some value or principle, and if it is to be judged, it must be judged on what it promotes. Racial equality has been the official policy of the United States since 1864, and the "separate-but-equal" ruling of *Plessy* v. *Freguson* was in its way an attempt to promote equality. But that rule had a flaw—it was based on the idea of separateness. *Brown* v. *Board of Education* did not strike down the principle of equality, but the idea of separateness.

So in conclusion, let me leave you as lawyers, or soon to be lawyers, with this thought for law day 1985. The life of the law is by no means exclusively entrusted to the guardianship of us judges. It is your role and your responsibility to attend to its well being throughout the balance of this century and the next.

When a lawyer writes a routine brief, a court writes a routine opinion.

Sometime ago I wrote in the transcript that the second worst invention of the 20th century was the word processor. The first worst being the hydrogen bomb and the third, tassel loafers.

In this age of microchips. I fear we are approaching the day where a lawyer enters "arguments of 119-B(1)" on his word processor and files his brief. Perhaps this day will not come. But, if it does you can be sure that a court will then enter "opinion 119-B(1)" on its word processor, so I emplore you this evening. Put life in your logic and fire in your words.

When I speak of fire, I am not speaking of inflamed rhetoric or passionate pleas, but the fire of ideas. If I am to be a creative judge, to see my way out of Socrates' dark cave, you must provide Plato's leaping spark to give me light. See what I mean.

THERESE KNECHT DOZIER, RECIPIENT OF THE NATIONAL TEACHER OF THE YEAR AWARD

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to extend recognition to my constituent Therese Knecht Dozier, who has distinguished herself as "1985 National

Teacher of the Year." I was pleased to attend ceremonies at the White House on April 18, at which Mrs. Dozier was presented the award by President Reagan. Therese Dozier has continually devoted herself to academic excellence both as a student and as a teacher. She is greatly loved by her students, who recognize her skill and dedication, and by the parents in the community. In becoming a teacher, she fulfulled a lifelong ambition to nourish, guide, and encourage young people. Through her unselfish and untiring devotion to her students, and through her personal standards of excellence, she has set a fine example for other teachers and prospective educators throughout the United States.

Born in Vietnam of a Vietnamese mother and German father, sold to a Chinese businessman, transferred to a French orphanage, and eventually adopted by U.S. Military Adviser Lawrence Knecht and his wife, Theresa Dozier has survived, seized on, and made the most of every opportunity that has come her way. She has devoted herself to a career in educating, nourishing, and enriching the lives of young people. Recognition of Mrs. Dozier as National Teacher of the Year underscores the valuable contributions Asian-Americans are making to our Nation in fulfillment of the American dream. South Carolinians and all Americans can be justifiably proud of this excellent teacher.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that additional biographical information on Mrs. Therese Knecht Dozier be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my statement, in order that my colleagues may be informed of the background and accomplishments of this remarkable young woman.

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

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION: THERESE KNECHT DOZIER

1985 National Teacher of the Year

The sequence of events that brought Therese Knecht Dozier from a South Vietnam orphanage to a South Carolina classroom and recognition as 1985 National Teacher of the Year reads like a wildly improbable novel, one that is also a glowing and inspirational chronicle of the indomitability of the human spirit against almost unsurmountable and, at times, cruel odds.

Terry Dozier was born on or about June 17, 1952 (she is not sure of the exact date) in war-torn Saigon. Her mother was a Vietnamese woman, her father a former colonel in Hitler's Waffen SS who had fled Germany during the closing days of World War II and joined the French Foreign Legion. He eventually wound up in what was then known as French Indochina, where Vietnamese nationalists were threatening to end French colonial rule. There he met and married Terry's mother, who died 20 months later, shortly after giving birth to Terry's younger brother, Timothee.

Unable to care for the two children, their Legionnaire father sold them to a Chinese businessman, who planned to sell them to a childless Chinese couple. When the French authorities discovered this and began searching for the children, the Chinese businessman, fearing arrest, gave Terry and her brother to an old Chinese woman living on a sampan in the Saigon River. The authorities found the two children there, suffering from malnutrition, and turned them over to a French orphanage. Meanwhile, their father was believed to have been killed in the crucial defeat of the French at Dien Bien Phu in 1954, which brought about the division of Vietnam at Geneva that year.

At the time, Lawrence Knecht, a U.S. Army warrant officer, was stationed in Saigon as a military advisor to the French. For years he and his wife, Anne, had tried unsuccessfully to adopt a child in the States. At the French orphanage, they were immediately captivated by Terry's brother and decided to adopt him. When told by the orphanage chaplain that the 15-month-old boy had a two-and-half-year-old sister, the couple agreed to take her, too, although, as Knecht recalls, "Terry was so undernourished that she was all skin and bones and her hair was falling out." Terry and her brother are believed to be the first Vietnamese children to be adopted by an American couple.

Upon completing his assignment in Vietnam in 1955, Knecht was sent back to the States, and the family spent two years in Atlanta, Georgia, where Terry went to kindergarten. Then Knecht was reassigned to Heidelberg, Germany, where his daughter was a first grader in a school for dependents of American soldiers. It was in Germany that Knecht had a strange experience touching on Terry's past. While driving on the autobahn one day, he picked up a hitchhiker, who turned out to be vaguely familiar. Knecht suddenly realized that the hitchhiker was a former member of the French Foreign Legion he had known slightly in Saigon. The hitchhiker confirmed that Terry's natural father had been killed in Dien Bien Phu.

When Knecht retired from the army in 1959, the family settled in Punta Gorda, Fla., where Terry attended and graduated from Charlotte High School as valedictorian. She has wanted to teach as long as she could remember, even though people discouraged her, citing poor salaries and the fact that she was too "bright" to waste her talents teaching. The orphanage chaplain had termed her "the smartest child I've ever seen," and her adoptive father said she was bright enough to be anything, "even a brain surgeon."

Nonetheless, while in high school, Terry wrote an essay on "Why I Want to Become A Teacher," which won a $2,000 state Jaycees teaching scholarship.

She attributes her interest in history largely to her exotic, multi-national heritage and the fact that her own life was directly influenced by historic events. "However," she says, "my interest was also the result of several dynamic high school teachers and the emphasis my parents placed on the significance of historical events."

She therefore majored in both education and history at the University of Florida, from which she graduated in 1974 with a straight A average as the university's "Outstanding Four-Year Scholar." One week after graduation, she married Mark Dozier, a student with whom she had worked several years before in a Gainesville book store, and began her career in education teaching social studies at a middle school in Gainesville, Fla. "Working with the underprivileged low-achievers there reconfirmed the decision I had made years before to teach," she recalls. At the same time, she pursued the requirements for the master's degree in social studies she eventually earned from the University of Florida.

In 1976, Mark's work as a sales representative in the travel field took them to Miami, where she taught math to extremely disadvantaged children at an inner-city middle school. It was a rough school, and the first advice the young teacher got was to lock herself in her room, although she says she never had any serious disciplinary problems. "Again, the economic plight and low educational caliber of the students made me realize how truly fortunate I was and how desperately good teachers are needed to stimulate and encourage children," Terry says.

A year later, Mark was about to be promoted and transferred to New York City—a move that neither Mark nor Terry were enthusiastic about. "Being a teacher is very important to me," she says. "But with my southern accent I worried about how I would be accepted in New York."

So the couple selected Columbia, S.C., which they had visited on one earlier occasion because it was exactly halfway between their hometowns of Memphis, Tenn., and Punta Gorda, Fla. Neither had any job prospects in Columbia, but Terry applied for interviews with several school districts in the area. Ironically, the only district that refused to interview her was the one containing Irmo High School. But a vacancy suddenly developed when another teacher hired failed to qualify completely, and Terry was suddenly called in for an interview, hired, and assigned to Irmo, where she has been teaching since 1977.

During the first two years there, she taught world geography, civics, U.S. history, and values clarification; since 1979, she has concentrated on world history, the subject in which she feels she can make the greatest contribution.

She has earned the respect and admiration of students and parents alike for the innovative ways she has developed for bringing history alive through various classroom activities. "I try to bring history to life for my students," she says. "Stimulating a student's mind and inspiring students to learn are a teacher's most difficult task."

The ingenious techniques she has devised for stimulating students include an annual "Medieval Fair," where students assumed the roles of royalty, barbarians, minstrels, jugglers, and jesters; a board game, Imperialism, where students and classes, assuming the roles of European powers, compete with each other in trying to amass the largest colonial empires; and an oral history project involving the entire community.

Mrs. Dozier is known as a demanding teacher who has high expectations of her students. She feels that her primary goal as a teacher is to help her students recognize their potential and develop their abilities to their fullest extent. "To do this, I feel it is essential to set high standards of excellence for my students," she explains, "because I have discovered that students will live up to the expectations that are set for them. Therefore, I strive to challenge and stimulate my students while maintaining an unshakable faith in their ability to meet that challenge."

However, she also feels that winning the hearts of students is equally as important as stimulating their minds. "This is accomplished by showing that you care about the

students as individuals," she says. "By cultivating and maintaining a good rapport with my students, I nurture an atmosphere of trust."

But, in her view, capturing the hearts of students also means showing concern for them outside the classroom. She feels that teachers must make themselves available to their students, whether it is for extra help with schoolwork or to listen to their personal problems. Also, she feels that teachers must keep in contact with parents of their students, not only when they have problems but when they need to be praised.

Terry Dozier's interests outside the classroom include travel, the theater, reading, sewing, gardening, backpacking, camping and fishing—as well as two that are teacher-related.

One is to be the first teacher in space, and to help her fulfill this goal South Carolina Governor Richard Riley has endorsed her application for the NASA Teacher in Space Project.

To broaden her teaching horizons, she has also applied again for a Fulbright fellowship to China for a summer of study in that country. Last year she was selected as an alternate for this U.S. Department of Education seminar program.

"It has been my education that I prize most as an American citizen," Terry says. "It is the one thing I know I could never have received if I had not been adopted and brought to this country. I try to convey to my students that education can open up the world and the doors of opportunity to them, as it has done for me.

"I have always been very conscious of having been given a chance to make something of myself," she continues. "I want to give that chance to others and to share the excitement of learning that I have always felt. Teaching is my way of repaying a debt."

JEWISH LIFE IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. TRIBLE. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to again take part in the 1985 call to conscience in behalf of Soviet Jews.

In the days ahead, free people around the world will commemorate the 40th anniversary of the liberation of Jews from the death camps of the Nazi regime. The Jews' liberation from Auschwitz, Buchenwald, and the other stations of horror that dotted Nazi Germany was a source of hope to the world. It inspired in free men a belief that good might yet triumph over evil.

But this will not be accomplished without a struggle. The freedom to worship God cannot be secured by good intentions alone. Rather, it demands that free people sustain their profound faith in God, and that they work tirelessly to ensure for others the same right of religious freedom.

Today, religious freedom is under assault in the Soviet Union, and the Jews are the chosen victims of Soviet oppression. As always, it is difficult to practice any religion in the U.S.S.R. As always, it is particularly difficult to be a Jew in that country.

The Soviet regime refuses to allow the widespread practice of Judaism. It closes synagogues at will and confiscates prayer books. It harasses and imprisons prominent Jewish leaders.

Is it any wonder that the pleadings of Jews who wish to leave the Soviet Union have grown? During the past several years, hundreds of thousands of Jews have risked persecution and villification to apply for permission to emigrate. The vast majority have been refused. They remain imprisoned in a land where their faith is oppressed, with little hope of leaving for lands in which religion can flourish.

Earlier this year, a fellow Virginian informed me of one such family in the Soviet Union—the Uspenskiis. The Uspenskiis applied to leave the Soviet Union in July 1979. Prior to that, they had visited the West a number of times, and were accomplished academicians in the U.S.S.R.

Not surprisingly, their request to emigrate was refused. They were excluded from further scientific and academic travels, and their articles were no longer published by the Soviet press. By December 1981, Mrs. Uspenskii had been fired from her job, and her husband demoted from his.

Theirs is the typical story of Jewish life in the Soviet Union. Overt expressions of religious faith are treated harshly by the Soviet regime. The government has stepped up its oppression of Jews in recent years. At the same time, it refuses to allow Jews to leave the U.S.S.R.

Mr. President, we are their hope. We who enjoy religious freedom are obliged to try to extend it to others, especially those for whom the weight of Soviet oppression grows heavier every day. We must continue to affirm our commitment to the Soviet Jews, to their freedom and their faith, and I urge my colleagues to continue to take part in the call to conscience.

OPPOSITION TO APARTHEID IN SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, yesterday, acting for himself, Senator MATHIAS, myself and Senator LUGAR introduced a bill to express strong U.S. opposition to apartheid in South Africa and to encourage the South African Government to dismantle the apartheid system.

Apartheid in South Africa is one of the most important, but also one of the most complex and emotion-laden, foreign policy problems which we face today. It is, therefore, an issue on which we must be particularly thoughtful in what we do and particularly realistic in what we hope to accomplish.

OUR NATIONAL GOALS

Almost all of us agree on what our basic goals in South Africa should be. Most important, we insist on a speedy end to the apartheid system. Apartheid is immoral. It violates the basic precepts of the Judeo-Christian ethic and the basic principles on which this and other democratic nations are founded. There is no excuse for perpetuating apartheid—it serves no one's long-term interests. Apartheid must go. Apartheid will go.

But it is also in everyone's interest to see that apartheid's demise, while speedy, is nonviolent. It will not serve black interests, any more than white, if apartheid is swept away in a torrent of hatred and bloodshed. Our aim is not to force the white South African authorities to the wall—it is to get them to change their policies and let blacks into the system.

Finally, while the removal of apartheid must be at the heart of our policies in South Africa, it would be naive and dangerous to ignore the reality that we also have other goals in that country and region. We want to minimize the presence and influence of the Soviets and their surrogates in southern Africa. We want to see an end to regional conflict, with normalized relations between South Africa and its neighbors, especially Angola and Mozambique. We want to see true Namibian independence. We cannot compromise our stand against apartheid in pursuit of these other goals, but neither can we ignore these other factors as part of the total picture in that important region of the world.

ACHIEVING OUR GOALS

While there is general agreement on these goals, however, there is great disagreement on how best to achieve them. And, I want to say, there is sincere disagreement on how to achieve them. For our part, we think our bill, which contains a four-part approach, is the one which offers the best chance for quick, peaceful, and comprehensive change in South Africa.

CONDEMNS APARTHEID

First, we condemn apartheid, loudly and clearly. There can be no waffling on this point. In our bill, there is none.

CONSTRUCTIVE ACTIONS

Second, we have tried to emphasize the constructive actions which we as Americans can take to reach our goals—actions which can make South Africa a little better place immediately and can speed the day when the worst features of its governmental system can be swept away entirely.

The bill asserts what I strongly believe—that, by and large, the American business presence in South Africa has been and is a constructive force for economic progress, social reform, and even political liberalization. In my view there is no question that South African blacks are better off today in virtually all spheres than they would be if the American business presence were eliminated. In my view, the worst thing we could do now would be to force disinvestment, either directly or indirectly. Our bill, in sum, aims at en-

couraging the continued presence of American business as long as it continues to be a force for good in the country.

The bill also increases the positive impact of our Government's presence in South Africa. It earmarks additional funds within AID's budget for scholarships for blacks and for human-rights-related projects. It directs that the administration, to the extent feasible, procure the goods and services it needs to support our presence in South Africa from black and other non-white-owned firms. It also encourages both OPIC and Exim to increase their involvement with and support for such companies. All of these steps are intended as a concrete and direct manifestation of our wish to see South Africa become a land of more equitable opportunity and political freedom.

SULLIVAN PRINCIPLES

Third, our bill strongly encourages the continued and expanded adherence to the so-called Sullivan principles by American firms in South Africa. I would repeat two things I said earlier: First, we think the American business presence is by and large a positive force in South Africa, which we want to encourage; but second, we want to encourage it only so long as it is that positive force. We do not favor an American business presence in South Africa if its only purpose is making money. Our bill, we are convinced, encourages the right kind of business presence.

It authorizes and requires the Secretary of State to establish procedures by which it can be determined which firms are in compliance with the Sullivan principles and which are not. Those companies not in compliance would thereafter be denied the right to expand their investment in South Africa and would not be able to call upon the intervention of our Government in other commercial disputes. These features are not intended to and should not scare companies in compliance with Sullivan, but we believe they will be a powerful incentive for noncomplying companies to change their ways.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT

Finally, our bill directs the President to report to the Congress periodically—beginning within a reasonable timeframe—whether South Africa is making significant progress in dismantling the apartheid system. In setting our timeframe, we have in mind Bishop Tutu's own comments and ideas about the best way to proceed. Should the President in any one of these periodic reports, determine that the South African Government has not made such progress, he is directed to recommend from among appropriate sanctions, which we have listed. The Congress would deal with the President's reports and recommendations under expedited procedures.

We hope we won't reach that stage. We hope the South African authorities, though, will understand from this approach that our patience has just about worn out. We want—we insist upon—some real progress. We insist upon it soon. And if we don't see it soon, we will act.

CONCLUSION

Much of the credit for this bill must go to my two original cosponsors. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee was the major architect of the overall package. He is determined to move ahead with good legislation in this area, as demonstrated by the excellent hearings which he has already begun. The senior Senator from Maryland has also made a tremendous contribution to the shape of this bill. Indeed, its important final sections were largely derived from the excellent legislation which he introduced, and which the Foreign Relations Committee overwhelmingly approved, several weeks ago.

I would also note that, press accounts notwithstanding, this is not an administration bill. We would, of course, welcome the administration's support for the bill—we hope we will get that support—but this is a bill undertaken at our initiative, on which the administration—to the best of my knowledge—has not yet spoken.

We do hope that all of you, though, our colleagues here in the Senate, will speak out now, and speak out favorably, on this bill. We think this is a strong, constructive, realistic approach to this very important problem. We think if offers the best chance of achieving the goals we all share. We think it ought to be passed by the Congress and signed by the President. And we think it ought to be soon.

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, the Senate-administration deficit reduction plan is legislation designed to deal with America's greatest domestic problem—uncontrolled Federal spending.

This is not a perfect package. In my judgment, there are areas that should have come in for greater reductions, such as agricultural subsidies, and areas in which the package cuts too much, like Amtrak. But the bottom line is simple—after months of difficult negotiations, compromises and general agony, we have before us a package that accomplishes the fiscal restraint that all of us know is critical. I think this package deserves the support of the Senate, if not in every particular, certainly as an overall blueprint to reduce Federal spending.

We find America right now in a "good news-bad news" situation. The good news is that the United States is on the move again. Our economy has made a remarkable turnaround that is the envy of the world. The strong recovery has not only created millions of jobs for Americans, but has been the engine of growth for the free and Third World. We can be justly proud of these accomplishments and especially of the renewal of the American spirit.

Once again we are a confident people who face the future with vigor. A bright future awaits us and our children if we have the courage to make the decisions necessary to meet the challenge of the times. That is the good news.

The bad news is that if we continue to ignore Federal spending, we run the risk that interest rates will climb, housing and construction will decline, production of exports will diminish, creating even worse balance of payment problems and heavy unemployment in trade-related industries, farmers will continue to lose their farms, and the growth of our standard of living will slow. Further, the Government will continue to pay larger and larger amounts of money just on interest on the national debt. In fact, current projected budgets deficits will double our $1.5 trillion national debt in 5 years, resulting in annual interest payments which will approach the current defense budget.

To give you another sense of the problem, this year the individual share of the national debt for every man, woman, and child in the United States is $6,400. Unless action is taken now, that share will rise to $11,200 by 1990.

In short, we must sacrifice today for a better tomorrow. We must ensure that our children, and our children's children, have the same chance of success that you and I have had. Those of us who reached maturity in the postwar period have been the beneficiaries of the greatest period of economic prosperity in the history of the world. It would be the height of arrogance for us to pass on to the next generation not the gift of opportunity which we have enjoyed but instead the burden of debt caused by our own selfishness. Yet that is exactly what we are on the verge of doing.

Fortunately, however, we still have time to right this wrong. We still have time to lay a strong foundation for economic growth that will benefit our children. But we must act now. The legislation before us this week gives us that opportunity to match our actions with our rhetoric and act to provide that foundation.

We all are part of the budget problem. For too many years, just about every American has come to expect a benefit in some way, shape or manner from the Federal Government.

Uncle Sam helps us buy our houses, educate our children, build our roads, pay our hospital bills, provide us cheap food and utilities, set up new businesses, have nice vacations—the

list goes on and on. And everybody, down to the biggest dyed-in-the-wool fiscal conservative, happily assumes they are his or her God-given rights on Earth.

In short, we have a deficit problem not just because we spend too much on defense or welfare, but because we expect too much from Government.

I will be voting to cut or terminate programs with this bill that I have enthusiastically supported in the past. But I know of no other way to reduce the deficit. The easy cuts have been done.

Some people have argued that we could avoid all this pain, or some of it, by simply raising taxes. After all, say these big-spenders, Roth-Kemp was nothing more than a giveaway, and it's time to regain our fiscal senses.

For the life of me, I cannot understand how these politicians and businessmen continue to make that argument. Taxes as a percentage of GNP are at their historical levels. The four tax increases that Congress has passed since 1981 have literally canceled out the revenue reductions contained in Roth-Kemp. We just had a national election where the central issue was whether to raise taxes—and 49 States emphatically said no.

As far as I am concerned, the sooner we forget taxes as an option, the sooner we will make progress on the real villain—excessive spending. The authors of this package are to be commended for recognizing the truth, and not recommending any general tax increase.

However, there are those in this Chamber and around the country who are hoping that this package falls flat on its face, because they know that will give them a great opportunity to jump in with their warmed-over and completely discredited plans to raise the taxes of the working people of this country. That is one big reason why this package, or something very similar must pass this body.

Mr. President, as I travel around Delaware, one thing has become very clear to me. Delawareans are willing to sacrifice, as long as they believe the pain is being spread evenly. Whatever else Congress does in dealing with the budget, it must, to the greatest extent possible, be fair. This package meets that fairness test—it hits almost everybody. There are no sacred cows in this plan. Social Security is included, against the wishes of the President. Defense is cut substantially. Almost every special interest has been hit in some way. Whatever faults this proposal has, it is comprehensive.

Mr. President, it is no fun having to consider this deficit reduction package. Nobody likes to say "No."

But it is our inability to say "No" in the past that has gotten us into the fix we are in today. The vast majority in this country know this, and they want action and leadership from this body. Quite frankly, if we continue to ignore the deficit, we are going to look like fools, and the public will remember our inaction at the ballot box—as well they should.

In the last few weeks, I have had a parade of people at my office door with the same message—do something about the budget deficit, but cut somebody else.

This year, that strategy won't work. Tough, painful cuts like those called for in this resolution must be made across the spectrum of programs. It is the only way to avoid very serious problems later.

To create long-term growth, it is essential to establish those policies that will enable the United States to compete in the world economy. That, in turn, depends upon regaining control of Federal spending so that the United States has the resources to develop the world's most modern industrial facilities. The lesson of Chrysler and United States Steel is that obsolete plants cannot compete with foreign producers utilizing the latest technology. It is the failure to remain competitive that has caused the decline of Europe and the loss of millions of jobs.

We cannot let that happen here. If we sacrifice a little today, we will have a better tomorrow. What American, what mother or father, what grandmother or grandfather, is not willing to give a little to help their children, or children's children, face a brighter future?

By tightening our belts, we can guarantee for our young people the kind of future that we found not that long ago. America is a great country. Our economy is the envy of the world. Because of our strong economy, we have become the place where the world puts its money. And despite what the "gloom and doomers" tell you, the future of this country is brighter now than in a long, long time. If we can successfully deal with the challenge of the deficit, the prosperity that we now enjoy will not be a passing fancy. It will last, and our children can look forward to the progress and the happiness that this generation has come to take for granted.

I urge that the Senate look favorably upon the bulk of this package.

A SPECIAL EVENING FOR A GREAT AMERICAN: RECEPTION AND DINNER TO BUILD THE STROM THURMOND CENTER AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, on Wednesday evening, April 24, this Senator had the privilege of serving as toastmaster at a dinner honoring one of the truly great Members in the distinguished history of this body. At the Capitol Hilton Hotel in downtown Washington, hundreds of friends, neighbors, and colleagues gathered yesterday to salute Senator STROM THURMOND and the very worthy educational project named for him at the Senator's alma mater, Clemson University. The planned project is called the Strom Thurmond Center for Excellence in Government and Public Service. In my view, no monument could better exemplify the contributions the senior Senator from South Carolina has made to the people of his State and to this Nation. The Strom Thurmond Center represents the best hope for the future of America, because there is no goal more important than inspiring the youth of this country to become involved in government.

Of course, my good friend, STROM, has dedicated his entire life to public service. As a citizen, soldier, and statesman, Senator THURMOND has spent 60 years striving to make America a better place to live.

First, as an educator, school superintendent, State senator, and circuit judge, then as a decorated World War II veteran, Governor of South Carolina, and for the past 31 years as a U.S. Senator, STROM THURMOND has personified the goals and ideals the center at Clemson University will be designed to promote.

STROM is much more than a Senate colleague. He is a good and trusted friend, a confidante, an adviser, and a distinguished member of the Senate leadership as President pro tempore.

Mr. President, this Senator would like to thank Senator JOE BIDEN, Senator BILL ARMSTRONG, and Clemson University President Dr. Bill L. Atchley for their participation in the program and their fine remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following materials from Wednesday evening's event be printed in the RECORD.

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

SPONSORS

The Honorable George Bush, Vice President of the United States.

Senator Robert Dole, the Majority Leader.

Senator Alan K. Simpson, the Majority Whip.

Senator John Chafee, Chairman, Republican Conference.

Senator Thad Cochran, Secretary, Republican Conference.

Senator William Armstrong, Chairman, Republican Policy Committee.

Senator John Heinz, Chairman, Republican Senatorial Committee.

Senator Robert C. Byrd, the Democratic Leader.

Senator Alan Cranston, the Democratic Whip.

Senator Daniel K. Inouye, Secretary, Democratic Conference.

Senator George J. Mitchell, Chairman, Democratic Senatorial Committee.

Senator Ernest F. Hollings, the State of South Carolina.

PRAYER

Gracious God, our Loving Father in Heaven, we honor one of America's great and good men this evening. Held in highest regard by the people of South Carolina and the Nation, respected and admired by his peers in Washington, D.C., cherished in love and affection by his friends and family, Senator Strom Thurmond is worthy of every accolade a people can render to its leaders. We praise You, Lord, for the leadership Your faithful servant has given this Nation and the world. We thank You for the vision of the Strom Thurmond Center, those whose vision it is, and all who make it a reality. Blest is the university on which this campus this Center of Excellence will diffuse its light and life, its history and its hope, as it reflects the integrity, the courage, the goodness, the grace of the man it honors.

We thank You, Father, for the pleasure of each others' company at these tables. May Your love fill this room and bless all who are present. We thank You for good food—the farmers who produced it—the industry which processed it—those who prepare and serve it. May we, who always have more than enough of everything, remember with compassion and generosity, those who never have enough of anything. In His name Who is Love Incarnate. Amen.

THE REV. DR. RICHARD C. HALVERSON,
Chaplain, U.S. Senate.

THE THURMOND CENTER

On October 29, 1981, Senator Thurmond announced his decision to place his public papers and memorabilia at his alma mater, Clemson University.

Because it shares the Senator's belief that service to others is the greatest privilege of democracy and that education should enhance freedom, Clemson University announced that the Senator's historic gift would be the first step in the establishment of the Strom Thurmond Center for Excellence in Government and Public Service. The Center's programs will embody the philosophy and values of Senator Thurmond and will be characterized by his pursuit of excellence and undaunted spirit of civic purpose.

The Center will be the focal point for important programs to serve people—programs in civic education, continuing education, and cultural education. In accordance with the Senator's wishes, it is never to be a monument, but a living institution, for students and scholars of government and public service. Already, major figures in government and foreign policy have appeared at Clemson University, under the auspices of the Thurmond Center.

The Center will provide public service and it will promote public service. It will enhance the cultural life of Clemson University, South Carolina, and the Nation. It will offer the kind of university-based civic education and continuing education that will enable people to put new ideas to work throughout South Carolina and across America for the betterment of their communities, towns, cities, and states. It is based on a view of "practical politics," "good government," and a truly "enlightened citizenry" that the founders of the nation understood firsthand.

An ambitious $25 million project, the Center will consist of a complex of three buildings at the heart of the Clemson campus—an auditorium facility, a continuing education building and the Strom Thurmond Institute.

LETTERS OF PRAISE

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 23, 1985.

I am pleased to send greetings to everyone at the dinner in honor of Senator Strom Thurmond and in support of the Strom Thurmond Center for Excellence in Government and Public Service.

You who are working to make that Center a reality deserve every commendation. The support of leaders like Bob Dole and Bob Byrd shows how important this Center is to all Americans, regardless of party.

We all have a stake in good government, and in inspiring the best of our young people to enter political life. The Strom Thurmond Center will help ensure that young Americans who decide on a career in government can acquire the knowledge and wisdom necessary to serve the Nation.

Nancy joins me in wishing all of you a memorable evening.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, April 24, 1985.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR STROM: I regret that I am unable to be with you tonight to help support the Strom Thurmond Center for Excellence in Government and Public Service. However, I am pleased to be among many distinguished sponsors of this fundraising dinner.

Good government, and inspiring the interest of our young people toward public service, is a goal all of us share. The future of America depends on tomorrow's leaders, and the Strom Thurmond Center will help ensure that generations yet to come will have facilities needed to seriously study our government and the field of public service.

Tonight's dinner, and the generous contributions of those in attendance, are strong symbols of the support and commitment the private sector has invested in education and tomorrow's leaders.

Strom, I want to join with your other friends tonight in saluting you for your commitment to these ideals, and to commend Clemson University for its support of the Strom Thurmond Center, a facility destined to be a great source for scholarly achievement and good government.

With warmest regards and best wishes,

GEORGE BUSH.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 23, 1985.

DEAR FRIENDS OF SENATOR THURMOND: You have chosen wisely in giving support to the Strom Thurmond Institute at Clemson University. A library to house public and private papers is an honor usually reserved for Presidents, but the building of this Institute will tell future generations of Americans something about a great American whose career has few parallels in modern American history.

Few people ever combined as many successful careers as Strom Thurmond: farmer, teacher and school superintendent, Governor, a decorated Major General, and now President pro tempore of the United States Senate. Others will undoubtedly expand on those achievements.

After graduating from Clemson in 1923, he studied law at night with his father, and then ranked at the top of the list of applicants taking the State Bar Examination. As one who also studied law at a night law school while working during the day, I can understand his dedication to the law. After practice as a private practitioner, a city attorney, and a county attorney, his election as a circuit judge in 1938 began a significant public career, and I have no doubt he would have had a remarkable career in the State courts except for his call to service in 1941. As Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Senator Thurmond oversees legislation concerning our Nation's courts and legal system and all nominations of federal judges must pass through his Committee. His accomplishments in enacting truly major legislation are too long to list, but most recently they included a key role in the passage of the Commission on the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution, the Bankruptcy Amendments and Federal Judgeship Act of 1984, and the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984.

The incumbent of my office necessarily works with the Committees on the Judiciary, and I have found Strom Thurmond a good man to turn to for counsel and advice. Supporters and adversaries alike look up to him as a man of rock-hard integrity and basic fairness. I am proud to be his friend. Seven times the people of South Carolina have elected him as their representative in the Congress where he has established a place that ranks him as one of the all time Senate "greats."

Cordially,

WARREN E. BURGER.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, April 24, 1985.

Hon. ROBERT DOLE,
The Majority Leader, United States Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: It's with regret that I will not be with you and the many distinguished guests for tonight's very special event honoring our friend Strom and the Strom Thurmond Institute. As former Chairman of the Budget Committee, I have been asked to observe and comment on the President's televised remarks on the budget. Thereafter, I must attend a dinner at the Madison where I am the honoree.

Our senior Senator has reached the stage of folk hero in our native South Carolina. He has served from school teacher to judge to Governor to presidential nominee to United States Senator to President Pro Tem of the United States. In each capacity, he has not only enhanced his own reputation and respect but has brought favor upon the State of South Carolina and this nation.

It is fitting that Strom is dedicating an institution to learning at Clemson University. It is said that those who educate our youth are more to be honored than those who produce them, for while the one renders the gift of life, the other gives the art of living. The Institute is a deserved tribute to our state's most dedicated public servant.

My fondest regards to Strom and Nancy and all the many supporters of the Strom Thurmond Institute.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS.

CONCLUSION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague from South Carolina capped the evening's festivities with an outstanding address. Although his comments were extemporaneous, the Senator from Kansas would like to paraphrase some of Mr. THURMOND'S remarks—the words are fresh in my

mind and bear repeating. The Senator stated—quite modestly—that we do not honor a single individual with a dinner, but rather an ideal: That America's future is invested wholly in its youth. Indeed, this commitment to succeeding generations is what the Thurmond Center is all about. For years to come, all political points of view will have the opportunity to converge under one roof on the Clemson campus, where eager minds will advance the freedom of expression that has made this country great. In fact, the good feelings and bipartisan nature of Mr. THURMOND's evening represented the very essence of Clemson's ambitious project, and tells us that the spirit of America is alive and well in the Palmetto State.

Mr. President, this Senator can only thank the good people of South Carolina for sending their outstanding citizen-politician-statesman to Washington.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and the withdrawal of a nomination.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:35 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1869) to repeal the contemporaneous recordkeeping requirements added by the Tax Reform Act of 1984, and for other purposes; it agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ARCHER, and Mr. VANDER JAGT as managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 33) designating the week of April 29 through May 5, 1985, as "National Child Safety Week."

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-174. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 1601

"Whereas, the Kansas economy greatly depends on the health and stability of the agricultural sector, the strength of which requires a competitive and expanding presence in international grain markets; and

"Whereas, Existing federal grain grade standards fail to reflect to foreign buyers important characteristics that affect the ultimate value of grain in processing and consumption; and

"Whereas, Grain grade standards only have value to the extent they provide useful marketing information and economic incentives for quality throughout the export system: Now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, the House of Representatives concurring therein: That the United States Department of Agriculture change current grades for grain to:

"(a) Establish separate factors for measuring broken grain and foreign material;

"(b) eliminate moisture as a grade determining factor in all grains, with moisture to be recorded on the certificate; and

"(c) include factors that have economic value as related to the end use properties and the products to be made from that grain; and

"Be it further resolved: That the United States Department of Agriculture should continue research and education efforts to standardize measurement techniques and grain grade to provide further uniformity among all major exporting and importing countries and should expedite revision of grade standards; and

"Be it further resolved: That the Secretary of State be directed to send enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the Administrator of the United States Grain Inspection Service, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Chairperson of the Committee on Agriculture of the United States Senate, the Chairperson of the Committee on Agriculture of the United States House of Representatives and each member of the Kansas Congressional Delegation."

POM-175. Joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Budget.

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 15

"Whereas, the Office of Management and Budget has projected a federal deficit of $210 billion in fiscal year 1985; and

"Whereas, the Office of Management and Budget has forecast a long-term federal budget deficit of $229 billion by fiscal year 1989; and

"Whereas, the Congressional Budget Office has projected a federal budget deficit of $263 billion by fiscal year 1989; and

"Whereas, in November 1983, the debt ceiling was raised by $101 billion to $1.490 trillion in order to allow the Department of the Treasury to increase its legal borrowing capacity to pay the expenses for programs previously written into law; and

"Whereas, in May 1984, the debt ceiling was increased another $30 billion to $1.520 trillion; and

"Whereas, in June 1984, the debt ceiling was raised again, this time by $53 billion, with the debt ceiling set at $1.573 trillion; and

"Whereas, the interest payments on the public debt represented 13 cents per dollar of federal budget outlays in fiscal year 1984; and

"Whereas, the net interest owed on the public debt is estimated at $109.5 billion in 1984—the equivalent of $300 million a day—and at $130.9 billion in 1985; and

"Whereas, for fiscal year 1989, the Office of Management and Budget forecasts net interest costs of the public debt at $153.1 billion, and the Congressional Budget Office projects net interest costs of the debt at $214 billion, which figures respectively represent $419 million and $586 million owed for each day of the year in interest alone; and

"Whereas, in the past 5 years, the gross federal debt has almost doubled and is expected to total, $1.807 trillion by the end of fiscal year 1985.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

"(1) That the Legislature call upon the President of the United States to immediately submit to the United States Congress a balanced federal budget.

"(2) That the United States Congress adopt a balanced budget for the ensuing federal fiscal year.

"(3) That the Secretary of State send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, and to each member of the Montana Congressional delegation."

POM-176. Joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

"JOINT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION CONCERNING OPPOSITION OF THE MAINE LEGISLATURE TO PROPOSED TRADE REGULATION RULES OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION WHICH WOULD REMOVE EXISTING RESTRICTIONS IN THE STATE OF MAINE ON COMMERCIAL OPTOMETRIC PRACTICE

"We, your Memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Maine, now assembled in the First Regular Session of the One Hundred and Twelfth Legislature, most respectfully present and petition the Federal Trade Commission as follows:

"Whereas, the Federal Trade Commission is currently considering rules relating to the corporate practice of optometry most recently set forth in 16 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 456; and

"Whereas, the Maine Legislature has enacted comprehensive legislation regulating the practice of optometry in Maine, set forth in the Maine Revised Statutes, Title 32, chapter 34-A; and

"Whereas, the State has specifically addressed the issue of the corporate practice of optometry in the Maine Revised Statutes, Title 32, sections 2434 and 2435; and

"Whereas, the State of Maine and the Legislature have historically devoted extensive consideration to the issue of the corporate practice of optometry, beginning in

Maine's first corporate practice law, enacted in 1939, and in subsequent legislation in 1951 and, most recently, in 1981 and 1982, during the 110th session of the Maine Legislature; and

"Whereas, the Maine Legislature is empowered and directed by the citizenry of Maine to enact such legislation as will protect the health, welfare and interests of the citizens of Maine, and Maine Legislatures have done so in enacting laws related to the practice of optometry in the State; and

"Whereas, the federal rule-making process and the rules now under consideration by the Federal Trade Commission will not reflect or address the needs of the citizens of the State, as does the legislation which has been enacted by Maine Legislatures; and

"Whereas, the authority of Maine Legislatures, and now the 112th Maine Legislature, to enact legislation which protects the health, welfare and interests of the citizenry of the State of Maine should not be usurped by the federal rule-making process now under consideration by the Federal Trade Commission; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, do hereby respectfully urge that the Federal Trade Commission refuse to adopt the rules now under consideration which would preempt the laws of Maine regarding the commercial practice of optometry; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to each member of the Maine Congressional Delegation and to each member of the Federal Trade Commission."

POM-177. Concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

"HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 31

"Whereas, The Secretary of Transportation has called for bids on the transfer of the Federal Government's stock in the Consolidated Rail Corporation known as Conrail; and

"Whereas, Conrail is the preeminent rail freight carrier in the Commonwealth, employing over 14,000 Pennsylvanians, nearly 40% of its total work force; and

"Whereas, One quarter of Conrail's route mileage is located within Pennsylvania; and

"Whereas, Since 1976 Conrail has invested in excess of one-half billion dollars on maintenance and right-of-way improvement projects in this Commonwealth; and

"Whereas, Pennsylvania industries rely heavily on Conrail for moving three-quarters of a million carloads of raw materials and finished products annually; and

"Whereas, The corporate headquarters of Conrail is located in Philadelphia, accounting for 4,500 jobs in the southeastern region of this Commonwealth; and

"Whereas, Two of Conrail's five regional offices and four of seventeen divisional offices are located in this Commonwealth; and

"Whereas, Conrail maintains high volume classification yards at Conway, Enola and Allentown and many additional classification and industrial yards throughout this Commonwealth that process one-quarter of all Conrail traffic systemwide; and

"Whereas, Conrail has spent millions of dollars building and upgrading intermodal terminals in Morrisville, Harrisburg and Pittsburgh; and

"Whereas, Conrail has its major locomotive and freight car maintenance facilities in Altoona; and

"Whereas, Two-thirds of Conrail's maintenance employees work in this Commonwealth; and

"Whereas, Members of organized rail labor have contributed to make Conrail a financial success by increasing productivity and agreeing to wage deferrals totaling four hundred million dollars over the last three and one-half years with the expressed goal of preserving jobs in Pennsylvania and elsewhere on the Conrail system; and

"Whereas, Conrail is an integral part of moving and marketing Pennsylvania coal, with the railroad directly serving over 100 mines and providing connections to short lines serving over 30 additional mines in this Commonwealth; and

"Whereas, The General Assembly recognized the importance of Conrail to the Commonwealth's coal industry and greatly assisted the financing of the coal transfer facility at Pier 124 in Philadelphia by providing 22.6 million dollars in reconstruction funds; and

"Whereas, Pennsylvania has more operating short line railroads than any other state, with most of those small carriers totally reliant on Conrail for their vital outlet to the Nations's rail network; and

"Whereas, Conrail has amply demonstrated its ability to operate and prosper as an independent rail carrier serving Pennsylvania and the northeast quadrant of the Nation by earning one-half billion dollars net income in calendar year 1984; and

"Whereas, All other major railroads in the United States are stockholder owned; therefore be it

"Resolved (the Senate concurring), That the General Assembly of Pennsylvania implore the President of the United States, members of Congress and the Secretary of Transportation to select a public stock offering proposal for the return of Conrail to the private sector that includes the following provisions; significant employee ownership; a 10% ownership limitation by any holder or affiliates on common stock that is publicly offered; and the provision of funds from the proceeds of the Conrail sale to states in the Conrail service region for purposes of freight rail service preservation of rail-related infrastructure improvements, including grade-crossings and bridges and the provisions of Title VII of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-236, 45 U.S.C. Ch. 16, Subch. VII), as amended by the Northeast Rail Service Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-35, 95 Stat. 357); and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted immediately to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Transportation, the presiding officers of each house of Congress and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania."

POM-178. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

"Be it resolved by the legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas, the Guam water delivery and storage system is in need of construction of new lines and storage facilities and extensive repair to existing ones; and

"Whereas, the United States Congress recognized the need to assist Guam in improving this most essential part of her infrastructure; and

"Whereas, in Public Law 98-454, Section 401, Sixteen Million Three Hundred Thousand Dollars ($16,300,000) was authorized to be appropriated in Fiscal Year 1985 for improvements to Guam's water system; and

"Whereas, the legislative history of that section indicates that when the Bureau of Reclamation's final recommendations on Guam's water system are made, the Congress may need to revise the authorization; and

"Whereas, the Public Utility Agency of Guam has identified twelve (12) projects which will bring relief to those suffering from water shortages; and

"Whereas, the twelve (12) projects are:

"(1) Equipping eight (8) deep wells with larger pumps	400,000.00
"(2) Exploration and construction of wells in Southern Guam	700,000.00
"(3) Barrigada Booster Station	400,000.00
"(4) Inarajan River Water Treatment Plant	2,000,000.00
"(5) Umatac-Lasa Fua River Water Treatment Facility with a capacity of approximately 150 59 200 GPM	1,300,000.00
"(6) Malojloj-Inarajan Water Transmission Line	1,840,000.00
"(7) Mangilao-Inarajan Water Transmission Line	3,600,000.00
"(8) Pago Bay-Togcha Water Transmission Line	1,520,000.00
"(9) Barrigada and Mangilao Reservoir with connecting pipeline	2,000,000.00
"(10) Macheche Water Transmission Line	585,000.00
"(11) Improvement of Laelae Spring Water Treatment Plant and Transmission Line	950,000.00
"(12) Development of Agana Spring Wells	1,000,000.00;

now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, that Congressman Ben Blaz is respectfully requested to pursue the appropriation of Sixteen Million Two Hundred Ninety Five Thousand Dollars ($16,295,000) of the amount authorized for appropriation in Public Law 98-454 for these twelve projects; and be it further

"Resolved, that the Speaker certify to and the Legislative Secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the United States Senate; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives; to President Ronald Reagan; Richard T. Montoya, Assistant Secretary, Territorial and International Affairs; to Congressman Morris Udall, Chairman, House Interior and Insular Affairs; to Congressman John F. Seiberling; to the Director, Bureau of Reclamation; to Congressman Ben Blaz; to the Chief Officer, Public Utility Agency of Guam; and to the Governor of Guam."

POM-179. Joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

"HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 12

"Whereas, The United States Secretary of the Interior has instructed the Bureau of Reclamation and the Fish and Wildlife

Service to close Kesterson Reservoir, plug the San Luis Drain, and cease delivery of water to lands which drain into the reservoir; and

"Whereas, The decision of the Secretary of the Interior will force 49,000 acres of prime agricultural land out of production in Fresno County, the nation's No. 1 producing agricultural county, resulting in an estimated $133,000,000 first-year loss in residential and agricultural property value and income derived from direct farm product sales, indirect business, and personal and retail sales; and

"Whereas, Over 1,200 farm-related jobs will be eliminated and over 3,000 jobs indirectly affected by that loss, thereby adversely impacting the economies of communities throughout the affected area; and

"Whereas, Plummeting land values will result in a lower tax base, thereby causing a reduction in the quality and quantity of essential public services delivered to residents located within the affected area; and

"Whereas, Lending institutions are reconsidering the status of existing agricultural production, mortgage, and equipment loans, and the current and proposed financial obligations of farmers in the affected areas; and

"Whereas, Planting of this year's crops had begun prior to the decision of the Secretary of the Interior; and

"Whereas, The problem of agricultural drainage may adversely affect about 1,500,000 acres of San Joaquin Valley agricultural land; and

"Whereas, There exists a continuing need for the Secretary of the Interior to ensure that the Bureau of Reclamation studies, develops, and implements methods to safely drain agricultural waste water away from agricultural lands in the San Joaquin Valley; and

"Whereas, It is vital to the local and state economy to keep the affected 49,000 acres in production; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Assembly of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Secretary of the Interior to do all of the following:

"(1) Continue the delivery of water to the affected 49,000 acres while immediately moving to clean up Kesterson Reservoir.

"(2) Direct the Bureau of Reclamation to develop and implement irrigation management practices and drainage alternatives which will allow the affected lands to be farmed in the immediate future.

"(3) Immediately consider locating evaporation ponds which could be constructed and operated so as not to pose a hazard to human health and safety or fish and wildlife, or not to threaten to impair or alter the quality of the waters of the state under the conditions and constraints of existing state laws or regulations.

"(4) Develop and implement methods to treat agricultural drain water to remove salts, heavy metals, trace elements, and any other constituents which pose a threat to public health and safety, fish and wildlife, or water quality; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Assembly of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to act accordingly to ensure the stability and continuity of California agriculture which is so important to the people of this nation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Interior.

"HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 12 TAKEN UP BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT FOR SECOND READING

"Assembly Member Costa was granted unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 12 without reference to file, for the purpose of adopting the committee amendments at this time.

"House Resolution No. 12—Relative to The Kesterson Reservoir.

"Resolution read; amendments proposed by the Committee on Rules read and adopted.

"HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 12 AS AMENDED

"By Assembly Member Costa:

"Relative to The Kesterson Reservoir

"Whereas, The United States Secretary of the Interior has instructed the Bureau of Reclamation and the Fish and Wildlife Service to close Kesterson Reservoir, plug the San Luis Drain, and cease delivery of water to lands which drain into the reservoir; and

"Whereas, The decision of the Secretary of the Interior will force 49,000 acres of prime agricultural land out of production in Fresno County, the nation's No. 1 producing agricultural county, resulting in an estimated $133,000,000 first-year loss in residential and agricultural property value and income derived from direct farm product sales, indirect business, and personal and retail sales; and

"Whereas, Over 1,200 farm-related jobs will be eliminated and over 3,000 jobs indirectly affected by that loss, thereby adversely impacting the economies of communities throughout the affected area; and

"Whereas, Plummeting land values will result in a lower tax base, thereby causing a reduction in the quality and quantity of essential public services delivered to residents located within the affected area; and

"Whereas, Lending institutions are reconsidering the status of existing agricultural production, mortgage, and equipment loans, and the current and proposed financial obligations of farmers in the affected areas; and

"Whereas, Planting of this year's crops had begun prior to the decision of the Secretary of the Interior; and

"Whereas, The problem of agricultural drainage may adversely affect about 1,500,000 acres of San Joaquin Valley agricultural land; and

"Whereas, There exists a continuing need for the Secretary of the Interior to ensure that the Bureau of Reclamation studies, develops, and implements methods to safely drain agricultural waste water away from agricultural lands in the San Joaquin Valley; and

"Whereas, It is vital to the local and state economy to keep the affected 49,000 acres in production; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Assembly of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Secretary of the Interior to do all of the following:

"(1) Continue the delivery of water to the affected 49,000 acres while immediately moving to clean up Kesterson Reservoir.

"(2) Direct the Bureau of Reclamation to immediately develop and implement irrigation management practices and drainage alternatives under which the affected lands could continue to be farmed in the immediate future.

"(3) Immediately consider locating evaporation ponds which could be constructed and operated so as not to pose a hazard to human health and safety or fish and wildlife, or not to threaten to impair or alter the quality of the waters of the state under the conditions and constraints of existing state laws or regulations.

"(4) Develop and implement methods to immediately begin to treat agricultural drain water to remove salts, heavy metals, trace elements, and any other constituents which pose a threat to public health and safety, fish and wildlife, or water quality; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Assembly of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to act accordingly to ensure the stability and continuity of California agriculture which is so important to the people of this nation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the United States of the Interior."

POM-180. Resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Finance.

"RESOLUTION

"STATEMENT OF MOTIVES

"During the past years Puerto Rico has been suffering from a high unemployment rate. The labor Intensive industries that generated employment have been leaving the Island because they have lost their competitive capacity due to high costs. The corporations operating in Puerto Rico by virtue of the provisions of Section 936 have allowed the Commonwealth to replace many of the lost jobs with high-technology and better remunerated jobs.

"Section 936 of the Federal Internal Revenue Act provides tax exemption on the profits earned by industries that are subsidiaries of corporations established in the United States. Such legislation constitutes a considerable source of employment, as well as income to the Puerto Rican economy. Furthermore, said exemption is an highly-important incentive for the establishment of new subsidiary corporations on the island, which would, in turn, generate more jobs and income.

"If the exemption provided by the above mentioned Section 936 were eliminated, the economy of Puerto Rico, as well as the Puerto Rican labor force would receive a severe blow, and likewise, the great number of Puerto Ricans who depend on it.

"By repealing Section 936, the Federal Treasury would not receive any additional real income, because it is most probable that the corporations that benefit from this privilege in Puerto Rico would delay or postpone the payment of their income taxes to the United States Treasury for an indefinite period of time, by reincorporating in jurisdictions outside of the United States.

"It is also possible that the action of eliminating Section 936 would increase the federal deficit, on account of the payment of additional social welfare benefits to workers who become unemployed. Likewise, migration to the continental United States would increase, which would add to burdens of the United States social welfare system.

"Section 936 has allowed Puerto Rico to replace many of the jobs lost because of the Commonwealth's loss of competitive capac-

ity on a wage level, by providing better jobs in highly-technical industries.

"One of the main functions of this Legislature, as the direct representative of the people, is to watch over the fiscal stability of the Commonwealth and all those other conditions and opportunities which propitiate an increase in the labor force. For this reason, and responding to a legitimate concern in view of the possibility that the Section 936 exemption could be eliminated according to press reports, the Senate of Puerto Rico considers it an inescapable obligation to express itself on this respect, and to make it known to the pertinent North American authorities.

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of Puerto Rico:

"Section 1.—To express to the President of the United States, Hon. Ronald Reagan, the House of Representatives, and the Senate of the United States the desire of the People of Puerto Rico to keep in effect Section 936 of the Federal Internal Revenue Act, which grants federal tax exemption to corporations established in Puerto Rico, which are subsidiaries of corporations located in the United States.

"Section 2.—A copy of this Resolution, duly translated into the English language, shall be sent to the President of the United States, to the House of Representatives, and to the Senate of the United States."

POM-181. A resolution adopted by the Mid-Ohio Valley Mayors Association relating to General Revenue Sharing and Arc Grants to Cities; to the Committe on Finance.

POM-182. Joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 23

"Whereas, our nation has been immeasurably strengthened by the contributions of ethnic and religious groups from around the world, including Catholics and Protestants from Northern Ireland; and

"Whereas, our country's strong traditional ties of friendship and a shared heritage with the Republic of Ireland and Great Britain have contributed to the well-being of all three nations; and

"Whereas, the people of Ireland continue to suffer from political and civil strife that rends the fabric of human society; and

"Whereas, we take no side in the Irish dispute, but deplore all violence from whatever source; and

"Whereas, the United States, in the spirit of peace and humanity, has interceded in other areas and lands torn by civil strife to bring about a lasting resolution of the problem and lay to rest the specter of religious bitterness; and

"Whereas, the United States can and should take a constructive part in bringing about a peaceful solution to the problems that divide Ireland: Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana: That the United States is able to, and in fact should, take the lead in formulating and effecting a peaceful and just resolution to these problems because the United States has benefited so greatly during the past 150 years from its relationships with both Ireland and Great Britain.

"Be it further resolved, That Congress is urged to pass legislation calling for the President to appoint a Special Envoy to be dispatched to Ireland for the purpose of participating in and bringing about a resolution to the centuries-old problems in Ireland and specifically since 1921 in Northern Ireland.

"Be it further resolved, That the President, accordingly, is urged to appoint the Special Envoy without delay upon receipt of the congressional action.

"Be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, the President and Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Irish and British ambassadors to the United States, the members of the Montana Congressional Delegation, and Congressman Mario Biaggi, chairman of the ad hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs."

POM-183. Joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 15

"Whereas, There are currently 2,483 Americans still missing or otherwise unaccounted for in Indochina, and their families still suffer untold grief due to uncertainty about their fate; and

"Whereas, The Lao People's Democratic Republic has recently indicated increased willingness to cooperate, and agreed with the United States government to improve the overall relationship between our two countries; and

"Whereas, The Socialist Republic of Vietnam has pledged to accelerate their effort to cooperate with the United States government in resolving this humanitarian issue, separate from other issues dividing our two countries; and

"Whereas, The President of the United States has declared resolution of the POW/MIA issue a matter of highest natioanl priority, and has initiated high level dialogue with the governments of the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam on this issue; and

"Whereas, The citizens of the State of Illinois fully understand and agree that the fullest possible accounting can only be achieved through government to government cooperation; and

"Whereas, The citizens of the State of Illinois support the President's pledge of highest national priority to resolve the status of the 2,483 Americans still missing and unaccounted for in Indochina; and

"Whereas, The citizens of the State of Illinois urge the United States government to accelerate efforts in every possible way to obtain the immediate release of any Americans who may still be held captive in Indochina, and the return of American servicemen and civilians who died in Southeast Asia whose remains have not been repatriated; and

"Whereas, The citizens of the State of Illinois strongly urge the governments of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic to fully cooperate with the United States government in the humanitarian effort to resolve the fate of 2,483 American servicemen and civilians still missing in Southeast Asia; and

"Whereas, The families of America's missing men, including 105 from the State of Illinois, continue to wait for word on the fate of their loved ones; and

"Whereas, The citizens of the State of Illinois express particular concern for the following Illinois residents who remain unaccounted for in Southeast Asia:

"LTC Harold Joseph Alwan, Maj Harry Arlo Amesbury, Jr., SSGT Gregory Lee Anderson, CAPT Robert Donald Beutal, PFC Wayne Bibbs, GSGT Timothy Roy Bodden, CAPT Arthur Ray Bollinger, LT Daniel Vernor Borah, Jr., SSGT Alan Boyer, LTC James Alvin Branch, LTJG Thomas Edward Brown, COL Robert Wallace Brownlee, Jr., MAJ Bernard Ludwig Bucher, LCDR Kenneth Richard Buell, CAPT Park George Bunker, SSGT Michael John Burke, MAJ Joseph Henry Burne, MAJ Ralph Laurence Carlock, CAPT John Werner Carlson, CAPT John Bernard Causey, COL Charles Peter Claxton, CWO Dean Eddie Clinton, LCDR Ralph Burton Cobbs, CAPT Willard Marion Collins, CAPT Joseph Bernard Copack, Jr., SSGT Kenneth Leroy Cunningham, MAJ Patrick Robert Curran, SSGT Raymond George Czerwiec, CAPT Thomas Carl Daffron, SP4 Randall David Dalton, WO James Leslie Dayton, LT Richard Carl Deuter, LCDR Michael Edward Dunn, CWO Dennis Keith Eads, AX3 William Farrell Farris, WO Barry Frank Fivelson, ATC Ronald Edmond Galvin, SGT Charles Hue Gatewood, LCDR Donald Arthur Gerstel, LTJG John Bryan Golz, COL Robert Warren Hagerman, MSGT Thomas Edward Heideman, SSGT Robert Dale Herreid, LCPL Joseph Arnold Hill, SFC Anthony Frank Housh, LCDR Roger Burns Innes, PFC Michael James Jablonski, 1LT Ronald James Janousek, CAPT Jack Elmer Keller, LCDR Kenneth Keith Knabb, Jr., LTC Jeffrey Charles Lemon, SGT Leonard J. Lewandowski, Jr., MAJ Robert Ray Lynn, CAPT George Duncan MacDonald, COL Notley Gwynn Maddox, CAPT Richard Carlton Marshall, SP5 James Phillip Mason, LTC Glenn David McElroy, HN James Patrick McGrath, LTC Carl Ottis McCormick, LCDR Robert Charles McMahan, LCDR Roger Allen Meyers, SSGT William John Moore, CAPT Wayne Ellsworth Newberry, AX2 Randall John Nightingale, CAPT Joseph Paul Nolan, Jr., CAPT Michael Davis O'Donnell, LTC Floyd Warren Olsen, CAPT Warren Robert Orr, Jr., LTC Robert Joseph Panek, Sr., LTC Donald Eugene Parsons, CAPT Roger Dale Partington, MAJ Wayne Edward Pearson, LCDR Gordon Samuel Perisho, CWO James Larry Phipps, LCDR Thomas Holt Pilkington, CAPT Jerry Lynn Pool, 1LT William Marshall Price, SSGT Dennis Michael Rattin, MAJ Ronald Reuel Rexroad, MAJ Robert Paul Riggins, SSGT Billie Leroy Roth, LT Leland Charles Cooke Sage, CPL Richard Eugene Sands, CAPT Leroy Clyde Schaneberg, SP4 David Lee Scott, SGT Robert Carl Sherman, 2LT David William Skibbe, COL Harold Victor Smith, CAPT Joseph Stanley Smith, PVT James Clellon Story, CAPT Dean Paul St. Pierre, LTC John Willard Swanson, Jr., PFC Jerrold Allen Switzer, SSGT Derri Sykes, SSGT Oral Ray Terry, CAPT Kenneth Deane Thomas, Jr., CAPT John Cline Towle, LTJG Dusin Cowles Trowbridge, CWO Eykel Martin D. Vanden II, MAJ James Edward Whitt, SP4 Richard Dennis Wiley, MAJ Robert Cyril Williams, MAJ Kenneth Joseph Vonan, MAJ Robert John Zukowski; therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the Eighty-Fourth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that February 27, 1985, be proclaimed POW/MIA Recognition Day in the State of Illinois; and be it further

Resolved, That this General Assembly joins with the entire Nation is honoring all of the brave Americans missing or imprisoned in Southeast Asia, and in expressing our support to their families; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to demand that the governments of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos promptly account to the government of the United States for all Americans missing in those countries and return all American servicemen still being held captive; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this preamble and resolution be delivered to the Illinois Chapter of the National League of Families of American Prisoners of War and Missing in Action in Southeast Asia, the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, each member of the Illinois Congressional Delegation, Governor James R. Thompson, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam Mission to the United Nations."

POM-184. A resolution adopted by the City Council of Arden Hills, Minnesota, urging Congress to continue its efforts to halt the persecution of the Baha'i minority in Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-185. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 189

"Whereas, there is presently under consideration at the federal level a proposal based upon a Grace Commission recommendation to close some twelve thousand (12,000) small post offices throughout this Nation; and

"Whereas, such action would result in the closing of at least one hundred fifty-one (151) post offices in the State of Mississippi, which represents over thirty-three percent (33%) of the total offices operating in Mississippi; and

"Whereas, the closing of post offices on this scale would be extremely detrimental to the United States Postal Service; and

"Whereas, it is the opinion of this Legislature that Mississippi's economy is dependent on the operation of all post offices in Mississippi and that such offices should continue to serve the people of our state:

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi, the Senate concurring therein, That we do hereby oppose any federal action which would result in the closing of any post offices in the State of Mississippi.

"Be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Mississippi Congressional Delegation, to Mr. Charles W. Holmes and to Ms. Clara Johnson, President and Vice President, respectively, of the State Chapter of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States, and to members of the Capitol Press Corps."

POM-186. Concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 4075

"Whereas, loss of rights to Indians and non-Indians has occurred within the exterior boundaries of Indian reservations located in this state since statehood because of the lack of state civil jurisdiction within those boundaries; and

"Whereas, the great hope of obtaining justice on the Indian reservations of this state reflected in the report of the Legislative Research Committee to the Thirty-eighth Legislative Assembly has not materialized through the procedure provided under Chapter 27-19 of the North Dakota Century Code; and

"Whereas, 22 years have now elapsed since the adoption of Chapter 27-19 with no prospects in sight for ensuring justice in civil cases exceeding the present $300 jurisdictional limit of tribal courts within the exterior boundaries of Indian reservations of this state; and

"Whereas, the Congress of the United States has further complicated the matter of resolving Indian jurisdiction problems through the enactment of amendments to Public Law 280 in 1968 and by the enactment of the Indian's Civil Rights Act [Pub. L. 90-284, Sections 401, 402, 406, 82 Stat. 78-80; 25 U.S.C. Sections 1321, 1322, 1326]; and

"Whereas, the Supreme Court of this state in the case *Three Affiliated Tribes* v. *Wold Engineering,* Civil No. 10,172, has analysed the problem of state courts' jurisdiction over Indian reservations and has urged the attention not only of the Legislative Assembly of the state of North Dakota, but also the Congress of the United States;

"Now, therefore be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein: That the Legislative Council study the problem of civil jurisdiction within the exterior boundaries of the Indian reservations of this state; and

"Be it further resolved, That the Legislative Council is encouraged to include on the committee assigned to study this matter a representative from each of the Indian reservations of this state and an equal number of representatives from the North Dakota Association of Counties; and

"Be it further resolved, That the Legislative Council is encouraged to hold hearings on the respective Indian reservations and at appropriate county seats, and to meet with a like committee created by the Congress of the United States, if possible, and to meet and confer with other appropriate state and federal officials as well as the North Dakota Congressional Delegation; and

"Be it further resolved, That the Legislative Council seek the assistance of the Governor of this state and the North Dakota Congressional Delegation in securing the creation of a national committee to study the problems of civil jurisdiction within the exterior boundaries of Indian reservations throughout the United States, and to consider, among other things, amending federal law:

"1. To require that Indian people accept state civil jurisdiction within the exterior boundaries of reservations;

"2. To create a federal court to hear civil cases arising within the exterior boundaries of reservations; or

"3. To transfer such cases to existing federal courts; and

"Be it further resolved, That the Legislative Council report its findings and recommendations, together with any legislation required to implement those recommendations, to the Fiftieth Legislative Assembly; and

"Be it further resolved, That the Secretary of State send copies of this resolution to the leadership of the United States House of Representatives, including the Speaker, the Majority Leader, the Majority Whip, the Minority Leader, and the Minority Whip; the leadership of the Senate, including the Majority Leader, the Majority Whip, the Minority Leader, and the Minority Whip; the members of the North Dakota Congressional Delegation; the Governor; the Attorney General; the United States Attorney for North Dakota; the Executive Director of the North Dakota Association of Counties; the Executive Director of the Indian Affairs Commission; the President of the United States; the Vice President of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior; and the Attorney General of the United States."

POM-187. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1001

"Whereas, the First Congress of the United States of America at its First Session, in both Houses, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, adopted the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

The Conventions of a number of the States having at the time of their adopting the Constitution expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the government will best insure the beneficent ends of its institution—

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, two-thirds of both Houses concurring, That the following articles be proposed to the legislatures of the several states as amendments to the constitution of the United States, all or any of which articles, when ratified by three fourths of the said legislatures, to be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the said Constitution, viz.:

ARTICLES IN ADDITION TO, AND AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PROPOSED BY CONGRESS AND RATIFIED BY THE LEGISLATURES OF THE SEVERAL STATES, PURSUANT TO THE FIFTH ARTICLE OF THE ORIGINAL CONSTITUTION

"Art. II. No law varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.

"Therefore be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

"1. That such proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be and the same is hereby ratified.

"2. That the Secretary of State is requested to transmit certified copies of this Resolution to the Administrator of General Services, Washington, D.C., and the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States."

POM-188. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resource.

"HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 78

"Whereas, there is presently under consideration at the federal level a proposal based upon a Grace Commission recommendation to close Job Corps training centers throughout this Nation; and

"Whereas, such action would result in the closing of several such centers in the State of Mississippi; and

"Whereas, the closing of Job Corps centers would be extremely detrimental to the state and its citizens; and

"Whereas, it is the opinion of this House of Representatives that Mississippi's economy is dependent on the operation of all Job

Corps centers in Mississippi and that such offices should continue to serve the people of our state:

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi, That we do hereby oppose any federal action which would result in the closing of any Job Corps training in the State of Mississippi.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Mississippi Congressional Delegation and to members of the Capitol Press Corps."

POM-189. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Small Business.

"JOINT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO RESTORE FUNDING FOR THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

"We, your Memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the One Hundred and Twelfth Legislative Session now assembled, most respectfully present and petition the Congress of the United States, as follows:

"Whereas, 97% of all businesses in Maine are defined by the Small Business Administration as being small businesses; and

"Whereas, in 1984, the Small Business Administration approved $29.3 million in loans to 188 small businesses; maintained a portfolio of over 2,900 loans with more than $134 million; sponsored training programs for over 4,000 small business people; and, by establishing a resolving line of credit financing, made available working capital loans up to $1 million to exporters; and

"Whereas, the Small Business Development Center, whose principal source of funding is the Small Business Administration, provided counseling to more than 1,300 businesses, training programs for over 1,500 small business people and responded to more than 650 information requests through its Business Information Service; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved: That We, your Memorialists, respectfully urge and request that the Congress of the United States restore the funding for the Small Business Administration, which has assisted Maine business throughout the years; and be it further

"Resolved: That a copy of this Memorial duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of State to each member of the Maine Congressional Delegation and to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LUGAR, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 684. A bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, and the African Development Fund. (Rept. No. 99-38).

By Mr. LUGAR, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 1003. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, and the National Endowment for Democracy, and for other purposes for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 (Rept. No. 99-39).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LUGAR, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Mark L. Edelman, an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation for the remainder of the term expiring September 22, 1985.

(The above nomination was reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with the recommendation that it be confirmed, subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations, I also report favorably a nomination list in the Foreign Service which appeared in its entirety in the Congressional Record of March 28, 1985, and, to save the expense of reprinting the names on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

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. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. HOLLINGS):

S. 999. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide authorization of appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 1000. A bill to establish a conservation acreage reserve program and to promote the conservation of highly erodible land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MATTINGLY:

S. 1001. A bill to impose a minimum mandatory bail on all persons charged with a serious drug offense in the amount of $100,000 plus an amount equal to the street value of the drugs involved in the offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. METZENBAUM):

S. 1002. A bill to amend the Lanham Act to improve certain provisions relating to concurrent registrations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 1003. An original bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, and the National Endowment for Democracy, and for other purposes for fiscal years 1986 and 1987; from the Committee on Foreign Relations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. WALLOP):

S. 1004. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to provide for reclamation and other remedial actions with respect to mill tailings at active uranium and thorium processing sites; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. NICKLES (for himself, Mr. EAST, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. DENTON, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. QUAYLE, and Mr. MATTINGLY):

S. 1005. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to modify the provisions of such act prescribing the minimum wages to be paid laborers, mechanics, and helpers employed on public construction projects, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. KASTEN (for himself and Mr. WALLOP):

S. 1006. A bill to reduce tax rates in manner that is fair to all taxpayers and to simplify the tax laws by eliminating most credits, deductions, and exclusions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOSCHWITZ (for himself and Mr. DENTON):

S. 1007. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to develop and carry out a pilot program to determine the most cost effective methods of acquiring medical facilities to meet the needs of the Veterans' Administration and otherwise to promote additional health care for eligible veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1008. A bill to provide for a demonstration program in which a limited number of States would be permitted to provide unemployment compensation to individuals for the purpose of funding self-employment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 1009. A bill to increase the membership of the Advisory Board on Missing Children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1010. A bill to require the Attorney General to report to Congress regarding changes in Federal criminal law and procedures which would facilitate the participation of child witnesses in cases involving child abuse and sexual exploitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1011. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide the death sentence or mandatory life in kidnapping offenses involving the murder of a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1012. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide mandatory minimum sentence for offenses involving the sexual exploitation of children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1013. A bill to require the Attorney General to modify the FBI offense classification system to provide more specific information concerning offenses involving the sexual exploitation of children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1014. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on tungsten ore; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1015. A bill to extend for 3 years the existing suspension of duty on sulfapyridine; to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 1000. A bill to establish a conservation acreage reserve program and to promote the conservation of highly erodible land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION ACT

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Agricultural Resource Conservation Act of 1985. This legislation establishes consistency within U.S. farm policy by restricting Federal price support and loan incentives to agricultural producers who choose to farm highly erodible lands. This legislation does not restrict or limit a person's right to use owned property in any manner. It simply makes clear that Federal farm and loan programs will not be used as an incentive for farmers to plow grasslands simply to increase their share of Federal crop payments.

The Federal Government has encouraged farmers to plow marginal lands with its misguided price support programs. The size of virtually all farm price support payments rise proportionately as the farmer's so-called base acreage increases. With prime agricultural lands being a limited resource, the least cost method for increasing base acreage is to plow timber and pasture acreage that are likely to be producing less income than is presently being offered by the Federal support programs.

U.S. taxpayers are asked to pay many times for this ill-advised activity. They provide the incentive payments that result in this land being brought into production. They are required by law to give low-interest disaster loans and subsidized crop insurance when these lands experience a crop failure due to drought which is common place on highly erodible acres. Once the landowner breaks the soil and discovers the newly created erosion problems, U.S. taxpayers are there with conservation cost-sharing activities to reduce erosion on land that should not have been plowed at the onset and would not have been plowed had it not been for the Federal price support payments. A significant portion of the $1 billion annually appropriated to the Corps of Engineers goes to remove runoff and sediment from our rivers and streams.

This bill contains the so-called sodbuster language that prohibits price support and other forms of Federal payments to farmers who choose to plow highly erodible land. The plowing of this land has not been carefully monitored in the past, and national data is difficult to compile. The Soil Conservation Service, however, estimates that approximately 500,000 acres of such land in Colorado was plowed between 1979 and 1982. In South Dakota, it is estimated that 600,000 acres were converted to cropland between 1974 and 1982. Testimony presented before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry suggest that as much as 250 million additional acres of highly erodible lands could be brought under cultivation unless the incentives are phased out of the system. This would increase our current crop acreage by more than 50 percent.

The sodbuster provisions do not prevent a landowner from qualifying for crop price supports. Highly erodible land that is brought into production with an approved soil conservation plan is eligible for all price support benefits. As was negotiated with previous sodbuster legislation that passed the Senate, the restrictions would not apply to land that has been under cultivation in the last 10 years, and therefore, does not penalize farmers who were eligible for Federal payments at the time that they chose to plow the erodible land.

Mr. President, while the sodbuster provisions will help to discourage the plowing of another 250 million acres of highly erodible land, it is unfortunate that this legislation was not enacted into law a decade ago. The 1982 national resource inventories conducted by the Soil Conservation Service reveals that nearly 1 out of every 4 crop acres is suffering a rate of erosion at more than double the soil's renewable capacity. Nearly 50 percent of the sheet and rill erosion in the United States occurs on only 10 percent of the cropland. In order to reduce erosion from this acreage, my legislation calls upon the Secretary of Agriculture to offer a 30 million acre long-term conservation reserve. The reserve would idle our most erodible cropland for a period of at least 10 years. The Secretary of Agriculture would make annual payments for all retired acreage.

Unlike past efforts, the conservation reserve does not contain a predetermined set-aside payment. Historical evidence suggests that this type of system excessively rewards some landowners while being inadequate to justify participation by others. I propose, instead, a simple bid system where each landowner desiring to enter the reserve submits competitive bids. The Secretary of Agriculture would have the authority to determine which bids are the lowest based upon the erodibility of the acreage.

The competitive bids would reflect the landowner's cost of establishing a permanent cover crop. My legislation requires that 10 percent of reserve acres be planted to trees, and similarly, the competitive bid would reflect this cost and the landowner would assume responsibility for the reforestation process.

Many are familiar with the Soil Bank Program for the late 1950's. Unfortunately, much of the lands from this acreage retirement effort represent some of today's most highly erodible cropland. I do not propose to repeat this situation with my proposed conservation reserve. Upon termination of the land retirement contract, the sodbuster provision would immediately become applicable to the conservation acreage. I will not allow U.S. taxpayers to pay landowners to retire erodable acreage only to have the land brought back into production in order to increase the landowner's base acres and his or her share of Federal price support payments.

Mr. President, I cannot predict the long-term outlook on demand for U.S. agricultural goods or how much land will be required to meet this demand. Indeed, we may someday need full production from the conservation reserve acres. We may need to convert the 250 million acres of unbroken land into full-scale crop production. But this is a matter that simply must be dictated by the marketplace and not by governmental farm policy that bears no relation to actual market signals.

The fact of the matter is that today we do not need production from 420 million acres of cropland. Our farm policy, however, prevents market forces from dictating a reduction in our highly erodible and least productive cropland acres. The end result is simply overwhelming surpluses, lower farm prices, and excessive soil erosion.

The most hard-pressed farms, unfortunately, do not have the resources to adequately safeguard against soil erosion. Their objective must be to maximize production in the near term with the very minimum of costs. For these farmers, the conservation reserve offers a guaranteed annual cash income and reduces his or her need for borrowed operating capital. It allows us to assist highly leveraged farmers while at the same time moving back to a system whereby our total cropland acres are determined by the marketplace and not by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Members of Congress.

In addition, my bill proposes to require farmers who are attempting to cultivate the most erodible land to comply with locally defined conservation requirements. I do not propose to require a conservation means test for 420 million acres of agricultural lands. The administrative burden of such a requirement would be overwhelming. Instead, I simply propose that the Secretary of Agriculture focus these requirements to our most erosive cropland. Ten percent of our agricultural lands produce over one-half of the total cropland erosion.

I recently chaired conservation hearings at the Senate Agriculture Committee. Witnesses testified that over

20 percent of the set-aside acreage for feed grains, and wheat in a 10 State midwestern region is not planted to a cover crop during the set-aside period. This barren land is the source of much of our erosion difficulties. My legislation requires the Secretary of Agriculture to issue regulations that would reduce erosion from this set-aside acreage. I recognize the difficulty that a mandatory cover crop creates for summer fallow wheat farmers and other operations. My legislation, therefore, does not require a cover crop on set-aside acreage, but simply requires the Secretary to issue fair and equitable regulations to reduce erosion from set-aside acre where a cover crop is advisable.

To summarize, my bill calls for, first, an end to Federal subsidies to farmers who plow highly erodible land unless accompanied by an approved conservation plan; second, the establishment of a long-term conservation reserve; third, an approved conservation plan for our most highly erodible cropland in order to qualify for price support payments; and fourth, a cover crop requirement for those set-aside acres that are subject to severe wind and water erosion.

I will offer these provisions during the Senate Agriculture Committee's markup of the 1985 farm bill. I hope my colleagues will join me in this effort to reduce soil erosion and to establish some consistency in all future Federal farm programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

CONSERVATION ACREAGE RESERVE

The Secretary shall conserve up to 30 million acres of erosion-prone crop land to conservation use.

The reserve's contract period shall be no less than ten years and no more than twenty years.

The Secretary shall control entry into the reserve in such a way so as not to adversely affect local economies.

The amount payable to landowners for annual conservation payments shall be determined through the submission of bids by the landowner.

At least ten percent of the funds made available for the conservation reserve shall be used for landowners who agree to plant trees.

The Secretary maintains full authority to terminate the reserve should conditions warrant such a change. The House and Senate Agriculture Committees must be notified at least ninety days prior to such a decision.

The landowner may not receive conservation reserve payments in excess of $50,000 annually.

SODBUSTER

Any person who produces an agricultural commodity on a field on which highly erodible land is the predominant class should be ineligible for Federal price supports, farm storage payments, Federal Crop Insurance, disaster payments, or an FmHA loan unless:

1. A crop had been produced from the land between 1973 and the date of enactment of this bill.

2. The land is brought into production using an approved conservation plan.

CONSERVATION PRACTICES ON EXEMPTED HIGHLY ERODIBLE LAND

In order to qualify for price support payments, any person who produces an agricultural commodity on highly erodible land must use conservation practices determined appropriate for the area.

COVER CROP REQUIREMENT

The Secretary is required to issue regulations to assure that set-aside acres are adequately protected from wind and water erosion for the entire set-aside period.

By Mr. MATTINGLY:

S. 1001. A bill to impose a minimum mandatory bail on all persons charged with a serious drug offense in the amount of $100,000 plus an amount equal to the street value of the drugs involved in the offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MINIMUM MANDATORY BAIL FOR SERIOUS DRUG OFFENSES

● Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to impose a minimum mandatory bail on all persons charged with a serious drug offense. Under the provisions of my proposal, the minimum bail amount for any person charged with an offense under the Controlled Substances Act which carries with it a maximum prison term of 10 years or more would be the sum of $100,000 plus the amount equal to the street value of the drugs involved in the offense.

I believe this legislation is consistent with the Comprehensive Crime Control Act which Congress passed and the President signed into law last year. That measure, which I strongly supported, contained a provision which allows for pretrial detention. Federal judges are now allowed to consider danger to the community in setting or denying bail. My legislation would not affect this provision. It would remain in place, as I believe it should. But in cases where Federal judges do not consider drug traffickers a danger to the community—which, Mr. President, I want to say at this point is a concept I fail to grasp—the judge would be required to set the minimum bail.

I believe that drug traffickers are the most dangerous of all criminals. The crimes they commit are not motivated by passion or conviction. They are motivated by greed and hatred. Their effect is to kill and to destroy, to destroy individual lives and the collective lives of families, communities, and, I believe, ultimately of this Nation, if we do not take strong action. This bill sends a clear signal and establishes once and for all that the Congress of the United States considers drug traffickers a danger to the community.

Let me answer the critics who would say the comprehensive crime package is enough before they speak. It is a good beginning, but it is not enough. There remains the possibility of a lenient judge and small bail amount. In realistic terms, that means there remains the possibility of an easy release and the opportunity to flee to avoid prosecution.

I believe that an article which appeared in the Washington Post on March 28 of this year makes a strong case for my legislation. The story reported:

> A New York man has been arrested after what police described as the largest seizure of cocaine in Montgomery County history—11 pounds of cocaine with an estimated street value of $2 million * * *

And the story went on the say that:

> Capt. Don Deering, of the Maryland National Capital Park Police, said Donald Chin, 43, was charged with possession of cocaine with intent to distribute * * * Deering said the cocaine is thought to be of "high quality." Chin was originally held on $100,000 bond; but it was reduced to $25,000 at a hearing yesterday.

Mr. President, we are engaged in a war against illegal drugs in this Nation. If we are going to win—and we cannot afford to lose—we must build a strong and varied arsenal. The legislation I am introducing today would add another weapon. I invite my colleagues to cosponsor this measure and urge their strong support.●

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. METZENBAUM):

S. 1002. A bill to amend the Lanham Act to improve certain provisions relating to concurrent registrations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS TO LANHAM TRADEMARK ACT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation which would correct an anomaly in the Federal laws governing trademarks. This bill is identical to an amendment which was offered on my behalf to H.R. 6286 at the end of the 98th Congress. My amendment was adopted without objection by the Senate.

The loophole which this bill is designed to address is illustrated by the plight of Associates First Capital Corp., a wholly owned subsidiary of Gulf & Western Industries. As that situation has been described to me, in late 1982, Associates proposed the mark "Equity Express" in connection with a loan service for homeowners. An independent professional search of all data bases as of December 13, 1982, disclosed no conflicting prior uses. In fact, however, Washington Mutual Savings Bank of Seattle, WA, had adopted the same mark for similar services on October 18, 1982, but its pending application had not arrived into the data bases as of the date of

search. Upon discovery of their dual use of the mark, the two users entered into an agreement that acknowledged Washington Mutual's exclusive rights in 4 States and Associates' exclusive rights in 46 States.

While Associates' right to continued use of the mark is clear, an anomaly in the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. Sec. 1051 et seq.) precludes Associates from obtaining a Federal concurrent use registration to protect its rights by foreclosing subsequent use by others in the States where Associates is clearly the first user. This is notwithstanding the fact that the Lanham Act expressly provides for, and indeed encourages, concurrent use registrations.

Under 15 U.S.C. Section 1052(d), a concurrent use registration may be granted in the discretion of the Patent and Trademark Commissioner in two situations. First, it may be granted if both parties use the mark before the first filing date. Second, such a registration may be granted if a court determines that more than one party is entitled to use. In Associates' case, or in the case of any similarly situated party, neither provision technically affords relief. Associates' lawful use of the mark occurred after Washington's filing date, but before anyone could reasonably have known of its filing and before its registration date. No court order is possible because the parties' amicable resolution of their differences means there is no case or controversy which could form the basis for a suit.

The Patent and Trademark Office has acknowledged that the parties are affected by an anomaly in the law. That office has indicated that it would accept the narrowly worded change in the Lanham Act which is contained in the bill I am introducing. This language will permit the Patent and Trademark Commissioner to grant concurrent registrations where the first filing party consents to such registration. As with any concurrent registration, the Commissioner would be required to determine that confusion or deception would not be likely to result and would be authorized to impose conditions relating to the mode or place of use of the mark to prevent such confusion or deception.

The remedy proposed presents no antitrust problems. On the contrary, it will serve to promote alternative business efforts by making a given trademark available for registration to more than one user.

Unlike rights in a patent, the courts have consistently held that rights in a trademark do not constitute a monopoly. See, for example, J.T. McCarthy, Trademarks and Unfair Competition, section 2.5b (1984) and cases cited therein. A trademark represents the right of a trademark owner to prevent others from confusing the public. Concurrent use registrations also serve to prevent confusion due to the limitations imposed by the Patent Commissioner, such as distinct geographic areas of activity, and do not limit competition. Indeed, in the example I cited, Associates and Washington Mutual will compete against each other in the latter's area, with Associates employing a different mark. Concurrent registration under limitations imposed by the Commissioner will not only ensure that consumers are not confused in areas where they do not compete, but that others could not engage in deception by using the same mark in other areas.

Mr. President, in light of the strong bipartisan support that my amendment enjoyed in the Judiciary Committee and the entire Senate in the last Congress, I am hopeful that we will be able to act favorably upon this bill at the earliest opportunity.

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. WALLOP):

S. 1004. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to provide for reclamation and other remedial actions with respect to mill tailings at active uranium and thorium processing sites; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

URANIUM MILL TAILINGS RECLAMATION ACT

● Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Uranium Mill Tailings Reclamation Act of 1985 on behalf of myself and my colleagues, Senators SIMPSON, BINGAMAN and WALLOP. Some of my colleagues who remember the Uranium Mill Tailings Act of 1978 might ask, "Why are we introducing another piece of legislation on this topic?" I can certainly say I wish we did not have to. Some of the provisions of that earlier legislation have been effective; for example, a number of the so-called inactive sites have begun reclamation. Because of interagency squabbles between the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Environmental Protection Agency, and regulations which appear to be technically indefensible, the program relating to active uranium mill tailings sites is a complete and utter failure.

What we have created is an expensive regulatory program which is tied in a knot. This comes at a time when uranium companies are shutting down their operations due to a glut of uranium on the market today and the failure of domestic utilities to sign any contracts for future supplies with our domestic producers. There is a growing concern, on my part and others, that these companies will be unable to complete the reclamation of the uranium mill tailings piles even when the regulatory knot is untied.

What we are attempting to do with this legislation is rise above all this confusion. It is time to begin the cleanup and we believe the legislation being introduced today will do just that. The legislation directs the Secretary of Energy to begin a remedial action program at the various active sites which are in existence prior to the date of enactment of this legislation. The Secretary is given the authority to designate the host State or owner of the mill tailings site to do the cleanup if that is mutually agreeable. The cleanup would be done according to the standards established under the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978 or pursuant to the regulations established by the various agreement States. The program is as simple as that. I believe the Department of Energy has demonstrated its ability to undertake cleanup activities such as this and manage them in an effective manner.

The cost of this program would not be left solely to the Federal Government. The Federal Government is responsible for about 30 percent of the mill tailings which would be cleaned up under this program. Therefore, this legislation authorizes funds for that portion of the cleanup, which is justifiably the Government's responsibility. The uranium producers are required to pay 15 percent of the cleanup costs and the nuclear utilities, who have benefited from this uranium production, would assume 55 percent of the costs. Their share of the costs would be provided for by placing a fee of $0.15 mill per kilowatt hour on nuclear power generation. All of these funds would be placed in the uranium mill tailings funds established in the Treasury.

Mr. President, the Federal Government has been the principal source of delay in the cleanup of those sites that are ready to be cleaned up in this country. The legislation I propose today, with my colleagues, is intended to turn that around, and make the Federal Government the leader in the effort to clean up.

Mr. President, 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. 1004

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Uranium Mill Tailings Reclamation Act of 1985".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.—

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 7901 et seq.) was enacted to provide for the reclamation and regulation of uranium mill tailings;

(2) the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 7901 et seq.) did not provide for a comprehensive method

of financing reclamation and remedial action at active uranium and thorium processing sites; and

(3) the creation of an assured system of financing will greatly facilitate and expedite reclamation and remedial actions at such active uranium and thorium processing sites.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act—

(1) to facilitate and expedite reclamation and other remedial actions at active uranium and thorium processing sites;

(2) to establish a comprehensive system for financing reclamation and other remedial actions at such sites; and

(3) to allocate the costs of such comprehensive system of financing fairly and equitably.

REMEDIAL ACTION PERFORMED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SEC. 3. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy, or such person as the Secretary may, by mutual agreement, designate (including the State in which the active site is located, or the owner or licensee of the active site for which reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial actions, and long-term maintenance and monitoring is to be performed) shall, except as provided in section 4, select and perform reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial actions, and long-term maintenance and monitoring at active sites (as defined in section 10(1)).

(b) APPLICABLE STANDARDS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION.—Reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial action, and long-term maintenance and monitoring performed by the Secretary or the designee of the Secretary under this section shall—

(1) comply with all applicable requirements established pursuant to the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978, as amended, or where appropriate, requirements established by a State that is a party to a discontinuance agreement under section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2021); and

(2) be undertaken in consultation, as appropriate, with the State in which such active site is located, and in the case of Indian lands, the appropriate Indian tribe and the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) CONSENT OF PROCESSING SITE OWNER.—Unless the Commission determines that a permanent cessation of operations leading to the production of byproduct material has occurred at any active site, the Secretary or the designee of the Secretary shall commence actual reclamation and decommissioning activities only with the consent of the owner of the active site in question.

(d) CONTRACTS WITH OWNERS OR LICENSEES.—The Secretary may enter into a contract with the owner or licensee of an active site for any reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial action, or long-term maintenance and monitoring associated with that active site.

(e) TRANSFER OF LICENSES AND TITLE TO BYPRODUCT MATERIAL.—Not later than the date on which the Secretary or the designee of the Secretary begins reclamation and decommissioning activities at an active site, any license pertaining to byproduct material at such site shall be transferred to the Secretary and owernship of such byproduct material and land, including any interests in such byproduct material and land that is used for the processing and disposal of such byproduct material, shall be transferred as provided in section 83(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2113(b)).

(f) COSTS OF REMEDIAL ACTION TO BE PAID FROM TAILINGS FUND.—The costs for reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial action, and long-term maintenance and monitoring performed by the Secretary or the designee of the Secretary under this Act shall be paid from the Uranium Mill Tailings Fund established in section 8.

REMEDIAL ACTION PERFORMED BY OWNERS OR LICENSEES

SEC. 4. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3, an owner or licensee of an active site initially licensed after effective date of this Act, may elect (in lieu of the Secretary) to select and to perform reclamation, decommissioning, or other remedial action at such active site.

(b) REMEDIAL ACTION TO BE PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPLICABLE STANDARDS.—Any reclamation, decommissioning, or other remedial action performed under subsection (a) by an owner or licensee shall comply with all applicable requirements established pursuant to the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978, as amended (or, where appropriate, requirements established by a State that is a party to a discontinuance agreement under section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2021)).

REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS

SEC. 5. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, subject to subsection (b), provide for reimbursement of costs, as determined by the Secretary, of any reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial action, and long-term maintenace and monitoring performed in connection with a site to which section 3 is applicable.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) Any reimbursement provided under subsection (a) shall be made

(A) only to the licensee or to a property owner of record at the time such remedial action was undertaken; and

(B) only with respect to costs incurred by such licensee or property owner.

(2) No reimbursement for actual costs of reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial action, or long-term maintenance and monitoring may be made unless the Secretary, in consultation with the Commission (or, where appropriate, and Agreement State), determines that such reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial action, or long-term maintenance and monitoring is necessary to comply with the requirements established pursuant to the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978, as amended, (or, where appropriate, requirements established by a State that is a party to a discontinuance agreement under section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2021)).

CONTRACT AUTHORITY FOR REMEDIAL ACTION FOR URANIUM AND THORIUM MILLS INITIALLY LICENSED AFTER EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 6. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into contracts with owners or licensees of uranium or thorium mills initially licensed after the effective date of this Act to provide for the Secretary or the designee of the Secretary to perform reclamation, decommissioning, and other remedial action at such site.

(b) COSTS TO BE PAID BY OWNERS OR LICENSEES.—Each contract entered into under subsection (a) shall provide that the owner or licensee of the site for which the Secretary or the designee of the Secretary performs reclamation, decommissioning, and other remedial action shall reimburse the Tailings Fund for all reasonable costs associated with the activities of the Secretary or the designee of the Secretary under the contract.

CONTRACTS FOR PURCHASE OR SALE OF URANIUM OR THORIUM TO INCLUDE REMEDIAL ACTION FUNDING PROVISIONS

SEC. 7. Contracts for the purchase or sale of uranium or thorium entered into after the effective date of this Act shall include provisions for the cost of reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial action, and long-term maintenance and monitoring attributable to uranium and thorium processing activities conducted in the United States after the effective date of this Act.

URANIUM MILL TAILINGS FUND

SEC. 8. (a) ESTABLISHMENT OF TAILINGS FUND.—There hereby is established in the Treasury of the United States a separate fund, to be known as the Uranium Mill Tailings Fund. The Tailings Fund shall consist of—

(1) all contributions, receipts, proceeds, and recoveries realized by the Secretary of Energy under subsection (c) and section 9, which shall be deposited in the Tailings Fund immediately upon their realization;

(2) any appropriations made by the Congress to the Tailings Fund; and

(3) any unexpended balances available on the effective date of this Act, for functions or activities necessary or incident to the disposal of, or remedial action pertaining to, byproduct material, which shall automatically be transferred to the Tailings Fund on such date.

(b) USE OF TAILINGS FUND.—The Secretary of Energy may, subject to subsection (c), make expenditures from the Tailings Fund only for purposes of compliance with this Act, including expenditures for any reimbursement under section 5.

(c) ADMINISTRATION OF TAILINGS FUND.—

(1) The Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall annually submit to the Congress a report on the financial condition and operation of the Tailings Fund during the preceding fiscal year.

(2) The Secretary of Energy shall submit the budget of the Tailings Fund to the Office of Management and Budget annually along with the budget of the Department of Energy submitted at such time in accordance with chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code. The budget of the Tailings Fund shall consist of the estimates made by the Secretary of Energy of expenditures from the Tailings Fund and other relevant financial matters for the succeeding three fiscal years, and shall be included in the Budget of the United States Government. The Secretary of Energy may make expenditures from the Tailings Fund in such amounts as approved in advance in appropriation Acts.

(3) If the Secretary of Energy determines that the Tailings Fund contains at any time amounts in excess of current needs, the Secretary of Energy may request the Secretary of the Treasury to invest such amounts, or any portion of such amounts as the Secretary of Energy determines to be appropriate, in obligations of the United States—

(A) having maturities determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate to the needs of the Tailings Fund; and

(B) bearing interest at rates determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the maturities of such investments, except that the interest rate on such invest-

ments shall not exceed the average interest rate applicable to existing borrowings.

(4) Receipts, proceeds, and recoveries realized by the Secretary of Energy under this section, and expenditures of amounts from the Tailings Fund, shall be exempt from annual apportionment under the provisions of subchapter II of chapter 15 of title 31, United States Code.

(5) If at any time the moneys available in the Tailings Fund are insufficient to enable the Secretary of Energy to discharge the Secretary's responsibilities under this section, the Secretary of Energy shall issue to the Secretary of the Treasury obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Treasury. The total of such obligations shall not exceed amounts provided in appropriation Acts. Redemption of such obligations shall be made by the Secretary of Energy from moneys available in the Tailings Fund. Such obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall be not less than a rate determined by taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of the obligations under this paragraph. The Secretary of the Treasury shall purchase any issued obligations, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such chapter are extended to include any purchase of such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the obligations acquired by him under this paragraph. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of obligations under this paragraph shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR COSTS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION

SEC. 9. (a) COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH URANIUM AND THORIUM PROCESSING ACTIVITIES BEFORE EFFECTIVE DATE.—The costs for reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial action, and long-term maintenance and monitoring activities, undertaken by the Secretary or the designee of the Secretary under section 3, associated with uranium and thorium processing activities before the effective date of this Act shall be shared by—

(1) the owners or licensees of pertinent active sites, as provided in subsection (c);

(2) the Federal Government, as provided in subsection (d); and

(3) persons using source material or special nuclear material for a civilian nuclear power reactor to generate electrical energy, as provided in subsection (e).

(b) CALCULATION OF COST FOR REMEDIAL ACTION FOR PROCESSING ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED BEFORE EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) The costs of reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial action, and long-term maintenance and monitoring activities that are attributable to milling operations before the effective date of this Act shall be the total costs multiplied by a fraction with:

(A) a numerator comprised of the total dry tons of tailings attributable to the site but generated prior to the effective date of this Act; and

(B) a denominator comprised of the total dry tons of tailings attributable to the site, ending on the date that the reclamation, decommissioning, or other remedial action is initiated.

(2) The Secretary may promulgate regulations relating to the calculation of the fractions specified in paragraph (1), and may require reasonable information to be submitted by the owners or licensees of the uranium or thorium processing sites concerning such calculations.

(c) SHARE OF COSTS OF OWNERS OR LICENSEES.—

(1) For uranium or thorium processing sites initially licensed before the effective date of this Act, the licensee or owner of each uranium or thorium site for which reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial action, or long-term maintenance and monitoring is performed by the Secretary or the designee of the Secretary shall pay to the Treasury of the United States, to be deposited in the Tailings Fund, an amount equal to—

(A) 15 percent of the cost determined under subsection (b); and

(B) 100 percent of the cost of such activities associated with uranium or thorium milling activities on or after the effective date of this Act.

(2) For uranium or thorium processing sites initially licensed on or after the effective date of this Act, and for which the Secretary or the designee of the Secretary performs reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial action, or long-term maintenance and monitoring, the owner or licensee of such uranium of thorium processing site shall pay to the Treasury of the United States, to be deposited in the Tailings Fund, an amount equal to 100 percent of the cost for such activities.

(3) All payments by licensees or owners under this section shall be made on an annual basis for reclamation, decommissioning and remedial action undertaken during each preceding one-year period beginning on the effective date of this Act, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary. Payments by licensees or owners for long-term maintenance and monitoring shall be paid no later than the date on which reclamation and decommissioning of the active site is completed.

(d) SHARE OF COSTS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—In recognition that some active sites contain tailings which have resulted from ore processing to extract uranium and thorium under contract with the United States for use primarily in defense programs, the Federal Government shall pay into the Tailings Fund an amount equal to 30 percent of the costs, determined under subsection (b), incurred during each one-year period beginning on the effective date of this Act for reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial action, and long-term maintenance and monitoring activities undertaken by the Secretary or the designee of the Secretary associated with uranium or thorium processing activities prior to the effective date of this Act.

(e) SHARE OF COSTS OF UTILITIES.—

(1) Persons using source material or special nuclear material for a civilian nuclear power reactor to generate electrical energy shall enter into agreements with the Secretary to pay a fee, as provided in paragraph (2), to offset 55 percent of the costs, determined under subsection (b), incurred during each one-year period beginning on the effective date of this Act, for reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial action, and long-term maintenance and monitoring activities undertaken by the Secretary or the designee of the Secretary associated with uranium or thorium processing activities prior to the effective date of this Act.

(2) For electricity generated by a civilian nuclear power reactor and sold on or after the effective date of this Act, the fee described in paragraph (1) shall be equal to 0.15 mil per kilowatt hour. Such fee shall be paid to the Treasury of the United States and shall be deposited in the Tailings Fund.

(3)(A) Not later than 120 days after the effective date of this Act the Secretary shall establish procedures for the collection and payment of the fee established by paragraph (1). The Secretary shall annually review the amount of such fee to evalaute whether collection of the fee, contribution by the owner or licensee, and the payments of the United States, will provide sufficient revenues to offset the costs experienced and expected for reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial action, and long-term maintenance and monitoring activities undertaken by the Secretary or the designee of the Secretary. In the event the Secretary determines that either insufficient or excess revenues are being collected, the Secretary shall, in order to recover the costs incurred by the Federal Government for reclamation, decommissioning, other remedial action, and long-term maintenance and monitoring, propose an adjustment to the fee established in paragraph (1) to ensure full funding. The Secretary shall immediately transmit this proposal for such an adjustment to the Congress. The adjustment to the fee proposed by the Secretary shall be effective after a period of 120 days of continuous session of the Congress have elapsed following the receipt of such transmittal unless during such 120-day period there is enacted into law a joint resolution disapproving such adjustment.

(B) For purposes of the 120-day period described in subparagraph (A)—

(i) continuity of session of the Congress is broken only by an adjournment sine die; and

(ii) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of the 120-day period.

(4)(A) The Commission shall not issue or renew a license to any person to use a utilization or production facility under the authority of section 103 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2133) or to use special nuclear material at such a facility unless such person has entered into an agreement with the Secretary under this section.

(B) The Commission, as it determines necessary or appropriate, may require as a condition to the issuance or renewal of a license under section 103 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2133), or a license for special nuclear material under section 53 of such Act, that the applicant for such license shall have entered into an agreement with the Secretary for the disposal of byproduct material.

(f) LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL OBLIGATION OF ACTIVE SITE OWNERS AND UTILITIES.—Except for the payment of the fee and contributions provided in this section, the Federal Government may not impose any further financial obligation on persons using source material or special nuclear material for a civilian nuclear power reactor to generate electrical energy, or on owners or licensees of uranium or thorium processing sites, for reclamation, decommissioning, other re-

medial action or long-term maintenance and monitoring associated with active sites.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 10. FOR PURPOSES OF THIS ACT—

(1) the terms "active uranium or thorium processing site" and "active site" mean—

(A) any uranium or thorium processing site, including the mill, containing byproduct material for which a license (issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or its predecessor agency under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, or by a State as permitted under section 274 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2021)) for the production at such site of any uranium or thorium derived from ore—

(i) is in effect on January 1, 1978;

(ii) is issued or renewed after January 1, 1978; or

(iii) for which an application for renewal or issuance is pending on, or after, January 1, 1978; and

(B) any other real property or improvement on such real property that—

(i) is in the vicinity of such site; and

(ii) is determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Commission, to be contaminated with residual byproduct material.

(2) The term Administrator means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(3) The term "byproduct material" has the meaning given such term in section 11e. (2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014(e)(2)).

(4) The term "civilian nuclear power reactor" means any civilian nuclear powerplant required to be licensed under section 103 or section 104 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2133).

(5) The term "Commission" means the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

(6) The term "Indian tribe" means any tribe, band, clan, group, pueblo, or community of Indians recognized as eligible for services provided by the Secretary of the Interior to Indians.

(7) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Energy.

(8) The terms "source material" and "special nuclear material" have the meanings given such terms in section 11 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014).

(9) The term "tailings" means the wastes produced by the extraction or concentration of uranium or thorium from any ore processed primarily for its source material content.

(10) The term "Tailings Fund" means the Uranium Mill Tailings Fund established in section 8.

TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

SEC. 11. (a) OWNERSHIP AND CUSTODY OF CERTAIN BYPRODUCT MATERIAL AND DISPOSAL SITES.—

(1) Section 83a. (1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2113(a)(1)) is amended by inserting before "the licensee" the following: "the Secretary of Energy will be in a position to, or, as appropriate,".

(2) Section 83(b)(5) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2113(b)(5)) is amended by striking out the last sentence.

(b) STANDARDS AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR BONDING, SURETY, OR OTHER FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS, INCLUDING PERFORMANCE BONDS.—Section 161x. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2201(x)) is amended by inserting after "ensure" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) the following: ", for the share of costs for which the licensee is responsible".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 12. There is authorized to be appropriated, effective on October 1, 1985, to the Uranium Mill Tailings Fund, $290,000,000, to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION ON SPENDING AUTHORITY

SEC. 13. The authority under this Act to incur indebtedness, or enter into contracts, obligating amounts to be expended by the Federal Government shall be effective for any fiscal year only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance by appropriation Acts.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 14. The provisions of and amendments made by this Act shall become effective upon the expiration of the 60-day period following the date of enactment of this Act.●

● Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I am pleased today to join with my good friend and colleague from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, in introducing the Uranium Mill Tailings Reclamation Act of 1985. The purpose of this legislation is to establish a comprehensive and equitable financing mechanism for the reclamation of tailings at active uranium and thorium processing sites regulated under title II of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978.

In 1978, when Congress passed this act, commonly referred to as UMTRCA, it established what was then believed by many to be a comprehensive program for the cleanup and stabilization of uranium and thorium mill tailings, both at sites that had been abandoned—the so-called inactive sites—as well as at sites that were still active.

For the active sites, the Environmental Protection Agency was directed to establish "generally applicable environmental standards" for both the radiological and nonradiological hazards of mill tailings. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission, in turn, was then to establish the detailed regulatory requirements to be met in cleaning up and stabilizing the tailings piles, and to conform those regulations to EPA's general standards. Following promulgation of the detailed regulatory requirements, the NRC was then to proceed with implementation of the program at individual sites.

Today, more than 6 years after the passage of UMTRCA, the program is in a shambles. EPS's standards were over 3 years late, and the standards that were adopted in late 1983 are widely viewed as simply inappropriate for the low-toxicity, high-volume mill tailings wastes for which EPA was to promulgate standards under UMTRCA. My own State of Wyoming, for example—which has been a leader in this Nation in the protection of its scarce ground water supplies—views the EPA standards as a myopic attempt to apply the EPA solid-waste standards for high-toxicity, low-volume chemical wastes to a type of waste—mill tailings—that is fundamentally different. As a result, the EPA approach simply makes no sense at all.

Beyond that, EPA has gone far beyond its charge under UMTRCA to promulgate "generally applicable environmental standards" for mill tailings piles and, instead, is seeking to become deeply involved in establishing and implementing detailed regulatory requirements for mill tailings—a responsibility that UMTRCA conferred exclusively on the NRC.

As a result of the questionable technical and jurisdictional basis for the EPA standards, the program is now mired in controversy.

Both the industry and the environmentalists have challenged the EPA standards in court; the NRC and EPA are firing salvos back and forth over who has jurisdiction over what; in the meantime, the NRC is trying to move forward with implementation of the EPA standards without first conforming its regulations to those standards; and, throughout all of this, the statutorily-mandated conforming process will not be complete for at least 3 more years. Only then—10 years after UMTRCA was first passed—will the necessary regulations be in place to move forward with any cleanup or stabilization.

I can hardly imagine that anyone believed, back in 1978, that it would be 10 years before we had the necessary regulations on the books to move forward with cleanup and stabilization of mill tailings piles. But that is where we are today. And in the intervening years, the estimates of the cost of cleanup and stabilization have skyrocketed.

More importantly, no one in the uranium business envisioned, back in 1978 when UMTRCA was passed, that the regulatory requirements that would subsequently be imposed would be delayed by almost 10 years by a turf-struggle between two agencies here in Washington; and that, when promulgated, the EPA standards would consist of merely slapping requirements on the uranium companies that were initially adopted for a wholly different purpose and would prove to be inappropriate and unnecessary costly for the low-toxicity, high-volume uranium wastes.

As a result, these costs of doing business were not, in many instances, assumed by the uranium companies in marketing their product—yellowcake—to utility customers.

The legislation that my colleague from New Mexico and I are introducing today is designed to get the mill tailings cleanup program back on track, by establishing a comprehensive, equitable, and reliable mechanism to pay for the cleanup and stabilization program. After witnessing years of delay and infighting, I am

now convinced that the approach reflected in this legislation is the only way that we can expect to move forward with cleanup and stabilization in a fashion that will ensure that the job will get done—and in a timely manner—now that we have wasted years of delay on this effort.

This legislation would establish a comprehensive cost sharing approach to fund the cleanup and stabilization of all existing tailings, and related areas and facilities, subject to the requirements of title II of UMTRCA.

The cost would be divided among the nuclear utilities, the uranium companies, and the Federal Government. The nuclear utilities would contribute 55 percent of the costs, through a fee of 0.15 mil per kilowatthour on electricity generated by commercial nuclear power plants; the uranium companies would contrbute 15 percent of the costs; and the Federal Government would contribute the remaining 30 percent, an amount roughly comparable to the proportion of tailings at these sites that resulted from the production of yellowcake by the uranium companies for the Federal Government's defense needs—the so-called "commingled tailings."

The actual cleanup would be conducted by the Department of Energy or, by mutual agreement, the State in which the site is located or the uranium company involved. All cleanup and stabilizatioin activity would be undertaken in accordance with all appropriate Federal and State requirements.

In summary, Mr. President, we have witnessed over 6 years of protracted and costly delay in implementation of the uranium mill tailings program, with the prospect for future delays on the immediate horizon. In the absence of firm congressional action to put this program back on track, we will, in all likelihood, be mired in the same controversies on the 10th anniversary of UMTRCA, with the comprehensive regulatory program envisioned by Congress back in 1978 delayed by 10 years, to the detriment of the public, the uranium companies, the States, the Federal agencies involved, and, in short, all who would like to see a reasonable, balanced cleanup and stabilization program move forward. For these reasons, Mr. President, I am joining with my colleague, Senator DOMENICI, today in introducing this legislation, and urge my other colleagues to support this effort.●

THE URANIUM MILL TAILINGS RECLAMATION ACT OF 1985

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from New Mexico in introducing the Uranium Mill Tailings Reclamation Act of 1985. I believe this legislation addresses an important problem that has been of great concern to the residents of New Mexico.

This problem is providing the appropriate method and funding for the cleanup of uranium mill tailings. These tailings or waste residues from the processing of uranium ore are a potential radiation hazard, and contamination may be spread to surrounding areas by wind and water erosion if the tailings are not disposed of properly.

The Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978 provided funding and authority to the U.S. Department of Energy [DOE] to dispose of radioactive tailings at inactive uranium mill sites. Remedial action at the two inactive sites in New Mexico will be carried out under this legislation. However, the responsibility for disposal of tailings at active mill sites remained on the owner or operator of the site.

Currently there are five active or licensed uranium mill sites in New Mexico. There are in excess of 80 million tons of mill tailings at these five sites. Approximately 30 million tons at three of the sites were generated under the Atomic Energy Commission [AEC] Uranium Program. The tailings generated under the AEC Program are commingled with tailings generated to produce uranium for nuclear generation of electricity.

Aside from the environmental and health problems from such tailings piles, there is the economic problem. The DOE has estimated an average cost for control to meet the Federal standards for cleanup to be approximately $3.75 per ton of tailings. On this basis, costs for control of the five sites will range from about $5 million for the smallest site to about $115 million for the largest site. The estimated total cost for the five sites is approximately $300 million.

The uranium industry in New Mexico is in a serious state of decline. Four of the five licensed uranium mills have been placed on standby status and may not reopen. The fifth mill is expected to operate only for 1 or 2 years. The deteriorating financial condition of the uranium industry indicates the importance of providing assistance to meet the costs of tailings disposal.

The legislation we introduce today would establish a program within the Department of Energy for the expeditious cleanup of existing uranium mill tailings to be financed by uranium producers, 15 percent, nuclear utilities, 55 percent, and the Federal Government, 30 percent.

For new tailings produced after the enactment of this act, the costs would be negotiated between the producers and the nuclear utilities. The program would operate under the regulatory scheme established in the Uranium Mill Tailings Act. The Secretary of Energy is directed to undertake the program and may designate the State in which the site is located or the owner of the site to perform the remedial action. A fund is established to cover the costs of reclamation. The fund would be derived from annual payments from uranium producers, annual appropriations from the Federal Government, and from a fee placed on nuclear-generated electricity. The fee would be 0.15 mill per kilowatthour or less than a nickle in a consumer's monthly bill.

I strongly support the Federal Government and other users of uranium sharing the responsibility for disposal of these radioactive wastes. The Federal Government was the sole purchaser of uranium for many years. Over 30 percent of existing tailings nationwide are a result of the Government's purchases for its defense programs. For these reasons, the GAO in 1979 recommended that the Government share in these cleanup costs. This legislation would ensure that the Government meets its legitimate responsibility. The nuclear utilities were required by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act to pay 1 mill per kilowatthour for the cleanup of high-level wastes. This legislation levies only a 0.15 mill per kilowatthour charge. Of course, the uranium producers must also share in any cleanup cost.

It makes good sense to have the Federal Government work with the industry and the nuclear utilities in financing the proper disposal of uranium mill tailings.

I will do everything I can to ensure swift passage of this much needed legislation.●

By Mr. NICKLES (for himself, Mr. EAST, Mrs. HAWKINS Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. DENTON, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. QUAYLE, and Mr. MATTINGLY):

S. 1005. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to modify the provisions of such act prescribing the minimum wages to be paid laborers, mechanics, and helpers employed on public construction projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

DAVIS-BACON REFORM

● Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, today, along with Senators EAST, HAWKINS, HUMPHREY, LAXALT, THURMOND, DENTON, GRAMM, GOLDWATER, QUAYLE, and MATTINGLY, I am introducing legislation reforming the Davis-Bacon Act. If enacted these changes will put an end to the inflationary pressures that the act has had on construction wage rates that, until recently, were determined by Labor Department procedures directly contrary to the fundamental intent of the 1931 act—to protect local wage rates from predatory contractors paying their workers less than prevailing wages. Everyone in

this body agrees, I suspect, with the proposition that Federal construction programs should not undercut local prevailing wage rates and practices.

Unfortunately the act has been administered over the years in a fashion designed to seek the highest wage rates and then require their payment on Federal and federally assisted projects spread over a wide geographic area. These high wage rates resulted from the use of the notorious 30 percent rule to identify the prevailing wage. Often these predetermined prevailing wages were then imported from urban areas to rural areas. Thus, construction practices and wage rates in many local areas, particularly rural communities, were not taken into account by the Labor Department in setting these predetermined prevailing wage requirements.

These DOL administrative practices, taken in their entirety, undercut the ability of local contractors to bid successfully on Davis-Bacon jobs. Local construction craftsmen suffered as a result of the inability of their employers to market their services to the Government. This intolerable situation was directly contrary to the intent of the Davis-Bacon Act.

As a result of these inflationary administrative practices, the General Accounting Office recommended repeal of the act in 1979. GAO is not alone. Contractor groups, taxpayer groups, and numerous others have called for repeal; so have the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times. The Carter administration conducted a study of Davis-Bacon by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy [OFPP] in 1979. This study was the first official study to call for significant reforms but, unfortunately, was ignored by the Carter Labor Department.

To its credit, the Reagan administration has identified these aforementioned problems with the act and has revised the Davis-Bacon regulations to alleviate those problems. Of course opponents did everything possible to stop them from being implemented. The Labor Department was sued by the construction unions when the new regulations were promulgated in May 1982. Federal District Court Judge Harold Greene enjoined all but one of the new regulations. The D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals reversed. In January 1984 the Supreme Court upheld the U.S. Court of Appeals decision. Essentially the courts held that the new regulations did indeed reflect congressional intent and were not a distortion of the act and that the Secretary of Labor was within his rights to implement these new regulations.

The legislation I am introducing today mirrors the essentials of the administration's regulatory changes. Additionally, it increases the threshold for Davis-Bacon coverage, currently $2,000, which of course cannot be done administratively. These reforms correct within the statute those problems identified by the GAO, the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, and numerous others. It will reduce the inflationary tendency of the act by setting wage levels that actually prevail in an area. Local contractors and construction craftsmen will thus be given the opportunity to bid on Federal and federally assisted jobs. These statutory changes clearly reflect the congressional intent of the original Davis-Bacon Act. The July 1983 decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals that upheld the new regulations discusses in great detail why these reforms are consistent with congressional intent at passage of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Briefly this legislation:

First, establishes a definition of prevailing rates based on identifying a majority—50 percent—of a job classification paid the identical rate. Failure to identify a majority will require a weighted average to establish the prevailing rate.

Second, bans the importation of urban wage data and rates into rural areas and vice versa.

Third, requires the DOL to recognize helper classifications in areas where they are a prevailing practice.

Fourth, increases the threshold application of Davis-Bacon from $2,000 to $1,000,000 thus allowing small contractors—and their employees—increased access to Government construction work consistent with all existing Federal labor and procurement standards.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that these four changes will save almost $2.5 billion in outlays and $3.7 billion in budget authority from fiscal year 1986 through fiscal year 1990.

Their summary, by budget function, follows:

DAVIS-BACON REFORM SAVINGS

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
050:					
Budget authority	−166	−178	−180	−187	−194
Outlays	−53	−104	−144	−165	−176
250:					
Budget authority	−7	−8	−8	−9	−9
Outlays	−4	−6	−7	−8	−9
270:					
Budget authority	−37	−39	−41	−42	−44
Outlays	−22	−33	−40	−42	−43
300:					
Budget authority	−117	−121	−125	−130	−134
Outlays	−40	−61	−85	−105	−117
400:					
Budget authority	−438	−452	−467	−478	−495
Outlays	−68	−276	−359	−404	−446
450:					
Budget authority	−84	−88	−91	−94	−98
Outlays	−4	−35	−73	−85	−91
550:					
Budget authority	−1	−2	−2	−2	−2
Outlays	0	−1	−1	−2	−2
700:					
Budget authority	−18	−19	−19	−20	−21
Outlays	−2	−6	−15	−19	−20
Total:					
Budget authority	−695	−720	−745	−765	−795
Outlays	−135	−410	−575	−655	−720

Note: Total may not add due to rounding.●

By Mr. BOSCHWITZ (for himself and Mr. DENTON):

S. 1007. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to develop and carry out a pilot program to determine the most cost-effective methods of acquiring medical facilities to meet the needs of the Veterans' Administration and otherwise to promote additional health care for eligible veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

VETERANS' HEALTH CARE PROMOTION ACT

● Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, today, along with my good friend and colleague from Alabama, Senator DENTON, I am introducing the Veterans' Health Care Promotion Act of 1985.

The roots of this legislation are long—stretching back to nearly 1980 when I became involved in trying to provide funds for a replacement hospital for the aged and outdated Minneapolis Veterans Hospital.

Those battles with the VA over its constantly changing priority list, and the parallel battles with certain local groups over the lack of need for a replacement facility because local hospital beds were unused, laid the groundwork for my continuing interests in veterans health care and the VA's construction process.

Mr. President, since those days in 1980 the VA has spent $2.7 billion on the construction of new or replacement medical facilities. This year the administration's budget calls for an additional $2.5 billion over the next 3 years. And this is really just the tip of the iceberg. CBO projects that $400 million will be needed over the next 5 years just to meet the new construction needs for nursing homes. However, if the VA attempts to retain its current level of providing nursing home beds, the costs would go up an additional $200 million.

Currently the VA provides 40 percent of the veterans nursing home beds, the State Home Program provides 20 percent, and the remaining 40 percent are contracted on an individual basis to non-VA nursing homes.

And in addition to nursing home spending, CBO estimates that the funds needed for the replacement or modernization of existing VA hospitals could cost as much as $2.9 billion.

Unfortunately, the VA's construction process is three to five times as expensive as the private sector. This means that while we are doing what we can to see that the veterans of this country are getting the health care they deserve, we are clearly not getting as much bang out of the buck as we could. And in this budget cutting climate we have to stretch each dollar as wisely and as far as we can. That is why I decided to introduce my legislation. I feel that if we can cut costs in

the construction area, we can provide more beds, serve more veterans, and provide better overall health care for this Nation's veterans.

I realize that at first blush some may see my bill as somewhat controversial, and perhaps as a first step of some sort toward dismantling the Veterans' Administration health care system. But it's clearly not either of these. In fact I believe my bill gives us a unique opportunity to strengthen the VA health care system.

Mr. President, everyone involved with veterans and the VA knows the crunch is coming. The demographics of the aging veteran have been published in every major media forum. The VA also, to its credit, has tried to address and plan for the influx of aging veterans.

If the VA is right and the demand for VA health care triples by the year 2000—with patient load leaping from 4.5 million today to over 12 million—then there will be a tremendous strain on both the VA and its budget. Clearly, we want to be in a position to provide VA health care for as many eligible veterans as we can.

Therefore, we must realize that in order to pay for the care we have promised the veteran, we must develop more cost-effective methods of providing it. But we must provide it in such a way that we don't jeopardize the commitments we have made to our veterans. And we must also recognize that the VA's costs will normally be somewhat higher than the private sector because of the type of patients it serves and the dedicated mission it has been given. However, it is clear Congress and the VA must look at the options and alternatives available.

That is what the bill Senator DENTON and I are introducing today is designed to do. First, get the VA to look at other ways to provide care before simply building a new expensive facility. Second, the bill sets up four pilot projects that will allow the VA, Congress, and the veterans of this country a chance to see how these options work.

Basically this legislation does three things.

First, it requires that the VA's first option when developing plans for new or replacement medical facilities shall be to consider leasing or purchasing existing community facilities. The VA has the authority now to lease or acquire existing facilities, but it has never used it for either hospitals or nursing homes.

Second, sets up a pilot program to look at four different scenarios. The first would be a privately built, privately run nursing homes that the VA would contract eligible veterans to in a 5-year agreement. Veterans in my State of Minnesota support such a pilot project located in Grand Rapids, MI. In this case, a veteran would like to build a nursing home facility for vets and then run it with his staff.

The second would be a nursing home that was privately planned, designed, and built that would then be leased to the VA and run by the VA. This nursing home would then revert to the private sector when no longer needed by the VA.

The third would require the VA to purchase an existing medical facility. It seems that a perfect opportunity to exercise this option is available in Mobile, AL, where the VA can acquire a hospital for $25 million, and in fact the purchase option has been looked at by the VA and the local community. In contrast, the replacement Minneapolis hospital I fought so hard and successfully to get funded cost over $200 million.

The fourth option would be for the VA to simply lease an existing facility.

Third, the bill also requires the VA to report on the potential cost savings of increasing the number of nursing home beds contracted to community facilities. As I mentioned earlier, the VA has a 40-percent share of the veteran nursing home beds, as do community contracts. The bill asks the VA to look at increasing the community share to 60 percent or 75 percent.

Mr. President, this provision was included in the bill primarily because of a survey I mailed to over 60,000 Minnesota vets last summer asking for their views on how Congress should fund the number of nursing home beds that will be needed by the year 2000. The results were somewhat startling with 73.4 percent of the respondents saying that the VA should not build more nursing homes. Overall, the results reemphasized my belief that veterans are concerned both about available health care and cost-effective care.

I ask unanimous consent that the results of this survey be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGING VET SURVEY RESULTS

[Based on results of 600 returned surveys]

SURVEY

I. How should nursing home sites be chosen? (Rank choices 1-4)

1. Number of Service-Connected Vets in an Area: 65 percent rank this as first or second choice.

2. Number of Veterans in Area Unable to Pay: 60.2 percent rank this as first or second choice.

3. Number of Vets as Percent of Population in Area: 35.7 percent pick as their first choice, but 53 percent have listed as third or last choice.

4. Distance From Existing Facility: 54 percent rank as third or last choice.

II. Should the VA build more nursing homes? 26.6 percent say Yes; 73.4 percent say No.

III. How should we "find" more nursing home beds?

1. Leasing Existing Facilities, Use VA Personnel: 77.4 percent chose as their first or second choice.

2. Leasing Wing of Existing Facility, Using VA personnel: 65.9 percent chose as first or second choice.

3. Use Community Facilities, Pay Per Diems: 45 percent chose as first or second choice.

4. Build More Nursing Homes: 65.8 percent chose as their last choice—only 24.3 percent chose as their first or second choice.

IV. Do you support contracting out of nursing home care? 64 percent said Yes; 27.2 percent said No; 8.7 percent didn't know.

Of those who responded 57 percent within 50 miles of an existing VA facility, 28.3 percent live more than 100 miles.

V. Should the VA devote more of its resources to programs like Adult Day Health Care—seeking to keep the vet out of a full-time facility?

Over 80 percent said that the VA should devote more of the resources.

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will agree that the time is right to look at different ways to spend our VA construction money. The crunch is certainly coming. If we can get started now, maybe we can do more than just wring our hands when the time comes.

I also hope my colleagues will join me in working with the VA, veterans groups and the Veterans' Committee in working with this bill, perhaps improving it, and then seeing it made into law.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be entered in the RECORD at this time.

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

S. 1007

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Health Care Promotion Act of 1985".

SEC. 2. Section 5002 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) In developing plans for a new or replacement medical facility, the Administrator shall give first consideration to leasing or purchasing any existing medical facility that satisfies the requirements of paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(2) A medical facility satisfies the requirements of this paragraph if—

"(A) the facility meets the needs of the Veterans' Administration or is adaptable to meet such needs at cost that does not exceed the cost of construction of a medical facility to meet such needs; and

"(B) the cost of operating the facility (after adaptation, if necessary) is not expected to exceed the cost of operating a new medical facility.".

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this section, the term "medical facility" has the same meaning as provided in section 5001(3) of title 38, United States Code.

(b)(1) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall carry out a pilot program to determine the most cost-effective method or methods of acquiring medical facilities for the Veterans' Administration. Under the pilot program, the Administrator shall ac-

quire medical facilities using the methods set out in subsection (c).

(2) Not later than January 1, 1987, the Administrator shall enter into the contracts required by subsection (c) to carry out the pilot program. The Administrator shall carry out the program for such period, ending not less than 5 years after such date, as the Administrator determines to be appropriate.

(c)(1) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall enter into a contract with an appropriate entity to construct and operate a nursing home for the Veterans' Administration. Under the contract, the Veterans' Administration shall furnish the funds for construction of the nursing home. The contract shall provide that the contractor shall operate the nursing home for 5 years after completing the construction and that the Administrator may renew the contract for an additional term not to exceed 5 years. The contract shall include a provision that the Veterans' Administration shall refer a sufficient number of eligible veterans who require nursing home care to the nursing home to assure an 80 percent occupancy rate for the nursing home for the term of the contract. All rights, title, and interest in the nursing home constructed under a contract entered into pursuant to this paragraph shall vest in the United States.

(2) The Administrator shall enter into a contract with an appropriate entity to plan for, design, and construct a medical facility for the Veterans' Administration and to lease or sell the facility to the Veterans' Administration as the Administrator may direct. The Veterans' Administration shall operate the medical facility using Veterans' Administration employees.

(3)(A) The administrator shall acquire two existing medical facilities as provided in subparagraph (B). The Veterans' Adminstration shall operate the medical facilities using Veterans' Administration employees.

(B) In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall—

(i) purchase one medical facility that is located in an urban area and that is suitable for furnishing both hospital and nursing home services; and

(ii) lease one medical facility that is located in an urban area.

(d) The Administrator shall transmit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives an annual report on the administration of the pilot program and a final report promptly after the termination of the pilot program.

SEC. 4. Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall transmit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on (1) the extent to which the Veterans' Administration furnishes respite care to elderly veterans and to disabled veterans and (2) the Veterans' Administration plans for furnishing such care to such veterans in the future. The Administrator shall include in the report an estimate of cost savings likely to result from increasing the allocation of Veterans' Administration resources to respite care and other adult day health care and decreasing the allocation of such resources to long-term institutional care.

SEC. 5. (a) Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall transmit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives an estimate of the cost of increasing the number of community-based nursing home beds available to the Veterans' Administration by 50 percent and an estimate of the cost of increasing the number of community-based nursing home beds available to the Veterans' Administration by 75 percent. The estimates shall specify the cost savings likely to result from reduced construction of medical facilities for the Veterans' Administration and a comparison of the cost per patient per day for care furnished in medical facilities owned by the United States and operated by the Veterans' Administration and the cost per patient per day for care furnished in other medical facilities under the jurisdiction of the administrator.

(b) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is encouraged to place, through increased use of his authority to contract for medical facilities, as many eligible veterans as practicable in nursing homes located in the veterans' communities in the case of eligible veterans residing in areas other than urban areas.

SEC. 6. (a) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall use not more than $25,000,000 of the working reserve funds available to the Veterans' Administration for fiscal year 1986 to purchase an urban medical facility for the purpose of carrying out section 3(c)(3)(B)(i).

(b) The President shall include in the budget submitted to the Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 1987, a statement of the estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations necessary to carry out the pilot program required by section 3 in such fiscal year. The statement shall include the estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations necessary—

(1) to acquire medical facilities as provided in section 3(b) (other than estimated expenditures for which working reserve funds are required to be used as provided in subsection (a) of this section) and to renovate such facilities, if necessary; and

(2) to pay the personnel and other costs of operating the facilities.

(c) The Administrator shall achieve savings in the costs of operating medical facilities under the jurisdiction of the Administrator during fiscal year 1987 in a total amount sufficient to offset the personnel and other operating costs referred to in clause (2) of the second sentence of subsection (b). The Administrator shall achieve the cost savings by reallocating resources of the Veterans' Administration to the medical facilities referred to in subsection (b) from other medical facilities under the jurisdiction of the Administrator that have a surplus of beds, are underutilized, or are converted to perform new missions.●

● Mr. DENTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Minnesota, Senator BOSCHWITZ, to introduce legislation to provide for the "Veterans' Health Care Promotion Act of 1985." The legislation is particularly appropriate at a time when we are concerned about providing adequate medical care for our veterans, both nursing homes and hospitals, but face an increasing necessity to reduce the Federal budget.

For each of the 5 years that I have been a member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, the VA has requested large sums of money to build new hospitals to serve our veterans. The costs of the new hospitals are substantial, and we see with some frequency the construction of large, modern, expensive facilities in localities where it is difficult to justify the size and the cost.

I have taken a quick look at the costs of recently activated VA hospital facilities, and I think that it is kind of interesting. For 10 hospitals activated between 1973 and 1984, ranging in size from 205 beds to 1,305 beds, the costs per bed of the total project, in 1984 dollars, ranged from a low of $95,000 to a high of $313,000. The average cost per bed for the 5,951 beds built with $1,117 million (1984 dollars) was about $188,000.

I must say, Mr. President, that I have not noticed any inclination on the part of the Veterans' Administration to deal with that problem by finding less expensive or more cost-effective ways to provide necessary new or replacement beds. Indeed, the VA takes pride in the fact that it has not in its history acquired existing hospitals—other than its initial taking over of existing military hospitals—and that it builds new facilities of the most modern and, I must say, most expensive kind.

Everyone who has looked at the problem says that if the VA is going to continue to add hospitals, it needs to find a less expensive way to do it. The Congressional Budget Office, the Office of Management and Budget, and the VA itself have all said that the VA may well have to, or should, consider the lease or purchase of existing hospital facilities. Yet I have yet to see any action from the VA to explore or implement that concept.

The same general situation applies to nursing homes, which are of increasing importance as our veterans population grows older. The demographics tell us that we do face a problem with the massive population of World War II veterans who are reaching the point where they will need increased access to both nursing home and hospital care.

The VA already has the authority to purchase or lease existing medical facilities, which includes nursing homes as well as hospitals, but has not yet done so, and has not shown an active interest in exploring the possibility. That is one reason that I believe that the pilot program provided by the bill will be of great value.

The problem has been brought home to me by a situation in my State that seems to provide an unexcelled opportunity.

As background, it is important to understand that the VA planning process for the medical district that includes Alabama, the Florida Panhandle, and southeastern Mississippi has for several years provided for the construction of a new VA hospital, in the 1990's, to serve the veterans located in the Florida Panhandle, south Alabama, and a

small portion of Georgia. The new hospital is, however, only in the long-range plan, and the VA has not yet gotten to the point of including it in its actual construction plan.

We are, therefore, talking about an expensive new hospital to be built at some future time when costs will be higher and the budget tighter than it is now. In the meanwhile, an identified need goes unsatisfied, and the veterans and other interested parties can only hope that current plans ultimately come to fruition.

It is, nonetheless, clear that the VA has accepted the need for a new hospital in the region.

Last year, and by coincidence, a very fine private hospital in Mobile, AL—Providence Hospital—became available because its owners and operators, the Sisters of Mercy, are building a new hospital in a different part of town. They are not building a new hospital because there is anything wrong with the old one, large parts of which are new and all of which is well maintained. They are building because of a perception that their service mission required a different location.

The veterans in the area saw the availability of Providence as a boon to address a situation in which it was clear that the VA itself saw the need for a new hospital but in which that new hospital would be many years in the making and cost a great deal of money. They developed the view that the VA, the taxpayers, and the veterans would be better served if the VA acquired Providence as a VA facility rather than building a new hospital.

There were some additional considerations that were involved in the decision. Providence Hospital is relatively large, with 349 acute care beds, and has an adjacent 126-bed school of nursing which could be used for a veterans' nursing home. There are no nursing home beds currently available in south Alabama. The grounds are about 15,3 acres, with 1,000 paved parking spaces. There is a residence with space to house 13 employees. The hospital has the most modern facilities and equipment, all of which are available for purchase. In addition, the hospital could easily be a very good tertiary care facility because of its existing capabilities and the possibility of affiliating with a good medical school in Mobile. And the price is right, about $24 million.

I repeat, about $24 million. That is not much more than the cost for the design—just the design—of a new hospital now underway in a major city in another part of the country. As someone remarked the other day, this is the best deal around.

The veterans approached me with their idea. I confess that I was relatively cool to it at first because it looked too good to be true. Nonetheless, I asked the VA to take a look at the hospital to see whether, in physical terms, it would be usable.

The VA agreed to take a look at Providence, and did so with a professional team from the Office of Construction in the Department of Medicine and Surgery. Let me quote a couple of statements from the conclusions of its report, over the signature of the Director, Facility Planning Service, Department of Medicine and Surgery:

> The VA team concluded that the Providence Hospital is well maintained and in generally good condition. The newest construction is in excellent condition . . . It is the team's belief that if a programmatic determination were made to establish a VA medical center in Mobile, the Providence Hospital could be adapted to serve in this role. A detailed analysis would be needed to determine the cost of modifying Providence and thus the true costs of acquisition.

That's the VA's own people speaking, Mr. President. It struck me, and everyone else who has read the report, as a pretty good conclusion. What it meant, of course, was that there was nothing inherent to the hospital and its facilities that militated against its possible conversion to a VA facility.

In addition, the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in the other body asked one of his senior people to look at the situation. That look, by an experienced and knowledgeable individual, suggested that "the matter be further pursued with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs," with some additional recommendations, and I quote in part:

> . . . the Administrator be urged to give serious consideration to the acquisition of Providence Hospital, Mobile, AL.

The report went on to say that if the VA wants to put a hospital in that region and does not want to use Providence, it should be made to show in detail why Providence is not suitable or economical, and to show that staffing and quality of care would be as easily done and as good elsewhere as it would be in Mobile.

That position seems pretty strong to me, and certainly suggests that the matter should be looked at fully and carefully.

I won't go into detail with all the other arguments for this particular way of addressing the needs of the veterans in that part of the country. I will say, however, that the merits of the case seem so compelling to me that I would support a close look at the situation no matter where it might be found, anywhere in the country.

Yet the VA cannot seem to get very interested in the problem. There are some reasons for that, although they do not seem to me to be compelling when one looks at the costs involved and the potential savings.

If we use an average cost per bed for a new hospital in 1984 dollars, which the VA has given as about $300,000 per bed in this location, a 225-bed new hospital to serve the veterans in the region would cost something like $67.5 million. I doubt that there are very many of us who do not expect that the cost would increase substantially, in both dollar and real terms, by the time that the VA gets around to building that hospital, if it gets around to it at all.

By contrast, Providence could be bought as is, and fully equipped, for something like $25 million. With 349 beds, the cost per bed would be $71,500. Even if we assume that it might cost, say, $15 million—and I seriously doubt that it would cost anything like that—to convert the facility to VA standards and usage patterns, the cost per bed is only $115,000, or about one-third of the estimated cost that we might expect for new construction. And there is a lot of other stuff that comes free for that price, such as a facility that would serve well as a nursing home.

In other words, we could save a minimum of $25 or $30 million over the total cost of new construction, get more beds and a lot of other things in the bargain, and have an operating hospital several years sooner. After all, it takes something like 4 to 8 years from initial funding to activation of a hospital.

I do not deny that there are costs involved in saving money in this instance. There would have to be readjustments in hospital service areas, the location in the region may not be ideal—although it is pretty good—and the VA would have to wrench itself out of its traditional pattern of providing hospitals only through new construction.

Nonetheless, the monetary savings would be substantial, and our veterans would benefit greatly. And that's what it is all about.

The bill, Mr. President, provides in section 3 for four pilot projects, each of a different nature and each innovative. One of those is the purchase of an existing urban medical facility that can furnish both hospital and nursing home services. Senator BOSCHWITZ and I had Providence Hospital in Mobile specifically in mind when we drafted that provision.

Mr. President, I believe that our veterans, our taxpayers, and our country will be well served by the bill that Senator BOSCHWITZ and I propose. I know that my colleague has encountered somewhat the same situation in his State as I have in mine, a situation in which there is an opportunity to provide service to veterans in an innovative way that promises reduced cost. I commend him for his initiative in drafting the bill, and I appreciate his courtesy and cooperation in working with me to develop it further.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the bill. I believe that the

pilot program for which it provides will be successful, and that it will set us on a course that will benefit veterans in every State throughout our country. It will demonstrate that we can provide effective and efficient service to our veterans by the use of innovative approaches to facilities. Moreover, I believe that the VA will find the experience so congenial that it will take the initiative in further acquisition of facilities, whether nursing homes, hospitals, or replacements for current VA facilities when necessary.●

By Mr. HART:

S. 1008. A bill to provide for a demonstration program in which a limited number of States would be permitted to provide unemployment compensation to individuals for the purpose of funding self-employment; to the Committee on Finance.

SELF-EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY ACT

● Mr. HART. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Self-Employment Opportunity Act of 1985. This legislation will encourage the development of entrepreneurial talent and the creation of new jobs in the areas of our country that are suffering dislocations as a result of our economic transition. This Nation has experienced massive layoffs in many of our traditional manufacturing industries, and the noninflationary rate of unemployment continues to hover at 7 percent. Mr. President, we must examine new programs to enable unemployed workers to become, once again, productive members of our economy.

The Self-Employment Opportunity Act will examine one such exciting program. Currently, recipients of unemployment compensation are prohibited from engaging in self-employment activity due to State and Federal requirements relating to availability for work or refusal to accept suitable work. Under the legislation, 5 to 10 States will enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Labor to permit a limited number of unemployment compensation recipients to receive their benefits while starting a new business. The States would be given flexibility in establishing guidelines for their self-employment programs. The results of these pilot programs will be carefully evaluated by the Secretary of Labor at the completion of the 4-year demonstration project.

The dilemma posed by long-term structural unemployment challenges us to rethink the notion that the unemployment compensation system exists only to provide temporary income support. We must update a system that operates solely to provide support payments and prohibits the unemployed worker from taking steps to return to the ranks of the employed by receiving essential, retraining or attempting self-employment.

Britain and France initiated programs, now adopted in several European nations, that permit unemployed workers to use their benefits while establishing a small business. The French program allows unemployment compensation recipients to receive their first 6 months of benefits in a lump sum, for the intitial capitalization of their business. The British scheme permits unemployment recipients to receive regular weekly unemployment benefits during a business startup period.

Results of data gathered on the British scheme, a program similar to that proposed in this bill, indicate that 88 percent of firms survive the first crucial year of operation. These firms created an average of 1.7 jobs per company. As the firms become stable and profitable, the taxes they contribute increase government revenues.

Such programs demonstrate that entrepreneurial ability is not unique to MBA graduates or Ph.D.'s in computer engineering. But, every potential entrepreneur requires, at a minimum, a means for livelihood during the startup phase of an enterprise.

A Federal Government policy that allows the provision of unemployment compensation benefits to struggling entrepreneurs can be effectively combined with State, local, and private sector assistance. Under the bill, each State established essential guidelines for choosing up to 5 percent of its unemployment compensation recipients as participants in the program. The States monitor their progress and provide the kinds of assistance now entrepreneurs require to succeed.

Most of the businesses established under this program, of course, will not be large-scale capital ventures. But the opportunity provided to unemployed workers under this scheme to create jobs for themselves—to operate a small restaurant, a day care program at home or an automobile repair business—will offer them renewed hope, motivation, and pride.

The program established by the Self-Employment Opportunity Act, even if established throughout the Nation at a future time, represents only a small part of what must be a comprehensive strategy to deal with the critical problem of long-term, structural unemployment. Our Nation must search for innovative solutions to the problems created by an economy that is experiencing a massive shift in its employment base. To create an unemployment compensation system that offers hope rather than despair to our jobless workers, we must experiment with creative approaches to enable them to emerge as self-sufficient contributors to a productive national economy.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 84

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the names of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] were added as cosponsors of S. 84, a bill to incorporate the Pearl Harbor Survivors Association.

S. 89

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the names of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HECHT] were added as cosponsors of S. 89, a bill to recognize the organization known as the National Academies of Practice.

S. 177

At the request of Mr. HART, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 177, a bill to authorize a national program of improving the quality of education.

S. 281

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 281, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to add a section dealing with public safety vehicles.

S. 361

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. EAGLETON], was added as a cosponsor of S. 361, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make permanent the deduction for charitable contributions by nonitemizers.

S. 408

At the request of Mr. WEICKER, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] were added as cosponsors of S. 408, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide program levels, salary and expense levels, and authorizations for the Small Business Administration's programs for fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988, and for other purposes.

S. 425

At the request of Mr. GOLDWATER, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], was added as a cosponsor of S. 425, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases.

S. 484

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ZORINSKY], was added as a cosponsor of S. 484, a bill to amend the Saccharin Study and Labeling Act.

S. 625

At the request of Mrs. HAWKINS, the name of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 625, a bill to include the offenses relating to sexual exploitation of children under the provisions of RICO and authorize civil suits on behalf of victims of child pornography and prostitution.

S. 631

At the request of Mr. CHAFFE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 631, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

S. 632

At the request of Mr. CHAFFE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMINICI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 632, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require a mandatory section 338 election in hostile stock takeovers, and for other purposes.

S. 657

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] was added as a cosponsor of S. 657, a bill to establish the Veterans' Administration as an executive department.

S. 664

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. QUAYLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 664, a bill to facilitate the competitiveness of exports of U.S. agricultural commodities.

S. 680

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] were added as cosponsors of S. 680, a bill to achieve the objectives of the Multi-Fiber Arrangement and to promote the economic recovery of the U.S. textile and apparel industry and its workers.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. CHILES, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 746, a bill to require the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board to provide a comprehensive assessment of the designer drug problem and make recommendations to Congress for necessary legislation.

S. 777

At the request of Mr. HEINZ, the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 777, a bill to amend the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 to extend hospice benefits under the Medicare Program for an additional 3 years.

S. 850

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 850, a bill to create a Federal criminal offense for operating or directing the operation of a common carrier while intoxicated or under the influence of drugs.

S. 869

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 869, a bill to provide that the pensions received by retired judges who are assigned to active duty shall not be treated as wages for purposes of the Social Security Act.

S. 899

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ] was added as a cosponsor of S. 899, a bill granting the consent of Congress to the Midwest Interstate Compact on Low-level Radioactive Waste Management.

S. 925

At the request of Mr. HUMPHREY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 925, a bill to deny most-favored-nation trading status to Afghanistan.

S. 930

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 930, a bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter to exempt all agricultural exports from cargo preference requirements.

S. 945

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. LAXALT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 945, a bill to recognize the organization known as the National Association of State Directors of Veterans' Affairs, Inc.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 20

At the request of Mr. SYMMS, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. LAXALT] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 20, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the English language.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 57

At the request of Mr. CHILES, the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. DENTON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 57, a joint resolution to designate the week of October 20, 1985, through October 26, 1985, as "Lupus Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 92

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MCCLURE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 92, a joint resolution to designate October 1985 as "National Foster Grandparents Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 102

At the request of Mr. ZORINSKY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 102, a joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Illiteracy.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 123

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WEICKER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ZORINSKY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. QUAYLE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 123, a joint resolution to designate Dr. Jonas Salk Day.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 14

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, a concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that Josef Mengele should be brought to justice.

SENATE RESOLUTION 130

At the request of Mr. WALLOP, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WEICKER] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 130, a resolution relative to the Sport Fish Restoration Trust Fund.

SENATE RESOLUTION 140

At the request of Mr. BENTSEN, the names of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. EAGLETON], the Senator from California [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], the Senator from Florida [Mrs. HAWKINS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 140, a resolution urging the President to impose a trade boycott and embargo against Nicaragua.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

DOLE (AND DOMENICI) AMENDMENT NO. 37

Mr. DOLE (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988 and revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1985; 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 1985 is revised and replaced, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1986 is established, and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1987 and 1988 are set forth.

(a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1984, October 1, 1985, October 1, 1986, and October 1, 1987:

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

Fiscal year 1985: $736,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $793,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $866,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $956,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1985: $0.
Fiscal year 1986: $1,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $2,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $3,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1985: $44,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $51,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $56,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $61,300,000,000.

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 1985: $186,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $200,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $216,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $248,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1985: $1,055,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $1,070,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $1,133,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $1,210,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1985: $949,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $964,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $1,010,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $1,058,500,000,000.

(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 1985: $212,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $170,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $143,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $102,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1985: $1,849,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $2,090,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $2,316,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $2,529,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1985: $25,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $241,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $226,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $212,400,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1984, October 1, 1985, October 1, 1986, and October 1, 1987, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $53,500,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $69,300,000,000.
(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $33,900,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $73,600,000,000.
(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $32,700,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $73,600,000,000.
(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $32,200,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $78,300,000,000.
(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.

(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 1985 through 1988 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $292,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,000,000,000.
(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, $302,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $273,100,000,000.
(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, $323,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $292,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $346,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $313,000,000,000.
(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 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $25,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $10,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $21,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $20,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $20,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $9,100,000,000.
(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.

Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $8,800,000,000.
(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.

Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $9,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,000,000,000.
(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 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $1,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $5,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $4,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $5,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $5,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(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, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,400,000,000.
(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, $12,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $24,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $20,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $20,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $19,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $6,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $26,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $4,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $28,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $5,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $29,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $29,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $27,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $28,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $28,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $6,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $31,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $28,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $29,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $29,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $33,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,500,000,000.
(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, $34,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,000,000,000.
(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, $37,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $40,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medical Insurance (570):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $71,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $82,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,700,000,000.
(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, $90,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $93,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,000,000,000.
(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 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $162,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $128,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $155,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $116,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $165,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $174,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $195,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $189,300,000,000.
(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, $211,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $194,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $226,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $206,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $266,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,200,000,000.
(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 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $27,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $26,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $27,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $17,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $27,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $6,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,400,000,000.
(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, $6,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,700,000,000.
(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, $6,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $7,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,000,000,000.
(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 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,800,000,000.
(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, $5,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,200,000,000.
(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, $5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $5,400,000,000.
(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.
(18) General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (850):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $6,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,400,000,000.
(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, $4,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $4,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $2,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $129,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $129,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $142,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $151,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $151,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $153,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,200,000,000.
(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 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $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, −$2,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,200,000,000.
(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, −$2,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,900,000,000.
(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 1985:
(A) New budget authority, −$32,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,400,000,000.
(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, −$35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$35,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2. (a) Not later than June 18, 1985, the committees named in subsections (b) through (bb) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committees on the Budget of their respective Houses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committees on the Budget shall report to the House and Senate a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SENATE COMMITTEES

(b) The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $1,189,000,000 in budget authority and $990,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,764,000,000 in budget authority and $2,420,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $2,179,000,000 in budget authority and $3,390,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(c) The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to achieve savings of $531,000,000 in budget authority and $639,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $745,000,000 in budget authority and $1,210,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $838,000,000 in budget authority and $1,718,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(d) The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $8,640,000,000 in budget authority and $4,083,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $9,387,000,000 in budget authority and $6,685,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $10,178,000,000 in budget authority and $8,287,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(e) The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $1,998,000,000 in budget authority and $1,653,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $407,000,000 in budget authority and $403,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $510,000,000 in budget authority and $536,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(f) The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $2,962,000,000 in budget authority and $2,253,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $2,723,000,000 in budget authority and $2,569,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $2,720,000,000 in budget authority and $2,814,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(g) The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $719,000,000 in budget authority and $306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,208,000,000 in budget authority and $1,451,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,720,000,000 in budget authority and $2,112,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(h) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in budget authority and $12,054,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $0 in budget authority and $17,541,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $0 in budget authority and $22,267,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(i) The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $447,000,000 in budget authority and $357,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,076,000,000 in budget authority and $626,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,379,000,000 in budget authority and $530,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(j) The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, or (3) any combination thereof, sufficient to achieve increases in contributions and savings in budget authority and outlays as follows: $375,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $4,276,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,325,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $8,843,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,370,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $10,417,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(k) The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $2,975,000,000 in budget authority and $1,168,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $3,452,000,000 in budget authority and $3,009,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $4,078,000,000 in budget authority and $3,872,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(l) The Senate Committee on Small Business shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $1,443,000,000 in budget authority and $978,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,385,000,000 in budget authority and $1,611,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,900,000,000 in budget authority and $1,735,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(m) The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $973,000,000 in budget authority and $1,059,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,213,000,000 in budget authority and $1,514,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,312,000,000 in budget authority and $1,596,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(n) The Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $192,000,000 in budget authority and $87,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $201,000,000 in budget authority and $151,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $213,000,000 in budget authority and $181,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

HOUSE COMMITTEES

(o) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $1,189,000,000 in budget authority and $990,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,764,000,000 in budget authority and $2,420,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $2,179,000,000 in budget authority and $3,390,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(p) The House Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to achieve savings of $531,000,000 in budget authority and $639,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $745,000,000 in budget authority and $1,210,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $838,000,000 in budget authority and $1,718,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(q) The House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $7,581,000,000 in budget authority and $3,860,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $8,192,000,000 in budget authority and $6,242,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $8,850,000,000 in budget authority and $7,586,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(r) The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $2,409,000,000 in budget authority and $1,185,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $2,809,000,000 in budget authority and $2,765,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $3,336,000,000 in budget authority and $3,506,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(s) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $4,714,000,000 in budget authority and $7,128,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $3,464,000,000 in budget authority and $8,975,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $3,618,000,000 in budget authority and $11,977,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(t) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $447,000,000 in budget authority and $357,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,076,000,000 in budget authority and $626,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,379,000,000 in budget authority and $530,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(u) The House Committee on Government Operations shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in budget authority and $1,737,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $0 in budget authority and $2,594,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $0 in budget authority and $4,632,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(v) The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $540,000,000 in budget authority and $292,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $559,000,000 in budget authority and $402,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $636,000,000 in budget authority and $526,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(w) The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report (1)

changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $251,000,000 in budget authority and $229,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $43,000,000 in budget authority and $102,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $44,000,000 in budget authority and $100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(x) The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, or (3) any combination thereof, sufficient to achieve increases in contributions and savings in budget authority and outlays as follows: $375,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $4,212,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,325,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $8,694,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,370,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $10,170,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(y) The House Committee on Public Works and Transportation shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $1,991,000,000 in budget authority and $507,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $2,311,000,000 in budget authority and $1,808,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $2,935,000,000 in budget authority and $2,718,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(z) The House Committee on Small Business shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $1,443,000,000 in budget authority and $978,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,385,000,000 in budget authority and $1,611,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,900,000,000 in budget authority and $1,735,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(aa) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $973,000,000 in budget authority and $1,059,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,213,000,000 in budget authority and $1,514,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,312,000,000 in budget authority and $1,596,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(bb) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in budget authority and $9,904,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $0 in budget authority and $14,488,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $0 in budget authority and $17,260,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. (a) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective Committee on Appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, to exceed $303,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; aggregate total budget authority to exceed $324,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and aggregate total budget authority to exceed $347,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(b) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective Committee on Appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for nondefense discretionary activities to exceed $136,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; aggregate total budget authority to exceed $140,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and aggregate budget authority to exceed $145,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(c) The provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section may be waived or suspended in the Senate by a majority vote of the Members voting, a quorum being present, or by unanimous consent of the Senate.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 4. If the Congress has not completed action by October 1, 1985, 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 1986, 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 of such Act.

SEC. 5. It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate during fiscal years 1986 and 1987 to consider any bill, resolution, or amendment, except proposed legislation reported in response to reconciliation instructions contained in this resolution, authorizing new direct loan obligations or new loan guarantee commitments unless that bill, resolution, or amendment also provides that the authority to make or guarantee such loans shall be effective only to such extent and in such amounts as are contained in appropriation acts.

SEC. 6. It is the sense of the Congress that the previous distinction between "unified budget" and "off-budget" spending be ended, and that budget authority and outlays for the so-called "off-budget" agencies be included in the budget totals.

SEC. 7. (a) The Senate finds that—

(1) the existing tax structure of the United States distorts economic activity, leading to an inefficient use of national resources and a weakening of our domestic economic vitality and competitive posture in international markets;

(2) the relative tax burdens among various taxpayer categories are manifestly unfair insofar as they arise from differences in the capabilities of taxpayers to take advantage of complicated tax laws;

(3) the ability of the Federal Government to plan and conduct rational fiscal policy is frustrated by elaborate schemes to avoid taxation and the unintended effects of tax incentives and penalties;

(4) progressive erosion of voluntary compliance threatens the fiscal integrity of our public finances and the confidence of our citizens in the Federal Government's capacity to govern; and

(5) a number of plans, each designed to simplify and reform the Tax Code, have been before the Congress for a time sufficient to allow for extensive analysis and evaluation.

(b) It is therefore the sense of the Senate that tax reform should be adopted as soon as possible, and that it should incorporate the following principles and objectives:

(1) efficiency and responsiveness to market conditions in the economic activities of American businesses and consumers;

(2) simplicity of structure and lower marginal tax rates;

(3) a fair and equitable distribution of the tax burden among all taxpayers, with relief for those below the poverty level, and incentives to bring them into the work force;

(4) a broader tax base, with deductions essential to avoid genuine hardship or to protect the economic security of the American people; and

(5) increased incentives for work, saving, and investment.

SEC. 9. It is the sense of the Senate that because the Senate requires timely reporting of legislative action on spending bills, and because the Senate requires continual control over the budget, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall issue a weekly report during periods when the Senate is in session detailing and tabulating the progress of congressional action on bills and resolutions providing new budget authority and changing revenues and the public debt for a fiscal year, including, but not limited to the requirements set forth in Public Law 93-344, section 308(b).

DOLE (AND DOMENICI) AMENDMENT NO. 38

Mr. DOLE (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 37 proposed by them to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32), supra; as follows:

In the pending amendment,

On page 2, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$736,200,000,000".

On page 2, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$793,600,000,000".

On page 2, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$866,300,000,000".

On page 2, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$955,900,000,000".

On page 2, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 2, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$900,000,000".
On page 2, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".
On page 2, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,400,000,000".
On page 2, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$44,800,000,000".
On page 2, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$51,000,000,000".
On page 2, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$56,100,000,000".
On page 2, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$61,300,000,000".
On page 3, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$186,200,000,000".
On page 3, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$200,700,000,000".
On page 3, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$216,900,000,000".
On page 3, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$248,300,000,000".
On page 3, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$1,055,600,000,000".
On page 3, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$1,076,000,000,000".
On page 3, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$1,139,000,000,000".
On page 3, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$1,216,100,000,000".
On page 3, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$949,100,000,000".
On page 3, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$969,000,000,000".
On page 3, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$1,013,100,000,000".
On page 3, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$1,055,700,000,000".
On page 3, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$212,900,000,000".
On page 3, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$175,400,000,000".
On page 4, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$146,800,000,000".
On page 4, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$99,800,000,000".
On page 4, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$1,849,300,000,000".
On page 4, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$2,088,000,000,000".
On page 4, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$2,316,300,000,000".
On page 4, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$2,529,300,000,000".
On page 4, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$25,500,000,000".
On page 4, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$238,700,000,000".
On page 4, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$228,300,000,000".
On page 4, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$213,100,000,000".
On page 4, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$52,900,000,000".
On page 4, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$69,200,000,000".
On page 4, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 5, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$30,000,000,000".
On page 5, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$74,500,000,000".
On page 5, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 5, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$27,400,000,000".
On page 5, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$74,400,000,000".
On page 5, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 5, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$25,600,000,000".
On page 5, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$79,000,000,000".
On page 5, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 6, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$292,600,000,000".
On page 6, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$252,000,000,000".
On page 6, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 6, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 6, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 6, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$312,800,000,000".
On page 6, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$276,100,000,000".
On page 6, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 6, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 6, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 6, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$334,900,000,000".
On page 6, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$298,400,000,000".
On page 7, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 7, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 7, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 7, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$359,600,000,000".
On page 7, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$321,400,000,000".
On page 7, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 7, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 7, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 7, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$25,300,000,000".
On page 7, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$18,000,000,000".
On page 7, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$11,500,000,000".
On page 7, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$10,300,000,000".
On page 7, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 8, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$21,000,000,000".
On page 8, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$17,800,000,000".
On page 8, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$8,200,000,000".
On page 8, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".
On page 8, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 8, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$20,200,000,000".
On page 8, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$17,100,000,000".
On page 8, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$7,800,000,000".
On page 8, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".
On page 8, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 8, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$20,500,000,000".
On page 8, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$16,600,000,000".
On page 8, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$7,900,000,000,".
On page 8, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,00,000".
On page 9, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$9,100,000,000".
On page 9, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".
On page 9, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$8,800,000,000".
On page 9, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$8,800,000,000".
On page 9, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$9,000,000,000".
On page 9, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$8,800,000,00".
On page 9, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$9, 300,000,000".
On page 10, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$9,000,000,000".
On page 10, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$1,600,000,000".
On page 10, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 10, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 10, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 10, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$5,200,000,000".
On page 10, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$5,100,000,000".
On page 10, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 11, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$4,100,000,000".
On page 11, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$5,200,000,000".
On page 11, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$4,600,000,000".
On page 11, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$1,400,000,000".
On page 11, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$4,900,000,000".
On page 11, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$4,200,000,000".
On page 11, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$1,000,000,000".
On page 11, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$12,700,000,000".
On page 12, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$13,100,000,000".
On page 12, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".

On page 12, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$12,100,000,000".
On page 12, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$12,400,000,000".
On page 12, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 12, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$12,500,000,000".
On page 12, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$12,200,000,000".
On page 12, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 12, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$12,700,000,000".
On page 13, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".
On page 13, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$24,800,000,000".
On page 13, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$21,000,000,000".
On page 13, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$13,800,000,000".
On page 13, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$5,700,000,000".
On page 13, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$16,500,000,000".
On page 13, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$13,800,000,000".
On page 13, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$11,700,000,000".
On page 13, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 14, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 14, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$16,400,000,000".
On page 14, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$14,500,000,000".
On page 14, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$10,200,000,000".
On page 14, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 14, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 14, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$13,600,000,000".
On page 14, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$11,500,000,000".
On page 14, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$9,100,000,000".
On page 14, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 14, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 14, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$12,600,000,000".
On page 14, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$5,600,000,000".
On page 15, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 15, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$27,000,000,000".
On page 15, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$7,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$2,600,000,000".
On page 15, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$2,500,000,000".
On page 15, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$25,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,900,000,000".
On page 15, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 15, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$2,500,000,000".
On page 15, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$26,700,000,000".
On page 15, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 16, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$4,300,000,000".
On page 16, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".
On page 16, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$2,700,000,000".
On page 16, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$28,400,000,000".
On page 16, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 16, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$29,600,000,000".
On page 16, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$26,100,000,000".
On page 16, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 16, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 16, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 16, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$26,600,000,000".
On page 16, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$25,600,000,000".
On page 16, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 16, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 17, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 17, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$27,100,000,000".
On page 17, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$27,000,000,000".
On page 17, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 17, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 17, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 17, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 17, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$26,500,000,000".
On page 17, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 17, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 17, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 17, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$8,400,000,000".
On page 17, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".
On page 18, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 18, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 18, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 18, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$5,400,000,000".
On page 18, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$7,600,000,000".
On page 18, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$800,000,000".
On page 18, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 18, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 18, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On page 18, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$6,800,000,000".
On page 18, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$700,000,000".
On page 18, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 18, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 19, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$6,200,000,000".
On page 19, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$6,200,000,000".
On page 19, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$800,000,000".
On page 19, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 19, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 19, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$31,600,000,000".
On page 19, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$30,300,000,000".
On page 19, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 19, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$8,600,000,000".
On page 19, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 19, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$28,600,000,000".
On page 19, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$29,800,000,000".
On page 19, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$8,900,000,000".
On page 20, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$29,400,000,000".
On page 20, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$28,700,000,000".
On page 20, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$9,200,000,000".
On page 20, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$29,800,000,000".
On page 20, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$29,000,000,000".
On page 20, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$9,400,000,000".
On page 20, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$33,600,000,000".
On page 21, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$33,500,000,000".
On page 21, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 21, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$34,900,000,000".
On page 21, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$35,000,000,000".
On page 21, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".

On page 21, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$37,100,000,000".
On page 21, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$36,700,000,000".
On page 21, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 21, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$39,200,000,000".
On page 21, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$38,70,000,000".
On page 22, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 22, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$71,800,000,000".
On page 22, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$65,200,000,000".
On page 22, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$81,600,000,000".
On page 22, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$68,000,000,000".
On page 22, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$90,500,000,000".
On page 22, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$74,100,000,000".
On page 23, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$93,300,000,000".
On page 23, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$81,600,000,000".
On page 23, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$162,800,000,000".
On page 23, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$128,600,000,000".
On page 23, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$14,300,000,000".
On page 23, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$156,300,000,000".
On page 24, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$118,100,000,000".
On page 24, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 24, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$166,500,000,000".
On page 24, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$121,900,000,000".
On page 24, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$2,300,000,000".
On page 24, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$174,700,000,000".
On page 24, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$125,600,000,000".
On page 24, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 25, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$195,500,000,000".
On page 25, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$189,300,000,000".
On page 25, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$207,600,000,000".
On page 25, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$197,700,000,000".
On page 25, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$225,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$206,500,000,000".
On page 26, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$266,200,000,000".
On page 26, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$216,100,000,000".
On page 26, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$27,200,000,000".
On page 26, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$1,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$16,800,000,000".
On page 27, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$1,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$15,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$1,200,000,000."
On page 27, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$17,400,000,000".
On page 27, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$26,400,000,000".
On page 27, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,200,000,000".
On page 28, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$20,100,000,000".
On page 28, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$6,600,000,000".
On page 28, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 28, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$6,800,000,000".
On page 28, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$6,700,000,000".
On page 28, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$6,900,000,000".
On page 28, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$6,900,000,000".
On page 28, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$7,000,000,000".
On Page 29, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$7,000,000,000".
On Page 29, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On Page 29, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On Page 29, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On Page 29, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On Page 29, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On Page 29, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On Page 29, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On Page 29, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On Page 29, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On Page 29, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On Page 29, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On Page 30, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On Page 30, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On Page 30, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$5,400,000,000".
On Page 30, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On Page 30, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On Page 30, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On Page 30, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On Page 30, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$5,600,000,000".
On Page 30, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$5,500,000,000".
On Page 30, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On Page 30, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On Page 30, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On Page 30, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On Page 30, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 30, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 31, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 31, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".
On page 31, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$3,200,000,000".
On page 31, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 31, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 31, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$129,700,000,000".
On page 32, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$129,700,000,000".
On page 32, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$142,300,000,000".
On page 32, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$142,300,000,000".
On page 32, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$153,000,000,000".
On page 33, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$153,000,000,000".
On page 33, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$155,200,000,000".
On page 33, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$155,200,000,000".
On page 33, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 33, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 33, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 5, strike the figure and insert "−$1,400,000,000".
On page 34, line 6, strike the figure and insert "−$1,400,000,000".
On page 34, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 14, strike the figure and insert "−$1,200,000,000".
On page 34, line 15, strike the figure and insert "−$1,200,000,000".
On page 34, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 23, strike the figure and insert "−$200,000,000".
On page 34, line 24, strike the figure and insert "−$100,000,000".
On page 34, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 8, strike the figure and insert "−$32,400,000,000".
On page 35, line 9, strike the figure and insert "−$32,400,000,000".
On page 35, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 17, strike the figure and insert "−$35,000,000,000".
On page 35, line 18, strike the figure and insert "−$35,000,000,000".
On page 35, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 2, strike the figure and insert "−$37,800,000,000".
On page 36, line 3, strike the figure and insert "−$37,800,000,000".
On page 36, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 11, strike the figure and insert "−$41,100,000,000".
On page 36, line 12, strike the figure and insert "−$41,100,000,000".
On page 36, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 19, strike the date and insert "June 19, 1985".
On page 37, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$3,899,000,000".
On page 37, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$4,610,000,000".
On page 37, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$3,773,000,000".
On page 37, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$6,540,000,000".
On page 37, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$4,258,000,000".
On page 37, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$10,326,000,000".
On page 37, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$0".
On page 37, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$376,000,000".
On page 37, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 37, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$894,000,000".
On page 37, line 23, strike the first figure and insert "$0".
On page 37, line 23, strike the second figure and insert "$1,424,000,000".
On page 38, line 10, strike the first figure and insert "$10,122,000,000".
On page 38, line 10, strike the second figure and insert "$4,213,000,000".
On page 38, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$11,353,000,000".
On page 38, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$7,416,000,000".
On page 38, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$12,509,000,000".
On page 38, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$9,566,000,000".
On page 38, line 24, strike the first figure and insert "$2,622,000,000".
On page 38, line 24, strike the second figure and insert "$2,216,000,000".
On page 38, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,416,000,000".
On page 39, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$1,077,000,000".
On page 39, line 2, strike the first figure and insert "$1,633,000,000".
On page 39, line 2, strike the second figure and insert "$1,368,000,000".
On page 39, line 13, strike the first figure and insert "$2,962,000,000".
On page 39, line 13, strike the second figure and insert "$2,253,000,000".
On page 39, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$2,723,000,000".
On page 39, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$2,579,000,000".
On page 39, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$2,720,000,000".
On page 39, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$2,814,000,000".
On page 40, line 2, strike the first figure and insert "$719,000,000".
On page 40, line 2, strike the second figure and insert "$306,000,000".
On page 40, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$1,208,000,000".
On page 40, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$1,451,000,000".
On page 40, line 5, strike the first figure and insert "$1,720,000,000".
On page 40, line 5, strike the second figure and insert "$2,112,000,000".
On page 40, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 40, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$8,117,000,000".
On page 40, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$0".
On page 40, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$18,934,000,000".

51-059 O-86-30 (Pt. 7)

On page 40, line 18, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 40, line 18, strike the second figure and insert "$28,137,000,000".

On page 41, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".

On page 41, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$47,000,000".

On page 41, line 5, strike the first figure and insert "$275,000,000".

On page 41, line 5, strike the second figure and insert "$109,000,000".

On page 41, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$282,000,000".

On page 41, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$140,000,000".

On page 41, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$375,000,000".

On page 41, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 41, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,101,000,000".

On page 41, line 18, strike the first figure and insert "$1,325,000,000".

On page 41, line 18, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 41, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$7,332,000,000".

On page 41, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$1,370,000,000".

On page 41, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 41, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$9,097,000,000".

On page 42, line 6, strike the first figure and insert "$3,404,000,000".

On page 42, line 6, strike the second figure and insert "$1,299,000,000".

On page 42, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$3,826,000,000".

On page 42, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$3,446,000,000".

On page 42, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$4,291,000,000".

On page 42, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$4,231,000,000".

On page 42, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$882,000,000".

On page 42, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$1,258,000,000".

On page 42, line 21, strike the first figure and insert "$2,034,000,000".

On page 42, line 21, strike the second figure and insert "$2,101,000,000".

On page 42, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$2,594,000,000".

On page 42, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$2,275,000,000".

On page 43, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$858,000,000".

On page 43, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$791,000,000".

On page 43, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$1,332,000,000".

On page 43, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$1,496,000,000".

On page 43, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$1,725,000,000".

On page 43, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$1,987,000,000".

On page 43, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".

On page 43, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$87,000,000".

On page 43, line 22, strike the first figure and insert "$201,000,000".

On page 43, line 22, strike the second figure and insert "$151,000,000".

On page 43, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$211,000,000".

On page 43, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$181,000,000".

On page 44, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$3,899,000,000".

On page 44, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$4,610,000,000".

On page 44, line 12, strike the first figure and insert "$3,773,000,000".

On page 44, line 12, strike the second figure and insert "$6,540,000,000".

On page 44, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$4,258,000,000".

On page 44, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$10,326,000,000".

On page 44, line 19, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 44, line 19, strike the second figure and insert "$376,000,000".

On page 44, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 44, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$894,000,000".

On page 44, line 22, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 44, line 22, strike the second figure and insert "$1,424,000,000".

On page 45, line 8, strike the first figure and insert "$9,159,000,000".

On page 45, line 8, strike the second figure and insert "$4,028,000,000".

On page 45, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$9,730,000,000".

On page 45, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$6,870,000,000".

On page 45, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$10,379,000,000".

On page 45, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$8,550,000,000".

On page 45, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$2,838,000,000".

On page 45, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$1,316,000,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike the first figure and insert "$3,183,000,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike the second figure and insert "$3,202,000,000".

On page 45, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$3,549,000,000".

On page 45, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$3,865,000,000".

On page 46, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$5,188,000,000".

On page 46, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$8,187,000,000".

On page 46, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$3,871,000,000".

On page 46, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$10,159,000,000".

On page 46, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$3,958,000,000".

On page 46, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$13,539,000,000".

On page 46, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".

On page 46, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$47,000,000".

On page 46, line 25, strike the first figure and insert "$275,000,000".

On page 46, line 25, strike the second figure and insert "$109,000,000".

On page 47, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$282,000,000".

On page 47, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$140,000,000".

On page 47, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 12, strike the first figure and insert "$64,000,000".

On page 47, line 12, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$3,699,000,000".

On page 47, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$5,203,000,000".

On page 47, line 25, strike the first figure and insert "$540,000,000".

On page 47, line 25, strike the second figure and insert "$292,000,000".

On page 48, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$559,000,000".

On page 48, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$402,000,000".

On page 48, line 3, strike the first figure and insert "$634,000,000".

On page 48, line 3, strike the second figure and insert "$526,000,000".

On page 48, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$401,000,000".

On page 48, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$379,000,000".

On page 48, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$293,000,000".

On page 48, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$352,000,000".

On page 48, line 17, strike the first figure and insert "$394,000,000".

On page 48, line 17, strike the second figure and insert "$450,000,000".

On page 49, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$375,000,000".

On page 49, line 3, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 3, strike the second figure and insert "$3,037,000,000".

On page 49, line 4, strike the first figure and insert "$1,325,000,000".

On page 49, line 4, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$7,183,000,000".

On page 49, line 6, strike the first figure and insert "$1,370,000,000".

On page 49, line 6, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$8,850,000,000".

On page 49, line 17, strike the first figure and insert "$1,895,000,000".

On page 49, line 17, strike the second figure and insert "$469,000,000".

On page 49, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$3,091,000,000".

On page 49, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$1,950,000,000".

On page 49, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$4,170,000,000".

On page 49, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$3,161,000,000".

On page 50, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$882,000,000".

On page 50, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$1,258,000,000".

On page 50, line 7, strike the first figure and insert "$2,034,000,000".

On page 50, line 7, strike the second figure and insert "$2,101,000,000".

On page 50, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$2,594,000,000".

On page 50, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$2,275,000,000".

On page 50, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$858,000,000".

On page 50, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$791,000,000".

On page 50, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$1,332,000,000".

On page 50, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$1,496,000,000".

On page 50, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$1,725,000,000".

On page 50, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$1,987,000,000".

On page 51, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 51, line 7, strike the first figure and insert "$7,600,000,000".

On page 51, line 7, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 51, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$14,456,000,000".

On page 51, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 51, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$21,809,000,000".

On page 51, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$313,500,000,000".

On page 51, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$335,600,000,000".

On page 51, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$360,400,000,000".

On page 52, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$136,700,000,000".

On page 52, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$138,200,000,000".

On page 52, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$143,100,000,000".

On page 54, line 20, strike the figure and insert "8".

DOLE (AND DOMENICI) AMENDMENT NO. 39

Mr. DOLE (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 38 in the nature of a substitute for amendment No. 37 proposed by them to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32), supra; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

On page 2, line B, strike the figure and insert "$736,200,000,000".

On page 2, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$793,600,000,000".

On page 2, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$866,300,000,000".

On page 2, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$955,900,000,000".

On page 2, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 2, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$900,000,000".

On page 2, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".

On page 2, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,400,000,000".

On page 2, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$44,800,000,000".

On page 2, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$51,000,000,000".

On page 2, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$56,100,000,000".

On page 2, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$61,300,000,000".

On page 3, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$186,200,000,000".

On page 3, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$200,700,000,000".

On page 3, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$216,900,000,000".

On page 3, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$248,300,000,000".

On page 3, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$1,055,600,000,000".

On page 3, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$1,076,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$1,139,000,000.000".

On page 3, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$1,216,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$949,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$969,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$1,013,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$1,055,700,000,000".

On page 3, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$212,900,000,000".

On page 3, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$175,400,000,000".

On page 4, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$146,800,000,000".

On page 4, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$99,800,000,000".

On page 4, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$1,849,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$2,088,000,000,000".

On page 4, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$2,316,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$2,529,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$25,500,000,000".

On page 4, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$238,700,000,000".

On page 4, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$228,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$213,100,000,000".

On page 4, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$52,900,000,000".

On page 4, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$69,200,000,000".

On page 4, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$30,000,000,000".

On page 5, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$74,500,000,000".

On page 5, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$27,400,000,000".

On page 5, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$74,400,000,000".

On page 5, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$25,600,000,000".

On page 5, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$79,000,000,000".

On page 5, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 6, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$292,600,000,000".

On page 6, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$252,000,000,000".

On page 6, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$312,800,000,000".

On page 6, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$276,100,000,000".

On page 6, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$334,900,000,000".

On page 6, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$298,400,000,000".

On page 7, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$359,600,000,000".

On page 7, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$321,400,000,000".

On page 7, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$25,300,000,000".

On page 7, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$18,000,000,000".

On page 7, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$11,500,000,000".

On page 7, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$10,300,000,000".

On page 7, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 8, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$21,000,000,000".

On page 8, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$17,800,000,000".

On page 8, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$8,200,000,000".

On page 8, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".

On page 8, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 8, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$20,200,000,000".

On page 8, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$17,100,000,000".

On page 8, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$7,800,000,000".

On page 8, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".

On page 8, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 8, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$20,500,000,000".

On page 8, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$16,600,000,000".

On page 8, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$7,900,000,000".

On page 8, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".

On page 9, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 9, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$9,100,000,000".

On page 9, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".

On page 9, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 9, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 9, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 9, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$8,800,000,000".

On page 9, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".

On page 9, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 9, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 9, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 9, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$9,000,000,000".

On page 9, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$8,800,000,000".

On page 9, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 9, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 10, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 10, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$9,300,000,000".

On page 10, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$9,000,000,000".

On page 10, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 10, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 10, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 10, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$1,600,000,000".

On page 10, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".

On page 10, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 10, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 10, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$5,200,000,000".
On page 10, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$5,100,000,000".
On page 10, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 11, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$4,100,000,000".
On page 11, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$5,200,000,000".
On page 11, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$4,600,000,000".
On page 11, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$1,400,000,000".
On page 11, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$4,900,000,000".
On page 11, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$4,200,000,000".
On page 11, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$1,000,000,000".
On page 11, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$12,700,000,000".
On page 12, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$13,100,000,000".
On page 12, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 12, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$12,100,000,000".
On page 12, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$12,400,000,000".
On page 12, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 12, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$12,500,000,000".
On page 12, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$12,200,000,000".
On page 12, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 12, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$12,700,000,000".
On page 13, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".
On page 13, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$24,800,000,000".
On page 13, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$21,000,000,000".
On page 13, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$13,800,000,000".
On page 13, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$5,700,000,000".
On page 13, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$16,500,000,000".
On page 13, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$13,800,000,000".
On page 13, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$11,700,000,000".
On page 13, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 14, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 14, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$16,400,000,000".
On page 14, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$14,500,000,000".
On page 14, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$10,200,000,000".
On page 14, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 14, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 14, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$13,600,000,000".
On page 14, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$11,500,000,000".
On page 14, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$9,100,000,000".
On page 14, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 14, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 14, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$12,600,000,000".
On page 14, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$5,600,000,000".
On page 15, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 15, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$27,000,000,000".
On page 15, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$7,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$2,600,000,000".
On page 15, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$2,500,000,000".
On page 15, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$25,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,900,000,000".
On page 15, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 15, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$2,500,000,000,".
On page 15, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$26,700,000,000".
On page 15, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 16, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$4,300,000,000".
On page 16, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".
On page 16, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$2,700,000,000".
On page 16, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$28,400,000,000".
On page 16, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 16, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$29,600,000,000".
On page 16, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$26,100,000,000".
On page 16, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 16, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 16, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 16, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$26,600,000,000".
On page 16, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$25,600,000,000".
On page 16, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 16, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 17, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 17, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$27,100,000,000".
On page 17, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$27,000,000,000".
On page 17, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 17, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 17, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 17, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 17, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$26,500,000,000".
On page 17, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 17, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 17, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 17, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$8,400,000,000".
On page 17, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".
On page 18, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 18, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 18, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 18, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$5,400,000,000".
On page 18, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$7,600,000,000".
On page 18, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$800,000,000".
On page 18, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 18, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 18, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On page 18, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$6,800,000,000".
On page 18, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$700,000,000".
On page 18, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 18, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 19, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$6,200,000,000".
On page 19, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$6,200,000,000".
On page 19, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$800,000,000".
On page 19, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 19, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 19, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$31,600,000,000".
On page 19, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$30,300,000,000".
On page 19, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 19, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$8,600,000,000".
On page 19, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 19, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$28,600,000,000".
On page 19, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$29,800,000,000".
On page 19, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".

On page 20, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$8,900,000,000".
On page 20, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$29,400,000,000".
On page 20, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$28,700,000,000".
On page 20, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$9,200,000,000".
On page 20, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$29,800,000,000".
On page 20, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$29,000,000,000".
On page 20, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$9,400,000,000".
On page 20, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$33,600,000,000".
On page 21, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$33,500,000,000".
On page 21, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 21, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$34,900,000,000".
On page 21, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$35,000,000,000".
On page 21, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 21, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$37,100,000,000".
On page 21, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$36,700,000,000".
On page 21, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 21, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$39,200,000,000".
On page 21, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$38,700,000,000".
On page 22, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 22, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$71,800,000,000".
On page 22, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$65,200,000,000".
On page 22, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$81,600,000,000".
On page 22, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$68,000,000,000".
On page 22, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$90,500,000,000".
On page 22, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$74,100,000,000".
On page 23, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$93,300,000,000".
On page 23, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$81,600,000,000".
On page 23, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$162,800,000,000".
On page 23, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$128,600,000,000".
On page 23, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$14,300,000,000".
On page 23, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$156,300,000,000".
On page 24, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$118,100,000,000".
On page 24, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 24, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$166,500,000,000".
On page 24, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$121,900,000,000".
On page 24, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$2,300,000,000".
On page 24, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$174,700,000,000".
On page 24, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$125,600,000,000".
On page 24, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 25, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$195,500,000,000".
On page 25, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$189,300,000,000".
On page 25, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$207,600,000,000".
On page 25, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$197,700,000,000".
On page 25, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$225,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$206,500,000,000".
On page 26, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$266,200,000,000".
On page 26, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$216,100,000,000".
On page 26, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$27,200,000,000".
On page 26, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$1,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$16,800,000,000".
On page 27, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$1,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$15,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$1,200,000,000".
On page 27, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$17,400,000,000".
On page 27, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$26,400,000,000".
On page 27, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,200,000,000".
On page 28, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$20,100,000,000".
On page 28, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$6,600,000,000".
On page 28, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 28, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$6,800,000,000".
On page 28, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$6,700,000,000".
On page 28, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$1,900,000,000".
On page 28, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$6,900,000,000".
On page 28, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 29, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$7,000,000,000".
On page 29, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$7,000,000,000".
On page 29, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On page 29, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On page 29, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On page 29, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On page 29, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$5,400,000,000".
On page 30, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On page 30, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$5,600,000,000".
On page 30, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$5,500,000,000".
On page 30, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 30, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 30, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 31, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 31, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".
On page 31, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$3,200,000,000".
On page 31, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 31, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 31, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$129,700,000,000".
On page 32, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$129,700,000,000".
On page 32, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$142,300,000,000".
On page 32, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$142,300,000,000".
On page 32, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$153,000,000,000".
On page 33, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$153,000,000,000".
On page 33, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$155,200,000,000".
On page 33, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$155,200,000,000".
On page 33, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 33, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 33, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$−1,400,000,000".
On page 34, line 6, strike the figure and insert "−$1,400,000,000".
On page 34, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 14, strike the figure and insert "−$1,200,000,000".
On page 34, line 15, strike the figure and insert "−$1,200,000,000".
On page 34, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 23, strike the figure and insert "−$200,000,000".
On page 34, line 24, strike the figure and insert "−$100,000,000".
On page 34, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 8, strike the figure and insert "−$32,400,000,000".
On page 35, line 9, strike the figure and insert "−$32,400,000,000".
On page 35, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 17, strike the figure and insert "−$35,000,000,000".
On page 35, line 18, strike the figure and insert "−$35,000,000,000".
On page 35, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 2, strike the figure and insert "−$37,800,000,000".
On page 36, line 3, strike the figure and insert "−$37,800,000,000".
On page 36, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 11, strike the figure and insert "−$41,100,000,000".
On page 36, line 12, strike the figure and insert "−$41,100,000,000".
On page 36, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 19, strike the figure and insert "June 30, 1985".
On page 37, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$3,899,000,000".
On page 37, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$4,610,000,000".
On page 37, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$3,773,000,000".
On page 37, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$6,540,000,000".
On page 37, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$4,258,000,000".
On page 37, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$10,326,000,000".
On page 37, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$0".
On page 37, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$376,000,000".
On page 37, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 37, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$894,000,000".
On page 37, line 23, strike the first figure and insert "$0".
On page 37, line 23, strike the second figure and insert "$1,424,000,000".
On page 38, line 10, strike the first figure and insert "$10,122,000,000".
On page 38, line 10, strike the second figure and insert "$4,213,000,000".
On page 38, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$11,353,000,000".
On page 38, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$7,416,000,000".
On page 38, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$12,509,000,000".
On page 38, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$9,566,000,000".
On page 38, line 24, strike the first figure and insert "$2,622,000,000".

On page 38, line 24, strike the second figure and insert "$2,216,000,000".

On page 38, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,416,000,000".

On page 39, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$1,077,000,000".

On page 39, line 2, strike the first figure and insert "$1,633,000,000".

On page 39, line 2, strike the second figure and insert "$1,368,000,000".

On page 39, line 13, strike the first figure and insert "$2,962,000,000".

On page 39, line 13, strike the second figure and insert "$2,253,000,000".

On page 39, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$2,723,000,000".

On page 39, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$2,579,000,000".

On page 39, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$2,720,000,000".

On page 39, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$2,814,000,000".

On page 40, line 2, strike the first figure and insert "$719,000,000".

On page 40, line 2, strike the second figure and insert "$306,000,000".

On page 40, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$1,208,000,000".

On page 40, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$1,451,000,000".

On page 40, line 5, strike the first figure and insert "$1,720,000,000".

On page 40, line 5, strike the second figure and insert "$2,112,000,000".

On page 40, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 40, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$8,117,000,000".

On page 40, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 40, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$18,934,000,000".

On page 40, line 18, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 40, line 18, strike the second figure and insert "$28,137,000,000".

On page 41, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".

On page 41, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$47,000,000".

On page 41, line 5, strike the first figure and insert "$275,000,000".

On page 41, line 5, strike the second figure and insert "$109,000,000".

On page 41, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$282,000,000".

On page 41, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$140,000,000".

On page 41, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$375,000,000".

On page 41, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 41, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,101,000,000".

On page 41, line 18, strike the first figure and insert "$1,325,000,000".

On page 41, line 18, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 41, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$7,332,000,000".

On page 41, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$1,370,000,000".

On page 41, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 41, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$9,097,000,000".

On page 42, line 6, strike the first figure and insert "$3,404,000,000".

On page 42, line 6, strike the second figure and insert "$1,299,000,000".

On page 42, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$3,826,000,000".

On page 42, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$3,446,000,000".

On page 42, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$4,291,000,000".

On page 42, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$4,231,000,000".

On page 42, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$882,0001000".

On page 42, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$1,258,000,000".

On page 42, line 21, strike the first figure and insert "$2,034,000,000".

On page 42, line 21, strike the second figure and insert "$2,101,000,000".

On page 42, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$2,594,000,000".

On page 42, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$2,275,000,000".

On page 42, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$858,000,000".

On page 43, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$791,000,000".

On page 43, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$1,332,000,000".

On page 43, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$1,496,000,000".

On page 43, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$1,725,000,000".

On page 43, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$1,987,000,000".

On page 43, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".

On page 43, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$87,000,000".

On page 43, line 22, strike the first figure and insert "$201,000,000".

On page 43, line 22, strike the second figure and insert "$151,000,000".

On page 43, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$211,000,000".

On page 43, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$181,000,000".

On page 44, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$3,899,000,000".

On page 44, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$4,610,000,000".

On page 44, line 12, strike the first figure and insert "$3,773,000,000".

On page 44, line 12, strike the second figure and insert "$6,540,000,000".

On page 44, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$4,258,000,000".

On page 44, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$10,326,000,000".

On page 44, line 19, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 44, line 19, strike the second figure and insert "$376,000,000".

On page 44, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 44, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$894,000,000".

On page 44, line 22, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 44, line 22, strike the second figure and insert "$1,424,000,000".

On page 45, line 8, strike the first figure and insert "$9,159,000,000".

On page 45, line 8, strike the second figure and insert "$4,028,000,000".

On page 45, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$9,730,000,000".

On page 45, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$6,870,000,000".

On page 45, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$10,379,000,000".

On page 45, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$8,550,000,000".

On page 45, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$2,838,000,000".

On page 45, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$1,316,000,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike the first figure and insert "$3,183,000,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike the second figure and insert "$3,202,000,000".

On page 45, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$3,549,000,000".

On page 45, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$3,865,000,000".

On page 46, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$5,188,000,000".

On page 46, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$8,187,000,000".

On page 46, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$3,871,000,000".

On page 46, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$10,159,000,000".

On page 46, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$3,958,000,000".

On page 46, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$13,539,000,000".

On page 46, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".

On page 46, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$47,000,000".

On page 46, line 25, strike the first figure and insert "$275,000,000".

On page 46, line 25, strike the second figure and insert "$109,000,000".

On page 47, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$282,000,000".

On page 47, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$140,000,000".

On page 47, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 12, strike the first figure and insert "$64,000,000".

On page 47, line 12, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$3,699,000,000".

On page 47, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$5,203,000,000".

On page 47, line 25, strike the first figure and insert "$540,000,000".

On page 47, line 25, strike the second figure and insert "$292,000,000".

On page 48, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$559,000,000".

On page 48, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$402,000,000".

On page 48, line 3, strike the first figure and insert "$634,000,000".

On page 48, line 3, strike the second figure and insert "$526,000,000".

On page 48, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$401,000,000".

On page 48, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$379,000,000".

On page 48, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$293,000,000".

On page 48, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$352,000,000".

On page 48, line 17, strike the first figure and insert "$394,000,000".

On page 48, line 17, strike the second figure and insert "$450,000,000".

On page 49, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$375,000,000".

On page 49, line 3, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 3, strike the second figure and insert "$3,037,000,000".

On page 49, line 4, strike the first figure and insert "$1,325,000,000".

On page 49, line 4, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$7,183,000,000".

On page 49, line 6, strike the first figure and insert "$1,370,000,000".

On page 49, line 6, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$8,850,000,000".

On page 49, line 17, strike the first figure and insert "$1,895,000,000".

On page 49, line 17, strike the second figure and insert "$469,000,000".
On page 49, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$3,091,000,000".
On page 49, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$1,950,000,000".
On page 49, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$4,170,000,000".
On page 49, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$3,161,000,000".
On page 50, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$882,000,000".
On page 50, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$1,258,000,000".
On page 50, line 7, strike the first figure and insert "$2,034,000,000".
On page 50, line 7, strike the second figure and insert "$2,101,000,000".
On page 50, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$2,594,000,000".
On page 50, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$2,275,000,000".
On page 50, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$858,000,000".
On page 50, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$791,000,000".
On page 50, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$1,332,000,000".
On page 50, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$1,496,000,000".
On page 50, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$1,725,000,000".
On page 50, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$1,987,000,000".
On page 51, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 51, line 7, strike the first figure and insert "$7,600,000,000".
On page 51, line 7, strike the second figure and insert "$0".
On page 51, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$14,456,000,000".
On page 51, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$0".
On page 51, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$21,809,000,000".
On page 51, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$313,500,000,000".
On page 51, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$335,600,000,000".
On page 51, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$360,400,000,000".
On page 52, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$136,700,000,000".
On page 52, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$138,200,000,000".
On page 52, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$143,100,000,000".
On page 54, line 20, strike the figure and insert "8".

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate and the public, I am announcing the scheduling of public hearings before the Subcommittee on Energy Regulation and Conservation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

On Tuesday, May 14, 1985, beginning at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, the subcommittee will hold an oversight hearing on automobile fuel economy standards.

On Tuesday, June 4, 1985, beginning at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, the subcommittee will hold an oversight hearing on the impact of imported petroleum products on the domestic petroleum industry.

On Tuesday, June 18, 1985, beginning at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, the subcommittee will hold an oversight hearing on the current state of and the factors affecting the natural gas market.

Those wishing to present oral testimony or submit written statements for the hearing record should write to the Honorable Don Nickles, chairman, Subcommittee on Energy Regulation and Conservation, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510.

You may contact the following committee staff at the above address for further information regarding these hearings: May 14, 1985, hearing on automobile fuel economy standards—Ms. Faye Johnson (202-224-2366); June 4, 1985, hearing on impact of imported petroleum products on the domestic petroleum industry—Ms. Elizabeth Baldwin (202-224-5205); and June 18, 1985, hearing on the current state of and the factors affecting the natural gas market—Ms. Elizabeth Baldwin (202-224-5205).

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the public that the Select Committee on Indian Affairs will hold a markup on S. 277, a bill to reauthorize and amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and for other purposes. The markup will be held on May 2, 1985, commencing at 10 a.m., in room 342 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

Those wishing to obtain additional information should contact Peter S. Taylor, staff director, or Patricia Zell, staff attorney of the committee at 224-2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration may have permission to meet today notwithstanding the fact that the Senate is in session. This request has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

S. 975, THE SECURITIES SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS ACT OF 1985

● Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to join with my distinguished colleague from New Mexico in sponsoring S. 975, the Securities Safety and Soundness Act of 1985. I believe this measure is a necessary step to insure the safety and soundness of our capital markets and banking system. It is not a permanent answer to some of the financing questions that have been raised by the most recent wave of mergers and acquisitions but it does address perhaps the most novel and least understood of these financing techniques.

This measure addresses the issue of junk bonds. These are the high yield, high risk securities we have been hearing so much about lately. Junk bonds are those considered below investment grade by the major bond rating services of Moody's and Standard and Poor's. Because they are not considered to be of investment quality, they carry higher risk and therefore, higher return. I suppose that ones position regarding the use of junk bonds is related to ones views regarding the merger and acquisition phenomena. I happen to believe that merger mania is not in the overall best interest of our country. I am concerned that mergers and acquisitions, especially of a forced nature, divert credit from more useful productive purposes, and result in trauma to many of the vanquished company's stakeholders. The unfortunate results of some mergers have been plant closings, job loses, community disruptions and other unpleasant side effects. In addition, the management of a target company is often forced to divert attention from the normal operations and sacrifice the long-term good of the company for short-term financial considerations. The result is often a tremendous new debt load, swapped for equity, that compromises the long range viability of the firm.

I believe this bill represents a reasoned approach to the issue of junk bond financing of hostile takeover efforts. It does not ban forever the use of junk bonds for this purpose. It only places a moratorium for the remainder of this year where 20 percent of the acquisition is financed by these bonds. This makes sense because we simply do not know very much about junk bonds. We really do not have any track record to go by, especially of their performance during difficult economic periods. To me, this suggests considerable caution. The short period of the moratorium would give us some additional time to look at the junk bond phenomena and evaluate their impact not only on the merger and acquisition question but also the capital markets in general and corporate competitive positions.

The other important feature of the bill would prevent federally insured financial institutions from purchasing these securities for their portfolios. Here again the safety and soundness questions are paramount. We have just experienced a very difficult situation for some institutions in Ohio and given the absolute necessity to maintain confidence in our banking system,

prudence and caution should be our main consideration. This bill will assist in this effort.●

NINETIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMBINED JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES OF GREATER BOSTON

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I wish to recognize and honor the Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston as they celebrate 90 years of service to the community on April 25, 1985.

The Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston stands for a cohesive Jewish community, unified by its concern for the quality of Jewish life at home, in Israel, and around the world.

As first charitable federation in the United States and the acknowledged model for subsequent charities using the "umbrella" concept, this organization is truly a pioneer in providing human welfare and social services to the community.

Today, this organization proudly continues a tradition of service to the Jewish community, assisting in the work of 75 local, national, and overseas agencies.

Annually, volunteers of all ages and backgrounds share their skills and resources, giving untold hours to supporting vital programs and services, fundraising, and planning for the needs of the community.

In the Greater Boston area, the Combined Jewish Philanthropies supports Beth Israel Hospital, the Jewish Memorial Hospital, and the Recuperative Center, all three of which are major health care facilities.

Counseling and support services are provided by the Jewish Family and Children's Service, the Jewish Vocational Service, and the Jewish Big Brother and Sister Association. Many cultural, educational, and recreational activities are enjoyed by thousands each year at branches of three Jewish Community Center.

The Bureau of Jewish Education develops programs, courses, resource materials, and innovative teaching techniques to enrich learning experiences for day and afternoon Hebrew students.

The Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston is a significant force in Jewish life. Over 50 percent of the funds raised annually are channeled abroad through the United Jewish Appeal, and are used for resettlement and absorption of immigrants in Israel and aid dwindling and isolated Jewish communities in Eastern Europe, North Africa, and South America. It is men and women in every walk of life affirming their commitment to the institutions of our Jewish community, and linked by their caring for Jewish people around the world.

I wish to offer my congratulations to the Combined Jewish Philanthropies for their numerous achievements and contributions to the community, and hope that you will join me in celebrating their 90th anniversary of service.●

THE PUCCIO REPORT ON THE WESTWAY HIGHWAY PROJECT

● Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, several weeks ago I was pleased to join Senators PROXMIRE, BRADLEY and LAUTENBERG in the introduction of S. 826, the Westway Landfill Funding Prohibition and Hudson River Habitat Protection Act of 1985. Our bill would prohibit the use of Highway Trust Fund money for the Westway Landfill.

What's the big deal about Westway, anyway? In short, the project could end up being one of the greatest wonders in the less than wonderful world of boondoggles. In order to build a 4-mile interstate highway along the west side of Manhattan, the Westway plan calls for creating more than 220 acres of prime real estate in New York by filling in the Hudson River. Under the plan, 169 acres would be available for development. Estimates for the costs of this incredible project range from $4 billion to $6 billion—a substantial portion of which would come from the Nation's highway trust fund.

There's more—according to the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Westway project could "threaten the survival of the Hudson River population of the striped bass." The striped bass is an important commercial and recreation species which has been in serious decline along the Eastern Seaboard. Stripers have used the existing piers on the west side of Manhattan as nursery grounds. The Westway Landfill threatens to wipe out these grounds and thus put increased stress on up to 50 percent of the striper population along the Eastern Seaboard.

What makes Westway the wrong way is the fact that the State and the city do have alternatives to the project. Specifically, the Federal Highway Administration says that a nonlandfill road could be constructed along the west side for under $1 billion. Or, $1.71 billion in Federal funds which would be used to construct Westway could be traded to construct a nonlandfill highway and to rehabilitate New York's mass transit system.

In 1983, Governor Cuomo of New York commissioned Attorney Thomas Puccio to study the Westway project versus the alternatives. I think the study provides an excellent analysis of the issues involved in the Westway controversy, and I commend it to my colleagues. Today, I am inserting the first half of the report, and on Friday I will insert the second half.

Mr. President, I ask that the first half of the Puccio report on Westway be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

THE PUCCIO REPORT ON WESTWAY

Last July, I agreed to report on the continued viability of the controversial Westway project, in light of a federal District Court Judge's finding that State officials had suppressed important evidence during the approval process. This task proved too burdensome to complete on the sixty-day-period of time originally contemplated. Since taking the assignment, I have devoted considerable time to a review of documents (including briefs, court decisions, correspondence, and newspaper articles concerning Westway), and I have spoken at length with a number of individuals who are in favor of, and opposed to, the project.

Based on the above, I have reached two basic conclusions:

1. Whatever merit the Westway project originally had, it has now become a luxury that the City and State probably cannot afford. Moreover, legal entanglements which continue unresolved to date have put Westway almost out of reach. Accordingly, the valuable trade-in opportunity should be seriously explored before it is too late.

2. The federal District Court findings of deception by state officials makes an investigation by an appropriate state or federal agency a necessary step to restore public confidence in the integrity of the approval process.

BACKGROUND

Westway is a proposed highway/land development project that has been designed to take advantage of Federal funding available under the interstate highway laws. To the extent that Westway expenditures fall within the "interstate highway" definition and subject to the ultimate availability of funds. Westway's costs would be 90% covered by the Federal government, 10% by the State. At present, the State's cost estimate is in the order of $2 billion, though opponents believe that the eventual price would be $4 billion or more.

Westway is styled as a replacement roadway for the old West Side Highway south of 42nd Street. It would not, however, be built in the existing right-of-way (which is adequate to support a modest replacement roadway). Instead, approximately 200 acres of the Hudson River would be landfilled, and the road would be tunneled through this fill (or, for approximately one-third of its length, routed through an open cut in the fill or mounted on an elevated structure above the fill). The area of the fill ranges from the current bulkhead line outward as far as 800 feet to the pierhead line and is generally referred to as the "interpier area." According to the 1977 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Westway, approximately 90 acres of the landfill would be used for parkland, 100 acres would be available for development, and the remaining area would support the highway and its interchanges.

The history of how Westway was developed as a concept and manipulated through the review process is lengthy and need not be repeated here. It is sufficient to note that funding approval was given by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in January 1977: an air quality permit was issued for the project in 1980; and a Corps of Engineers' dredge and fill permit has since been set aside by the U.S. District Court (recently affirmed by the U.S. Court of Appeals), and the matter has been remanded to those agencies for reconsider-

ation after the preparation of a new EIS. The preparation of that EIS is now underway.

THE PRINCIPAL ISSUES

At the center of the Westway debate are two principal issues: first, the allocation of available Federal money to a combined highway real estate project or the alternative use of such funds for transit rehabilitation and other infrastructure improvements, and second, the impact of the highway and potential landfill development on existing communities, especially Greenwich Village. In addition, the District Court trial identified a third issue of substantial importance—i.e., the damage that the landfill might do to important fisheries resources of the Hudson River.

ALLOCATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS

The debate over the allocation of available Federal monies derives from Section 103(e)(4) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, which authorizes the State and City (if they agree) to abandon Westway and use the funds instead for substitute transit and roadway projects. Most Westway opponents are strongly in favor of this "trade-in" alternative, because of the immense infrastructure capital needs that the State and City face. Westway proponents, in contrast, have asserted that the trade-in is illusory and that in any event, Westway represents a "once-in-a-life-time opportunity" which should not be missed.

LAND USE

The "land use" issue has its own history. When Westway was first conceived, the Lower West Side was generally run down as it edged toward the Hudson. As a consequence, Westway was seen as the key to revitalizing this area. Since 1977, however, much of the Lower West Side has renewed itself through new construction and accelerated conversions. Thus, today, the residential communities in the Village and Tribeca, as well as in Lower Manhattan, already extend to West Street, and Westway has become something of an anachronism in this regard. Instead, for many community residents, Westway has become a spectre, since the landfill development could serve to cut them off from the Hudson. In addition, if the development should end up being luxury housing, the pressures on rentals (as well as co-op and condominium prices) in the existing upland neighborhoods could be severe.

IMPACT ON FISHERIES

Finally, the potential fisheries impacts have become a matter of concern to the groups who have been concerned with protecting the Hudson over the past 20 years. In this construction, the species of fish the most severely affected appears to be the striped bass, which has great commercial and sports value not only in the Hudson, but also on the north and south shores of Long Island, all the way to Montauk. The striped bass has been at the center of power plant controversies on the Hudson for many years and was probably the key factor in defeating Con Edison's proposal to build a pumped storage plant at Storm King Mountain. For the groups involved in that and other Hudson River controversies (including sports and commercial fishing interests), the idea that Westway could (to quote the National Marine Fisheries Service) "threaten the survival of the Hudson River population of striped bass" is a matter of deep concern.

THE CURRENT STATUS OF WESTWAY AND THE LIGIGATION

When the U.S. District Court set aside the Corps and FHWA approvals of Westway, Judge Griesa directed the preparation of a revised EIS on the fisheries impacts and reconsideration by both the Corps and FHWA, based on that revised EIS. Pending such reconsideration, the Court enjoined all major construction connected with Westway and most other substantial expenditures. As a result of that decision and injunction (which was affirmed by the U.S. Court of Appeals on February 25, 1983), major work on Westway has been brought to a halt.

In issuing its decision and injunction, the District Court found that the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT), as well as FHWA, had acted in bad faith and conspired to conceal critical new information on potential fisheries impacts. As a consequence of these findings (which were also affirmed by the Court of Appeals), the District Court made specific in its injunction the further steps that the Corps was bound to follow on the remand. Central among these was the obligation that the Corps act independently of, and not defer to, NYSDOT in shaping its decision. In addition, the Corps was explicitly instructed to consult with, and give great weight to the views of, the expert Federal fisheries agencies in deciding what additional field studies, if any, were to be undertaken.

CORPS' RECENT BEHAVIOR

Following the Court decision, the Corps began to gear up to prepare a revised EIS, and in that connection initiated a systematic inquiry into the need for additional studies. This led in August 1982 to a recommendation by the Corps' own consultants that further field studies be undertaken. Subsequently, in October, an expert panel assembled by the Corps concluded that two winters of additional work were needed and that the studies must be carried out independent of NYSDOT and its consultants. These judgements were, in turn, endorsed by each of the Federal fisheries agencies. However, when the State objected to doing such studies, the Corps abandoned the position which its expert consultants had taken and simply accepted what the State offered (which was a single winter of local sampling). Furthermore, despite the specific terms of the injunction that the Corps conduct its own independent evaluation, and despite the explicit recommendations of the expert panel that any studies be carried out independent of NYSDOT consultants, the Corps is apparently using NYSDOT—and the same NYSDOT consultants whom the District Court found to have misrepresented the earlier fisheries results—to carry out the future field work. Beyond this, the studies now being undertaken were commissioned without consultation with the Federal fisheries agencies.

In view of the preceding conduct (which is virtually a repetition of the 1980-81 activities that the District Court found unacceptable), the plaintiffs have moved to hold the Corps and NYSDOT in contempt. Judge Griesa, for his part, has made his concern quite clear and has scheduled court proceedings which are now ongoing. If the Corps and/or the State are held in contempt, the EIS process will have to start over and two winters of additional field work will eventually have to be undertaken.

TIMETABLE

This, of course, is not in accord with the State's timetable. To the contrary. Shortly before the contempt motion was filed, the State was reported as expecting a revised draft EIS to be available by April. This has not happened; but even if a draft was forthcoming soon, in light of the conduct described above, it would very likely be found defective by Judge Griesa. Accordingly, it is unlikely that an adequate EIS will be issued in 1983. If this happens, and taking account of time required for further judicial review, it is unlikely that major Westway work could resume before 1985, even if the outcome of the review process were favorable to the project.

"NO POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES?"

In the last connection, one other point should be recognized: there may well be an insuperable substantive obstacle to Westway: Specifically, under the Clean Water Act, the foiling of "special aquatic habitat" can only be permitted under extraordinary circumstances, where there are no possible alternatives. If, as the 1979-80 fisheries data appear to show, the interpier area is an important winter nursery for young striped bass and other fish, it will qualify as a "special aquatic habitat;" and since there are clearly alternatives to Westway (even if some people deem them less desirable), then under the applicable law, the Corps will not be able to issue a landfill permit. The likelihood of this outcome is all the greater because the Federal fisheries agencies continue to oppose the landfill permit; and as recently emphasized by the Court of Appeals in affirming Judge Griesa, the Corps must give "great weight" to these views. The Corps will not meet that test if, as in the last time around, if simply ignores the negative recommendations of the agencies.

In summary, the legal proceedings surrounding Westway are likely to stretch out many months, if not many years; and while it would be foolish to contend that a permit could never be issued, the obstacles are substantial and any authorization to proceed is uncertain at best.

THE TRADE-IN ALTERNATIVE

The alternative to Westway deserving the most serious consideration is the "trade-in" of Westway, and the use of Westway funds for a substitute replacement road, combined with transit and other infrastructure improvements.

The trade-in requires as a first step that the Governor and the Mayor join together to request that Westway be withdrawn as an interstate route and that the funds required to complete it (as set out in the most recent interstate cost estimate) be made available instead for substitute transit and roadway projects. The request is made to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation. To date, every such request made to the Secretary (now totalling nearly 30) has been approved, and there is no reason to believe that the result would be different with Westway. To the contrary, every recent Secretary of Transportation has indicated that if a Westway trade-in request were made, it would be approved.

Once the trade-in was effected, an "account" to the benefit of the City and State would be established in Washington, against which substitute transit and roadway projects would be authorized. The value of that account, based on current cost estimates, would be approximately $1.5 billion. (These funds require a 15% local match whether used for transit or roads.)

An initial allocation from the trade-in funds would be required to complete and

improve the substitute roadway link between 42nd Street and the Battery. The State has already removed most of the old overhead structures, and an interim road has been developed which provides a reasonable, if sometimes congested, vehicle route down the West Side. Significant improvements, however, may be possible with trade-in funds. For example, according to one view, within the 260-foot right-of-way that exists today, the roadway could be relocated eastward to permit the construction of a border park; a pedestrian overpass could be provided to facilitate access to the waterfront; turning lanes could be added to smooth the flow of traffic; intersections could be reduced in number to alleviate congestion; and, in general, a first-rate surface arterial could be developed to carry both auto and truck traffic along the West Side corridor. While the resulting roadway would not have the capacity of Westway, the speed differential would be small, involving, at most, five to ten minutes of additional driving time in a rush hour setting.

FUNDS FOR OTHER BOROUGHS

To reconstruct such a replacement road, including associated rehabilitation of the waterfront, the allocation of $100 million of the trade-in funds would undoubtedly be more than sufficient. The remaining trade-in funds, totalling approximately $1.4 million (plus the State share of approximately $200 million), would then be available for transit rehabilitation and bridge, road and related infrastructure repairs and improvements. These funds could be used, moreover, not only in Manhattan, but also to the benefit of the outlaying boroughs and, the general metropolitan area. For example, subway improvements could be financed in the Bronx, Brooklyn and Queens, as well as in Manhattan; funds might be used to purchase new buses for Staten Island; interborough bridges could be rehabilitated; and roadways could be repaired in diverse sections of the metropolitan area. In short, while the bulk of the funds would presumably be spent in Manhattan, trade-in offers options that could provide much broader benefits.[1]

The trade-in funds would be a major and critical source of the money needed to buoy up failing capital infrastructure. Even with the MTA's expanded 10-year program, for example, there are substantial shortfalls of transit capital funds; and the problem is equally serious in connection with bridges and roads. Furthermore, the allocation of trade-in funds to transit rehabilitation would avoid the need for up to $1 billion of borrowed capital and the resultant interest charges. This could save 10 cents to 20 cents in terms of the fare.

SURER FUNDING FOR TRADE-IN

Recent changes in the Federal Highway laws have increased the attractiveness of trade-in, in certain respects. In particular trade-ins for substitute roadway projects (including bridges) will now be funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, rather than being dependent on annual appropriations from the General Fund. This should provide somewhat greater assurance of receiving such funds in a timely way (at least as great assurance as for Westway itself) and will also relieve to some degree the annual competition for transit trade-in funds. The latter have been tentatively set at between $365 million and $400 million annually for the next four years—a relatively low sum which could, however, be increased. In any event it has been estimated that if Westway were traded-in, New York could obtain at least $100 million a year for transit, based on the current authorization level. That would be a substantial amount in its own right.

The preceding discussion assumes that the trade-in funds would be drawn down within the context of the current law. However, this need not be the case. If a decision were made to trade-in, it is possible (if not probable) that a deal could be negotiated with the Federal government that would be more advantageous than the scenario described above. For example, a regularized flow of Federal funds (perhaps $200 million a year over 10 years) might be effectively guaranteed, allowing the State to issue its own bonds, backed entirely by the flow of Federal funds. This would allow major repair work to proceed immediately and in an expansive way—all at the time when it is needed most. Such a program could also generate large numbers of current jobs, equal to or even greater than could Westway.

Based on experience in Boston, Chicago and Washington itself, it is apparent that the State of New York can make a deal with the Federal government to assure that trade-in works. Up to now neither the State nor the City has been prepared to negotiate; and so long as they remain unwilling to do so, they will be inclined to assert that trade-in does not work. However, it does, as the elections by other cities and states have shown; and in my view, there is little doubt that it will work in the case of Westway; if the City and State make that election and follow it through.●

[1] It is also worth noting that the trade-in would benefit the poor to a far greater extent than Westway, since the less affluent are heavily dependent on the subway and bus system.

NINTH ANNUAL SWEET POTATO AFFAIR

● Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the golden sunshine of spring calls to mind that most nutritious of foods—the delicious golden yam. Today, April 25, we are observing the ninth annual "Sweet Potato Affair," to celebrate the flavor and nutritional value of this excellent vegetable.

Our Nation is enjoying an upsurge of attention to our health and physical condition. We've learned that the kinds and amounts of food we eat can have a definite effect on our well-being.

In fact, the National Academy of Sciences recently came up with a number of suggestions on how our diet can affect our susceptibility of several diseases, including cancer. One of the recommendations was that we eat more fruits and vegetables rich in vitamins A and C.

These new facts make our annual "Yam Day," with its goal of encouraging greater consumption of the Nation's sweet potatoes, even more worthwhile. One sweet potato proudly claims 9,230 units of vitamin A, a greater portion than almost any other comparable food.

The yam is a natural way to satisfy our sweet tooth without adding sugar, and without gaining weight. A medium-sized sweet potato adds only 82 calories to a meal.

Bake them, mash them or—for an occasional treat—serve them candied. Sweet potatoes are especially good with poultry and pork, and don't forget that southern favorite, sweet potato pie.

Because we have such a plentiful yam harvest, the Government uses large amounts of sweet potatoes in its food programs for the military and for schoolchildren. Since major concern of these programs is to provide foods with a high nutritional value and a tasty flavor, the Louisiana yam is custom made. Yams have three great characteristics that make them ideal for Government feeding programs: They are extremely nutritious, they are very very versatile and can be prepared in many different ways, and they have a natural sweet taste that people—especially children—enjoy.

I encourage the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense to continue and increase their purchases of sweet potatoes, and hope that purchasing decisions will be made as early as possible to assist production planning.●

ORTEGA SHOWS HIS COLORS: PLANS VISIT TO MOSCOW

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. President, although the Senate has completed its debate over funding of the Contras for the moment, the debate over the character of the Sandinista government in Nicaragua and what U.S. policy should be, will continue.

Ironically, the question of how closely the Sandinistas are working with the Soviet Union was clarified in today's New York Times, 1 day after congressional consideration of funding for the Contras. In an article, "Sandinista Leader Says He Plans to Visit Moscow Soon to Seek Aid," the Times indicates just how little good congressional rejection of military funding of the Contras has done for easing Nicaragua's tilt toward Moscow.

Mr. President, it is essential that Congress understand just how closely the fate of the Sandinistas is tied to continued Soviet military and economic aid. I ask that the full text of the New York Times article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 25, 1985]

SANDINISTA LEADER SAYS HE PLANS TO VISIT MOSCOW SOON TO SEEK AID

(By Stephen Kinzer)

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA, April 23.—President Daniel Ortega Saavedra said today that he would visit Moscow at the end of this month to discuss economic assistance.

"We are visiting the Soviet Union to make proposals, naturally in the area of economics," he said, "to try to recover a little of what the United States has denied us."

Mr. Ortega also said he was pleased with the Congressional rejection of President Reagan's proposal for continued aid to insurgents fighting the Sandinista Government, but he insisted that the United States further ease pressure on his Government.

A leader of the domestic political opposition, Luis Rivas Leiva of the Social Democratic Party, said that with the Administration request defeated, "the Sandinistas should live up to the commitments they made to the Congressmen who came to our country." Several members of Congress who met President Ortega this month reported that he had indicated he would respond to an aid cutoff with a favorable gesture to the domestic opposition.

VISIT TO ARCHBISHOP

In what was viewed as a conciliatory gesture, President Ortega today called on Archbishop Miguel Obando y Bravo and congratulated him on being elevated to the rank of Cardinal. The Archbishop, whose elevation was annnounced in Rome today, has been a harsh critic of the Sandinistas.

Mr. Ortega said the Congressional votes on Tuesday represented "a favorable gesture the could help the search for a peaceful solution," but he noted that many members of Congress had voted in favor of the Administration's proposals, and he said Congress could only affect part of American foreign policy.

SENATOR OBJECTS TO TRIP

(By Shirley Christian)

WASHINGTON, April 24.—A United States senator who voted against President Reagan's request for aid to the rebels said today that he would have voted in favor had he known of Mr. Ortega's planned trip.

Senator Jim Sasser, a Tennessee Democrat, said it was "an ill-timed and ill-advised trip which I think only serves to underscore the growing East-West conflict in Central America." He added: "I think for him to be going to the Soviet Union at this time, just when the Administration is beginning to show some flexibility as the result of pressures from Congress, indicates that the Sandinista leader is either naive, incompetent or not as committed to negotiations as recent statements would indicate."

In another development, three Nicaraguan opposition leaders issued a news release today in which they urged the Congress to channel any aid through the United States Agency for International Development, not through the Red Cross or the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

They said aid through the private organizations would "in effect be used to neutralize and disperse the movement of the Democratic Resistance in Nicaragua" while aid through the government agency would "signal to the world that the U.S. Congress believes our cause has justice."

The statement carried the names of Arturo Cruz, a leading civilian opposition leader; Adolfo Calero, leader of the Nicaragauan Democratic Force, a rebel group, and Alfonso Robelo Callejas, a leader of the other principal rebel group, the Democratic Revolutionary Alliance.

President Ortega and other leaders of the governing Sandinista Front have made numerous trips to the Soviet Union since coming to power in July 1979. The trips first resulted in agreements on trade and economic cooperation, then the establishment of relations between the Soviet Communist Party and the Sandinista Front, then military assistance.●

THE ABORTED CHILD

● Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we all know that a child is sentient at the moment of its birth. It is clear from this that the child's sensitivity to light, temperature, sound and pain were developed while the child was still residing within the womb. It is simply logical that otherwise the capacity would not be present at birth. We also know that a fetal surgeon must anesthetize his tiny patient in order to perform surgery. Despite such obvious acknowledgments of fetal pain, we still hear the matter disputed.

We read in "The Development of the Brain, Biological and Functional Perspectives," by Reinis and Goldman, that

The sensory nerves approach the skin of the fetus in the 8th week [gestation] and are in contact with it by the following week * * *. The sensitivity to pressure or contact develops in a cephalocaudal direction from the lips downward. Thus, lip tactile reflex responses may be evoked by the end of the 7th week. By 10.5 weeks, the palms of the hands are responsive to light stroking with a hair, and at 11 weeks, the face and all parts of the upper and lower extremities are sensitive to touch. By 13.5 to 14 weeks, the entire body surface, except for the back and top of the head, is sensitive to pain.

Although we have regulations for the humane disposition of animals, we do nothing for the child in the womb. In abortion, these developing infants are subjected to dismemberment, saline burning, and other cruel procedures. Late-term abortions often produce the "dreaded complication"—a living aborted child. What if, right now, every legislator in America was handed a gasping, living aborted child at his desk? To answer this, let me simply quote from Paul R. Gastonguay's article "Abortion and Law":

Abortion does not merely deal with a mother; it must also deal with the ridding of the aborted child, the occasional piecemeal removal of fetal arms and legs, the drowning of a kicking fetus in a pail of water. If such thoughts are repulsive, as I certainly hope they would be, then surely the whole concept of abortion must be. This is what we are talking about: a bloody, gasping, kicking fetus which any legislator in his right mind would immediately attempt to wash and console.

Mr. President, I ask that two articles, "Unborn Clearly Feel Pain," by Dr. Steven R. Zielinski, and "Pro-Choice Movement Aided by Ignorance," by columnist James Edwards, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the National Right to Life News, Feb. 28, 1985]

UNBORN CLEARLY FEEL PAIN

(By Steve Zielinski, M.D.)

Recent efforts of the pro-abortion lobby to deny the horror of the abortion procedure are not unlike those old magic tricks once popularized by Houdini. Everyone remembers the fascination they spawned. A person was put inside a cabinet and long sharp knives were put in on all sides, and, when the knives were removed, voila!, the person was no longer there!

The response of such pro-abortion stalwarts as Judy Goldsmith to Bernard Nathanson's firm, "The Silent Scream," shows just how dangerous and devious those "old tricks" can be.

The magician's art is to distract your attention from what is occurring before your very eyes. Goldsmith does the same. She claims the film is a sham; too emotional and inaccurate. She is wrong on both counts.

How is one to avoid emotion when a human "lifeform" (dare we say a "human being?") is being torn limb from limb? Of course the abortion evokes emotions. A human being is being torn apart.

In "The Silent Scream," we have within our grasp the means to convert hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of individuals who have been riding the fence on the abortion issue. With their claims of "inaccuracy," the abortion promoters are even now, through the media, trying to create a dust storm to cloud the vision of the viewing public. We must be able to clear away that dust with a few simple answers to the obvious questions and objections.

Do unborn children really scream? Doubtful. Even if they did you couldn't hear any sound travel through the fluid environment of the womb. Do they look like they are screaming during the abortion? The answer is open to interpretation. I'd say yes, but then I think unborn children are people. Those who think unborn children are clumps of tissue can rationalize and say "clumps of tissue don't scream." However, the critical question is, are the previous two questions relevant at all? The answer is a resounding, No!

If one were to decide to beat a dog, would the dog have to cry out and whine before there could be any assurance that the dog's agonizing writhing and efforts to avoid and escape punishment were evidence enough for the pain and distress being suffered?

The womb cloaks unborn children in silence. Since they cannot talk to us and cannot scream or cry, how can we tell whether they experience pain? We must compare their physical activity and capacity with that of those we know can feel pain. Specialists in the nervous system tell us there is a basic difference between an "aversive," or whole body response to something that would normally be painful (a "noxious stimulus"), and a mere "reflex" of the affected body part, like a hand that instinctively pulls away from a hot stove.

A reflex response only goes to the spinal cord and back to the affected limb. Full body aversive responses only come about as a result of activities of the central nervous system—the brain—usually at the level of something called the thalamus.

In noncommunicative human subjects, as well as in dogs and other animals, the "aversive response to a noxious stimulus" is the accepted standard by which the presence of pain is determined.

Kathyrn Moseley, a prominent pediatrician and neonatologist from St. Louis, states in an affidavit in the case of *Keith* v. *Daley* that "Infants born between 18 and 24 weeks gestation who have come under my care demonstrate aversive responses to noxious stimuli similar to those seen in infants of later gestational ages. Such responses, and similar responses indicative of discomfort in the newborn subjected to noxious stimuli are interpreted by the neonatologist as pain and treated accordingly."

It is certainly not unreasonable to assume such activities occur in the womb prior to birth among unborn children of the same gestational age. But "The Silent Scream" gives us evidence this occurs even earlier into pregnancy. The pathetic attempts of the 12 week unborn child to escape a suction abortion graphically demonstrate the full body's attempt to avoid destruction, and thus the presence of fetal pain.

Critics of this sort of analysis claim the fetus does not feel pain the way others do, largely because unborn children possess no memory by which to compare the pain and no sense of past or future. They also point out that unborn children lack "significant cortical development." The cortex is the largest portion of the brain, the portion that sits on top of all the other structures, and is responsible for logical thinking and interpretation of sensory information.

The first of these arguments is absurd. It may be true that the unborn child has nothing to compare to the pain of abortion, if she or he has—as some claim—no memory. But if one cannot experience pain without first relating it to a memory of prior pain, how could one ever have experienced the prior pain? The first time a child puts her hand on a hot stove, the pain is real (the burn certainly is real enough) and the lack of memory of a similar pain does not keep the child from crying.

What of the second argument: does the cortex play an important part in the perception of pain? Does the absence of a fully functioning cortex in the unborn child mean pain is not possible?

The medical literature indicates that while the cortex may modulate the response to pain, it is by no means essential in order to experience it. Many textbooks of neurology and physiology point out that there is little evidence that pain information even reaches the sensory cortex in normal adults. The critical structure for the sensation and response to painful stimuli is the thalamus, a small center of nerve interconnections at the base of the brain.

It is not necessary to read advanced medical textbooks to learn this information, you just have to read Time magazine. (An article on "The Mechanism of Pain" was the lead story in a June 1984 issue of Time.) We know that the unborn has a functioning thalamus by 9 weeks gestation.

However, the importance of the cortex should not be ignored; it is essential for sapient adults to use the logical thinking functions of the cortex to realize the basic injustice of abortion.

The third objection Goldsmith and her cohorts make to the claim of fetal pain just doesn't make sense. Again and again, they dismiss fetal movements in response to painful stimuli as mere "reflexes." But those who use their cortex know that the limb does not control the body and that sensation of noxious stimuli in one limb should not cause the other limbs to try to get away from the stimulus as we see in The Silent Scream.

That horrible little drama we see during an ultrasound abortion is not a single isolated event. While we may see it only once, the human tragedy is replayed again and again, thousands of times a day. Normal human beings who see the film cannot help but identify with that helpless solitary voyager—soon to be terrorized and tortured.

When the "old tricks" of the abortion promoters are finally put back in the magician's chest, and viewers can respond—in their minds and in their hearts—to what abortion really is, then there will truly be a public scream—a scream of outrage and horror. But, as legislators and judges will come to know, that scream will not be silent.

[From the Manchester Union Leader (NH), Mar. 28, 1985]

PRO-CHOICE MOVEMENT AIDED BY IGNORANCE

(By James Edwards)

Prodded by an indignant pro-choice faction, the authorities in Pensacola, Fla., spent much of last week scurrying around trying to find out whether any laws were broken by a pro-life activist who displayed an aborted 20-week-old fetus during a television interview.

They should have asked me—I could have saved them the effort.

There are no laws existing in any of these United States regarding the disposition or disposal of fetuses.

Most fetuses—and there is an abundant supply of them—are incinerated. Smaller ones are frequently flushed into the sewer system. Others are stored in jars of formaldehyde, rather like surplus garden produce pickled for use in the off-season. Pickled fetuses are sold for use in medical research or commerce.

Some clinics and hospitals put fetuses out with the trash. Last May, United Press International reported on a Mother's Day ceremony in Dallas involving the mass burial of 1,000 fetuses recovered from a dumpster in an alley behind an abortion clinic.

Also in 1984, stray dogs sniffing around a dump in Kansas City, Mo., began tearing open garbage sacks full of fetuses. The same thing happened in Richmond, Va., where plastic bags containing fetuses were pulled by dogs from a trash compactor. After the animals had eaten their fill, the site was littered with the bones of babies. Photographs of the grisly scene were widely disseminated by pro-life forces, much to the distress and indignation of the pro-choice movement.

It's not that the pro-choice crowd really cares what happens to the fetuses after they have been killed. If, as they claim, fetuses are inhuman, then it matters little how they are disposed of after death. Right?

No, the reason they get so uptight when confronted by images of dead fetuses is that they don't want the general public to get a glimpse of their handiwork.

Take this Pensacola case. As soon as John Burt, a local pro-life activist, began unwrapping a fetus on camera, the newscaster who was conducting the live interview signalled frantically for the scene to be taken off camera.

Why the panic? In pursuit of an answer, I called station WEAR and asked to speak to Becky Ozburn, the newscaster who had pulled the plug on John Burt. Ms. Osburn was unavailable for comment, but Renee Lewis, another anchorwoman, explained that Burt's action had threatened to turn the interview into "a circus." She added something to the effect that many viewers were eating their dinner at the time and that she assumed their appetites had been spoiled by the sight of the "grey-colored" fetus.

It seems she was right. Both WEAR and the Escambia County Sheriff's Department received some "pretty indignant" phone calls from viewers who had gotten a disturbing glimpse of the fetus.

Interestingly enough, not all the callers were pro-choice. Some said they had open minds on the abortion issue, others said they sympathized with the pro-life viewpoint; virtually all of them, however, denounced Burt's action.

"They thought it was—well—inappropriate," a sheriffs department spokesman told me, adding that several callers wondered if Burt had left himself open to prosecution.

The question is significant because it shows how confused many people are about abortion. For example, the tiny body which was shown briefly on WEAR was so demonstrably human that it prompted a flood of phone calls from irate viewers demanding that legal action be taken against the person who was walking around with a corpse in his possession. Paradoxically, however, some of those outraged callers identified themselves as being pro-choice supporters, which meant that—at least theoretically—they subscribed to the argument that abortion does not involve the taking of human life.

This confusion and ignorance on the part of the general public is clearly in the best interests of the pro-choice movement, which is locked in a kind of public relations battle with the pro-lifers for the hearts and minds of the American people.

The pro-choice set would have Americans believe that abortion involves nothing more than flushing formless blobs of fetal matter out of the womb. In many instances it does. But in too many cases it involves the aborting of second and third-trimester fetuses—such as the one which so upset the WEAR viewers. That such "viable" fetuses experience pain when being aborted is no longer open to debate. According to numerous medical experts—including two past presidents of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists—it is patently absurd to suggest that fetuses with fully developed nervous systems are immune to pain.

The unmistakable humanity of such late-stage fetuses is the reason why the pro-choice faction gets so jittery when somebody like John Burt attempts to jolt society into an awareness of what abortion actually involves. Thus far, the pro-choice movement—aided by powerful allies in the media—has been able to keep the public largely in the dark about abortion. People like John Burt are dying to bring some light to bear on the subject. If, in so doing, they are accused of resorting to bizarre and even tasteless tactics, then that is the price they are willing to pay in defense of the living but unborn.●

DEFENSE CONTRACT ABUSES

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, for several years now, there has been a repetitious disclosing of malpractice, bad practice and just plain dumb practice by corporations selling military equipment to our government. I, first, have to commend the Members of this body, like Senator GRASSLEY and Senator ROTH, who have been pursuing these mistakes and, as I have pointed out, as long as they stick to that approach, I am all with them and wish them luck.

Now, what has been happening? Two stories, appearing in this morning's edition of USA Today, show real progress. One article by John Fisher, who is president of the American Security Council, points out the great ad-

vances being made by the Navy, and I can report, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that every other service has the same type of operation going now, although they are not as fully or as completely developed as the Navy's.

The other article, by Joseph Sherick, who is inspector general for the Defense Department, points out the great number of people that he has employed under his command to get at the bottom of these abuses whenever they are disclosed or even when they are not disclosed, which is more important.

When I became chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I said that my aim in the Senate would be to get "more bang for the buck," and doing that will mean a lot of work in this field of getting all contractors to toe the line.

I have to say to my colleagues and friends that, while there have been abuses, they have been practiced by a relatively small percentage of the total contractors. Most of them operate in a proper manner, but the few who haven't are being brought to "court" by Secretary Weinberger and by the separate services, themselves.

To indicate the interest of the Armed Services Committee in this, I asked the committee this year to establish a Subcommittee on Defense Acquisition Policy. Chaired by Senator QUAYLE, and with Senator LEVIN as the ranking minority member, the subcommittee has done an outstanding job of investigating procurement policy questions. The Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1986, which will be reported to the Senate in a few days, includes thoughtful provisions reflecting this excellent work.

In addition, other members of our committee have had a strong interest in these matters. Senator GRAMM is the author of the Defense Efficiency and Economy Act of 1985, which was adopted by the committee. That proposal not only addresses some very important procurement problems, but also takes important steps toward saving the American taxpayer hundreds of millions of dollars by changing long-standing congressionally imposed waste in such areas as contracting out, base closings, and wage scale calculation on defense construction contracts. I hope that the Senate will support all these proposals when our authorization bill comes to the floor.

I ask that the two articles I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

THE ABUSE IS RARE; PENTAGON'S FINDING IT

(By John M. Fisher)

BOSTON, VA.—Any mismanagement or waste by defense contractors is taken very seriously by all of us who are involved in national security.

We will not excuse any firm that does not implement the numerous reforms initiated by Secretary Caspar Weinberger, but we also feel the public has to recognize that major change is occurring.

Navy Secretary John Lehman has in fact already announced that 40 percent of the new commissions for flag-rank officers in the Navy will be reserved for those who have a background in procurement.

The numerous stories about overpriced spare parts have seriously hampered the president's efforts to rearm the USA. Anti-defense lawmakers have had a field day with their charges that defense contractors are selling $7,600 coffee makers and $436 hammers to the Pentagon.

The public can clearly understand these stories, but they lose sight of the fact that there are 13 million contract actions each year at the Pentagon. In addition, the Defense Department operates on such a large scale that any mistake involves eyebrow-raising sums.

Anti-defense lawmakers and the news media usually do not mention that these "revelations" were first uncovered by the Defense Department and the industry itself. The department has completely overhauled the procurement process, and most of the charges being made against the defense industry must be labeled as cheap shots.

We recognize that there are sincere individuals who are concerned about military reform. But, unfortunately, far too many people are taking information out of context and using it to smear the Defense Department and the defense industry in an attempt to force cuts in the defense budget.

The great majority of these controversial contracts were initiated in previous administrations. And, in fact, the Pentagon never paid for those $436 hammers. It simply told the manufacturer to give the government a refund, or that firm would not be doing business with the Pentagon in the future.

In the current budget debate, we cannot lose sight of the strategic importance of our defense industry. Meaningful reforms have already been implemented in the defense procurement process, and Weinberger has significantly increased the number of contracts that are open to competitive bidding. We are all very concerned about the charges that relate to overpricing, but it must be recognized that these abuses have occurred in only a very small percentage of contracts.

Our national security has suffered from decades of neglect, and it would be tragic if these sensational charges derailed the president's modernization program.

The defense industry has served the USA well, and it deserves to be called the "arsenal of democracy."

NEW WEAPONS TO COMBAT FRAUD

(By Joseph H. Sherick)

WASHINGTON.—In the year ended Sept. 30, the Department of Defense placed 15 million contracts worth $146 billion involving over 60,000 prime contractors and hundreds of thousands of other suppliers and subcontractors.

The department's internal audit organizations issued over 18,000 reports with potential monetary benefits of over $2.7 billion. They issued over 61,000 audit reports with net savings of over $7.4 billion.

There are 750 fraud-trained criminal investigators in the department. We have recommended adding 400 more.

We have conducted 15 five-day fraud training seminars, which have provided advanced training to over 500 Defense criminal investigators.

We have prepared a handbook on contract fraud indicators, which has been distributed to 50,000 procurement, audit, and investigative personnel.

My office has also conducted over 375 fraud training sessions for 18,000 procurement personnel—in addition to 6,400 fraud training sessions provided to 240,000 Defense management officials by criminal investigators assigned to the military departments.

We have developed training materials to be used by trade associations and contractors to assist in identifying for their members and employees the types of procurement fraud that will be investigated and prosecuted by the government.

The department has the right to protect itself from contractors who cannot adequately demonstrate their responsibility as government contractors. In 1984, the department suspended or barred 454 contractors, compared with 79 in 1980.

Generally, I believe the government is in a much more capable position to deal with procurement fraud in the Department of Defense than it was two years ago.

Working with the Department of Justice and the FBI, we have increased investigative and prosecutive resources, improved referral procedures, provided enhanced levels of training, developed more significant investigations, and seen an increase in the number of indictments and convictions.

For example, in fiscal year 1982, the Department of Defense obtained 27 indictments and 102 convictions. In fiscal year 1984, we obtained 174 indictments and 181 convictions.●

ON THE PLIGHT OF SOVIET JEWS AND TRENDS IN SOVIET DISSENT

● Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the past several weeks, I have attempted to keep my colleagues aware of the conditions in Soviet-controlled Afghanistan through the insertion of various journalistic pieces in the RECORD. The tragic plight of the Afghan people under Soviet Russian tyranny is a cause to which I am committed. I will continue to press the case for greater public awareness of this tragedy, and I hope that many of my colleagues will join me.

Today, however, I wish to turn my attention, and the attention of this body, to the plight of another group of human beings who suffer under relentless Soviet repression. I am speaking of the campaign of persecution, both official and informal, against Soviet Jews and the community of dissidents in the Soviet Union. Their only crime is that they continue to speak out for such basic causes as self-determination, freedom of religion, and the right of emigration. These, of course, are not the only reasons for which the KGB and other organs of "state security" have seen fit to intimidate, humiliate, and persecute these defenseless segments of the population. But they are such fundamental human rights as to highlight the degree of repression which exists within the Soviet Union.

Indeed, it is all too evident that repression within the Soviet Union has increased drastically over the last several years. It was not too long ago that many in the West were debating whether Yuri Andropov's appreciation of Western jazz would make him a less implacable Soviet dictator; meanwhile, former KGB-Chief Andropov wasted no time in rounding up the dissident community for imprisonment and exile, and reduced the level of emigration of Soviet Jews from a trickle to a virtual halt. Such has been the effect of "Westernization" upon Soviet leaders. We can only guess as to what effect this acculturation has had upon Mr. Andropov's protege and successor, Mikhail Gorbachev, and those with whom he has recently surrounded himself.

Mr. President, I hope that I speak for this entire body when I say that I am appalled and disgusted by this vicious campaign of intolerance and repression. I could go on for hours on end in enunciating the crimes which the Soviet Government has perpetrated upon the harmless community of dissidents and Soviet Jews, particularly the refuseniks, who are at the same time mercilessly persecuted and cruelly refused permission to leave.

In fact, the record of Soviet official conduct speaks for itself. By the record, I mean the facts compiled in the staff report of the U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, more commonly known as the Helsinki Commission, to which the Soviet Union itself is a signatory. Their report, "A Summary of 1984 Trends in Soviet Dissent," reports faithfully the miserable record of the Soviet Union on human rights and their brutal treatment of Soviet Jews and dissidents. I would ask that a copy of this report follow the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Helsinki Commission will convene the second week in May this year in Ottawa, at which time the issue of the mistreatment of these oppressed people may be raised. I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader and Senator D'AMATO, the new chairman of the Commission, for inviting me to sit as a delegate to the Helsinki Commission; I appreciate his thoughtful understanding of my interest in the plight of the Afghan people and the oppressed who remain fettered within the Soviet Union. I want to inform my colleagues that, when the Helsinki Commission meets in May, I intend to be a vocal and persistent critic of Soviet official behavior toward the basic human rights of speech, of religion and of emigration which are so shamelessly absent in the Soviet Union.

The report follows:

A SUMMARY OF 1984 TRENDS IN SOVIET DISSENT—CSCE COMMISSION STAFF SURVEY

Soviet human rights performance continued its 5-year decline in 1984. The Soviet government throughout the year sustained its harsh law-and-order campaign KGB-style initiated after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in late 1979. During this period, the Soviet government demonstrated almost total disdain for world opinion on human rights issues and virtually ignored its international commitments under the Helsinki accords and UN agreements. Exemplifying this Soviet attitude, the Kremlin ignored Andrei Sakharov's plea—despite a hunger stike in May—to permit his wife, Elena Bonner, to be allowed to go West for medical treatment. Indeed, the Kremlin has almost totally isolated the Sakharovs from family, friends and the world.

What were some major elements of this Kremlin anti-dissent campaign in 1984? The promulgation of four new laws to broaden the so-called crime of dissent and to further isolate the Soviet population from foreign contacts was one factor. Greater violence and more brutal treatment of political prisoners, as seen in the death of seven Prisoners of Conscience (POCs) in 1984, was another. A renewed official drive to eradicate *samizdat* (unofficial literature) and thus to stifle any expression of independent political, religious, national, cultural or economic views was a third significant element. The continued imposition of nearly insurmountable obstacles to emigration was still another component.

NEW ARRESTS AND TRAILS

In terms of numbers, there were at least 130 arrests of Soviet human rights activists in 1984, including 71 religious activists, 21 would-be emigrants, 12 Jewish activists, 12 Georgian activists and 11 distributors or authors of *samizdat*. There were at least 41 trials of Soviet dissidents in 1984; the average term of imprisonment was three years.

RESTRICTIVE NEW LAWS

As early as January, the Soviet government signalled its adherence to harsh policies on dissent by passing two repressive changes in the laws. It is now a criminal offense to disclose information from the workplace to foreigners. Divulging to foreigners "professional secrets" is now punishable by up to eight years of imprisonment. A second change relates to the definition of "anti-Soviet agitation" under Article 70 RSFSR Criminal Code. The new definition includes not only the preparation and dissemination of "detrimental" materials, but also mere possession of such works. Another provision specifies that those found guilty under Article 70 using "money or other valuables from foreign organizations or persons acting in (their) interest" can now be imprisoned for up to 15 (rather than 12) years.

In July 1984, a USSR Supreme Soviet decree fixed penalties of up to 100 rubles for Soviet citizens who violate "rules for stay in the USSR by foreign citizens or stateless persons" or provide shelter, transportation or "other services" to foreigners without official permission. Although the decree did not extend the range of illegal actions, its promulgation called attention to heightened Kremlin concern over contacts between Soviet citizens and foreigners.

Another new Soviet regulation issued in August and effective in October 1984 forbids foreigners from pre-paying often exorbitant tariffs on packages sent to Soviet citizens. This regulation ended a 30-year Soviet policy under which foreign friends and relatives could send clothing and food through special package companies which accepted pre-payment. This new restriction will especially affect families of POCs, religious believers and refuseniks, since they now must pay high tariffs and there is no longer guaranteed delivery of parcels from abroad.

The new trial of Russian Orthodox POC Vladimir Poresh was on October 23, 1984. It marked the first known instance of the application of a new article 188.3 RSFSR Criminal Code, "Malicious Disobedience of the Administration of Corrective Labor Institutions" with a possible five-year term. The new law—promulgated in late September 1983 one week after the close of the Madrid CSCE Meeting—authorizes administrators of penal institutions to charge inmates with "malicious disobedience to its lawful demands" if the prisoner had already been punished for another such infraction during the previous year. Poresh, arrested in Chistopol Prison one day before the end of his term, was given a new three-year prison term for four peaceful protests against denial of prisoners' rights. There are fears that at least two other Soviet POCs, Russian *samizdat* author Viktor Grinev and Byelorussian activist Mikhail Kukobaka also may face charges under this new so-called "Eternal Prisoner" law.

ISOLATION AND BRUTAL TREATMENT OF POLITICAL PRISONERS

During 1984 the Soviet government intensified its policy of isolating political prisoners in the *gulag*. One technique frequently used is to deny prisoners their legal rights to family visits—often for years in advance. For example, imprisoned Lithuanian Helsinki Monitor Viktoras Petkus has had no family visits since August 1983.

In addition, greater official reliance on violence against POCs—not to speak of ordinary prisoners—was discernible in 1984. The deaths of at least seven POCs during the year provided tragic testimony to this fact. Three noted Ukrainian human rights activists, Oleksy Tykhy, Valery Marchenko and Yury Lytvyn died in Perm Camp 36/1, the only POC special regimen camp. Two other human rights activists, Aleksei Nikitin—who protested dangerous working conditions for Donetsk coal miners—and well-known camp poet Valentin Sokolov, died after extended maltreatment in Soviet psychiatric hospitals. Seventy-two-year-old Ukrainian Catholic Anton Potochnyk died on May 29 in camp while serving his fifth term. Another religious activist, Baptist Boris Artyushenko, died in Kursk prison in December during his fourth term of imprisonment. Conditions of incarceration have deteriorated so much that veteran POC Yury Lytvyn was reportedly driven to suicide. Imprisoned peace activist Aleksandr Shatravka also attempted suicide in May 1984.

Other evidence of increased cruelty is suggested by reports of the extremely poor health of numerous POCs. Eduard Arutunyan, founder of the Armenian Helsinki Group, is reportedly suffering from extreme malnutrition and had one lung removed in prison hospital. At least two POCs suffered heart attacks. Thirty-nine-year-old Baptist rock musician Valery Barinov—sentenced to two and a half years in camp on November 23 in Leningrad—suffered a massive heart attack one week later. Pentecostal emigration activist Vasily Barats suffered two heart attacks in Perm Camp 36/1. Two leading Jewish activists, Anatoly Shcharansky and Iosif Begun, are in precarious health,

partially due to hunger strikes protest extended terms of punishment isolation.

There were also more frequent reports of increased brutality by the administration of Soviet penal institutions in 1984, including more instances of beatings of POCs in the camps and even in pre-trial detention in Moscow. The gifted Ukrainian-Polish poet, Irina Ratushinskaya, spent 39 days in solitary confinement, was twice hospitalized for tuberculosis and was beaten and force-fed while on hunger strike. Dr. Anatoly Koryagin, advisor to the Psychiatric Working Group, was beaten in Chistopol prison with the door of his cell open so that others would hear his screams; he reportedly is near death after a prolonged hunger strike. Baptist minister Mikhail Khorev spent 17 days in special isolation and two months in camp prison in mid-1984 for not properly greeting a camp commandant. Khorev, who is nearly blind, was also deprived of his glasses. Sergi Grigoryants, a *samizdat* editor in Chistopol prison, was so badly beaten by wardens that his arm was broken. In late December, Jewish activist Iosif Berenshtein lost the use of his right eye after being beaten by prison wardens; the prison authorities in Zhitomir, Ukraine claim he poked his out with a potato peeler.

PSYCHIATRIC ABUSE

In April 1983, the Soviet Union withdrew from the World Psychiatric Association to avoid an expected censure motion in July. Some hoped that this move signalled increased Soviet sensitivity to criticism of their abuse of psychiatry for political purposes. Soviet actions in 1984, however, soon proved these hopes to be unfounded. Among the Soviet human rights activists subjected to psychiatric abuse in 1984 are: Bashkir poet Nizametdin Akhmetov, in camp since 1969, sent to the Alma Ata special psychiatric hospital in June; Armenian human rights activist Garnik Tsarukyan, an Armenian Apostolic Church deacon, sent to a psychiatric hospital in February for criticism of church authorities; Leningrad *samizdat* writer Oleg Okhapkin, hospitalized in late August; Latvian Catholic Sandra Riga, editor of a *samizdat* ecumenical journal *Summons*, tried in August and sent for forcible psychiatric treatment; Yuri Popov of the Moscow youth peace "Good Will Group" placed in psychiatric hospital this year; and Russian worker Viktor Tsurikov who was held in psychiatric hospital in Krasnoyarsk for the month of April for refusing to vote.

One of the most tragic cases of psychiatric abuse is that of Ukrainian poet, Viktor Rafalsky, who has spent 15 years in Soviet psychiatric hospitals. Last year, Rafalsky escaped from the hospital, was recaptured and put on trial on February 27. Ruled "especially dangerous and requiring forced medical treatment," he was sent to the infamous Dnepropetrovsk special psychiatric hospital. While there, Rafalsky managed to smuggle out an appeal to the West reporting that letters from Amnesty International had eased his conditions and asking that Western assistance be more systematic and regular.

THE ANTI-SAMIZDAT CAMPAIGN

Another aspect of the Soviet crackdown on dissent in 1984 was an intensified campaign against all forms of *samizdat*. Among the victims was Lithuanian chemist Lyudas Dambrauskas who was sentenced on October 3 to five and a half years of imprisonment for writing memoirs about his 25 years in Stalinist camps. Several activists were sentenced for reproducing Western literature: Although Mikhail Polyakov confessed his "guilt," he still received a five-year camp term in April in Leningrad. Mikhail Meylakh, a Leningrad literary scholar, was also sentenced in April; he received a ten-year camp term for distributing Western publications of works by Akhmatova, Mandelshtam and Nabokov. Literary archivist Aleksandr Bogoslovsky was arrested in June for "making notes of an anti-Soviet nature" in his notebook and for giving foreign books to his uncle and two friends. Veteran Moscow human rights activist Yuri Shikhanovich was sentenced in September to a ten-year term for alleged involvement with the *samizdat Chronicle of Current Events* and for passing information to the West.

A number of religious activists who participated in *samizdat* activities were also arrested in 1984 including the Latvian Catholic editor Sandra Riga. Russian Orthodox activist, Sergei Markus, was sentenced in July 1984 to three years in camp for possessing religious literature—which was later ordered burned. Despite this drive against *samizdat*, new publications appeared in 1984: at least eight issues of the *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Ukraine*. This new *samizdat* journal, first issued in March, reports on the situation of religious and national rights advocates in Western Ukraine.

Several unregistered Baptists have also been imprisoned for religious *samizdat*. Viktor Savelev was arrested in Georgia in February for transporting unauthorized Baptist materials and Estonian Baptist, Pavel Vezikov, was sentenced in May to two years in camp for circulating religious *samizdat* and Western Christian literature. The arrest of two brothers, Egor and Andrei Volf in Kazakhstan on November 24 reveals the the massive scale of underground printing of Baptist literature in the USSR. The authorities found 30,000 printed Bibles, three tons of blank paper, and a portable printing press. This is the fourth such KGB raid against the unofficial Baptist "Christian Press" in the last ten years.

Perhaps one of the clearest demonstrations of the Kremlin effort to cut the flow of *samizdat* materials to the West was the arrest of long-time Moscow human rights activist, Lina Tumanova. As Tumanova met two U.S. diplomats on a Moscow street on July 4, 1984, she was arrested and the officials were detained. A package of *samizdat* was seized from Tumanova and she faces charges of "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda." She was released from prison in September for medical treatment and will still stand trial. The case received much negative publicity in the Soviet press—in an obvious warning to other Soviet citizens.

FURTHER EMIGRATION RESTRICTIONS

Emigration rates for all three Soviet nationalities which previously had been permitted to leave the USSR have reached new lows. Only 897 Soviet Jews were allowed to emigrate in 1984—compared to 1,315 in 1983 and 51,471 in the record year of 1979. A total of 913 Soviet Germans arrived in West Germany in 1984. Armenian emigration rates have also plummeted. Any Soviet citizen may face imprisonment if he or she presses emigration claims with Soviet authorities. Soviet citizens who are caught crossing USSR borders without official permission are given lengthy camp terms. At the same time emigration from the USSR came to a virtual standstill, there were signs that the Soviet authorities had embarked on a campaign to lure some high-profile Soviet defectors, including soldiers, back to the USSR with promises of no punishment.

REPRESSION OF RELIGIOUS ACTIVISTS

During 1984, the Soviet authorities kept up, and in some cases, intensified their campaign against religious activists. In addition to those already mentioned, numerous other leaders of various religious denominations were imprisoned during the year. In June, a Lutheran preacher, Jakob Rein, was sentenced in Kazakhstan to five years in camp for allegedly organizing unregistered religious services. Later in the year, two Russian Orthodox priests were sentenced on doubtful charges: Father Nikolai Temirbaev was given a two-year camp term in Turkmenia for allegedly beating his wife, and a popular youth priest, 44-year-old Pavel Lysak, was sentenced in December to ten months imprisonment for living in Moscow without a residence permit. A Lithuanian Catholic priest, Father Jonas Kastytus Matulionis, was arrested on November 9 on unknown charges. He had been previously jailed in 1976 for nine months for alleged involvement with the unofficial *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*. A Baptist preacher, Peter Peters, was sentenced to three years in camp in May.

Various religious communities felt the heavy hand of state authorities in 1984. A resurgence of interest among Soviet Jews in their religious heritage has led to increased anti-Semitic repression. Among the methods of intimidation used by the KGB were allegations that Jews use drugs in their religious rituals. For example, Moscow Jewish activist Yuli Edelshtein, arrested on trumped-up charges of drug possession, was sentenced on December 18 to three years in labor camp. Moshe Abramov, and Orthodox Jewish activist from Samarkand, received a three-year camp term for "hooliganism." One result of the official drive against Soviet Baptists was 46 arrests in 1984. Unregistered Soviet Adventists suffered at least six arrests in the first six months of the year. One such Adventist, Vladimir Vasilchenko, was jailed for recording foreign radio broadcasts. The continuing campaign against Soviet Pentecostals attempting to emigrate from the USSR was revealed in two month-long hunger strikes undertaken by 55 Pentecostals—mostly of German origin—in the Pacific coast town of Chuguevka. One Chuguevka Pentecostal pastor, Viktor Valter, was arrested on December 10—International Human Rights Day.

CAMPAIGN AGAINST UNOFFICIAL GROUPS

Independent peace groups, monitoring activists and other non-conformists continued to come under attack in 1984. Members of the unofficial Group to Promote Trust Between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.—which claims some 2,000 supporters among affiliate groups in Leningrad, Kiev, Odessa, Novosibirsk, Riga, Rybinsk and Tallinn—were subjected to various forms of harassment, intimidation and detention.

As a result of an earlier KGB campaign, most Soviet Helsinki Monitoring Groups have ceased to exist. There are currently 45 imprisoned Group members. Nevertheless, two Helsinki-affiliated religious rights groups function: the Catholic Committee in Lithuania and the Action Group for the Defense of the Rights of Believers and the Ukrainian Catholic Church. The latter group, formed on September 9, 1982 and led by former Ukrainian POC, Iosyp Terelya, has allied itself to the Helsinki process. The Soviet authorities took action against three other Helsinki activists in 1984: Elena

Bonner, a Moscow Helsinki Group founding member and the wife of Andrei Sakharov, was sentenced on August 17 to five years of internal exile for "anti-Soviet slander"; a Ukrainian Helsinki Monitor, Mykola Gorbal, was re-arrested in camp on October 21 for "anti-Soviet slander"—days before his scheduled release; and another Ukrainian Monitor, Iosif Zisels, was arrested in Chernivtsi on October 19 on unknown charges.

SUPPRESSION OF NATIONAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS

The Soviet government continued to act against advocates of greater national, ethnic and cultural rights for dozens of nationalities in its domain. In the fall, a stepped-up campaign against unofficial Hebrew teachers and Jewish cultural activists was initiated. Among the 12 currently imprisoned are: 34-year-old Aleksandr Kholmiansky, arrested in July on hooliganism charges; Yakov Levin of Odessa, arrested five days before his wedding and sentenced on November 20 to three years in camp for "anti-Soviet slander"; Iosif Berenshtein of Kiev who was sentenced on December 10 to four years in camp for allegedly "assaulting a police officer." Despite these measures, 1984 saw a resurgence of interest in Jewish culture with unofficial Hebrew and Jewish culture groups springing up in at least 30 Soviet cities.

In 1983 there were official celebrations to mark the 200th anniversary of the Treaty of Georgievsk which joined Georgia to Russia. Three Georgian workers, Zakarii Lashkarashvili, Tarial Ghviniashvili and Guram Gogopaidze, were tried in March and given terms ranging from four to five years for preparing leaflets protesting this celebration.

Armenian human rights activists also continued to feel the KGB heavy hand. Armenian Helsinki Monitor Robert Nazaryan is in Chistopol prison, while Armenian national rights advocate Paruir Airikyan was sent into internal exile in February.

Mustafa Dzhemilev, leader of the struggle of 500,000 Crimean Tatars to return to their Crimean homeland from Stalinist exile in Central Asia, was sentenced on February 10 to three years in strict regimen camp for "anti-Soviet slander." This represents Dzhemilev's sixth prison term on political charges. Dzhemilev's "crime" consisted of maintaining contacts with Crimean Tatars in New York. At least two other Crimean Tatar activists, Dzhelyal Chelebiev and Izzet Khairov, were arrested last year.

In the Baltic states of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania, human and national rights advocates also faced harsh repression by the Kremlin. A leading Estonian activist, Enn Tarto, was tried in April and given a ten-year term in special regimen camp. His "crimes" included signing protests, publishing and distributing human rights documents in Estonia, and maintaining contacts with Estonian emigres in Sweden. Recent imprisonments in Lithuania include those of Father Matulionis and of Lyudas Dambrauskas. Finally, the fate of one leading Latvian dissident, Gunars Astra, is a fitting commentary on the overall Kremlin attitude towards 1984: in December 1983, he was given a 12-year term of imprisonment for circulating George Orwell's visionary novel, 1984.●

THE ARMY'S EFFORTS TO REFORM

● Mr. HART. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very important article from the April 21 New York Times. The article is titled, "Army Survey Finds Officers Critical." It reports on a recent survey by the Army of its own officer corps, a survey that revealed some problems. According to the article, the findings reflect a belief by half of those surveyed that the bold, original, creative officer cannot survive in today's Army.

Mr. President, I am certain some people will use this study to criticize the Army. Instead, I want to praise the Army for conducting this analysis. The Army has courageously overcome the tendency, natural in any large institution, to sweep problems under the rug, and has instead attempted to bring them to light so they can be resolved. By doing so, the leadership of the Army has shown that it is sincere in its efforts to reform itself. It is a praiseworthy step, and one that should strengthen, not weaken, our support for the Army.

The Army's serious and highly important effort at self-reform has been evident for some time to many members of the military reform movement. It has thus far included the publication of an excellent new basic field manual, the 1982 edition of FM 100-5, that makes maneuver warfare official doctrine; the establishment of what is, in my view, the best course in the whole American military education establishment, the new second-year course at Ft. Leavenworth; and the Cohort and regimental system programs to improve unit cohesion. Now, there is an addition to that list: the survey reported by the Times.

Mr. President, our other armed services should follow the Army's lead. Their need for reform is no less; in the case of the Navy, it is in fact greater. But the services continue to pretend that the problems and deficiencies they face do not exist. Unfortunately, that means they could possibly be brought to light in combat, at the cost of unnecessary casualties and, very possibly, tragic defeats.

The Army, in contrast, is preparing itself for future success in combat by addressing its problems in time of peace. I strongly urge my colleagues, especially those who have joined with me in supporting military reform, to show the Army that we understand, appreciate, and support what it is doing.

Mr. President, I ask that the article, "Army Survey Finds Officers Critical," be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1985]

ARMY SURVEY FINDS OFFICERS CRITICAL

(By Richard Halloran)

WASHINGTON, April 20.—The Army's officers, in a remarkably candid self-evaluation, have expressed severe criticism of themselves, the Army and its senior leaders.

In a confidential Army survey of its officer corps, taken last fall and analyzed over the winter, half the officers who answered a long questionnaire agreed that "the bold, original, creative officer cannot survive in today's Army."

A report compiled from the survey said an even larger portion of the officers, 68 percent, agreed that "the officer corps is focused on personal gain rather than selflessness"—a virtue that military leaders cite as essential to good leadership.

In addition, nearly half the generals, who were questioned in a separate survey but whose answers were incorporated into the report, concluded that "senior Army leaders behave too much like corporate executives and not enough like warriors."

And one-third of all the officers, including the generals, thought that "most officers are promoted before becoming competent at their existing grade levels," the report said.

Despite these negative views, large majorities of the officers said that they were satisfied with their duty positions, that they intended to stay in the Army for a career and that fellow officers exemplified the "warrior spirit" and the "Army ethic."

Large majorities also said "the Army is more than a job" and "individual needs are secondary to Army needs." Although the officers had complaints about particular elements of the Army's educational and training system, they generally gave it good marks.

The survey was ordered by the Army Chief of Staff, Gen. John A. Wickham Jr., who said in a letter to those being queried, "Because this study will shape the future development of our officer corps, we need your candid opinions."

The state of the officer corps has been a contentious issue within and outside the Army since American forces withdrew from Vietnam more than 10 years ago. Military and civilian critics have asserted that officers emphasized management over leadership and corporate values over traditional military values.

The survey report was compiled from answers to two long questionnaires. The first was sent to all 436 serving officers in the four grades of general, of whom 333 replied; the second was sent to 23,000 randomly selected officers, from colonel down to lieutenant, of whom 14,046 replied. In those six grades are 92,000 officers. No estimate of the range of sampling error was provided in the report.

The results were tabulated into a report stamped "For Official Use Only" and "Close Hold," meaning that the information in the survey was not to be disseminated widely.

DEMANDS ON OFFICERS CITED

The Armed Forces Journal, a monthly magazine specializing in military matters that is published here, obtained a copy of the survey and has prepared an article for publication in its May issue. An advance copy of the article and the report were made available to The New York Times.

Evidently anticipating renewed criticism, the Army prepared a discussion paper to accompany the report.

"We place a tremendous burden on our senior Army leaders," the paper said. "We charge them to perform as statesmen, as spokesmen for their organizations, as stewards of tremendous resources, as role models, as standard setters, as long-range planners and decision makers. In short, we demand they perform as though they were effective corporate executives.

"In time of peace, there is a blurring of the distinction between pure 'warrior' and 'pure corporate executive.' In both peace and across the spectrum of conflict, we expect our senior Army leaders to be both."

Lieut. Gen. Charles W. Bagnai, who organized the survey, said it was part of a larger effort to improve the professional development of the officers corps. "We asked some real tough questions about strengths and weaknesses," he said in a telephone interview, "to see where we should be going in the future."

WORK ON RECOMMENDATIONS

Lieut. Gen. Arthur E. Brown, Jr., director of the Army Staff, which is preparing recommendations for General Wickham based on the survey said changes in the Army's system of educating officers in their careers were under serious consideration.

In each of the junior, middle and senior service schools, more emphasis would probably be put on teaching officers to be better mentors and coaches of their subordinates, General Brown said.

The findings of the survey suggested that the Army officer corps had not entirely recovered from the dark days of Vietnam. When morale was down, ethics were slighted and many officers put premotion ahead of duty, according to historians of the Vietnam War.

The survey responses also appeared to reflect the questioning attitude discerned in many younger officers, the majors and captains who were commissioned in the post-Vietnam period of the late 1970's. They brought into the Army the skepticism of their youth in the turbulent 1960's.

DIFFERING VIEWS OF GENERALS

Several marked differences between the generals and the lower-ranking officers showed up in the survey. The generals, the report said, thought the officer corps was less focused on personal gain than on "selflessness"; lower-ranking officers disagreed.

The generals said they felt that about two-thirds of the captains and lieutenants would make good wartime leaders, while the captains and lieutenants themselves rated only half of their peers as potentially good battlefield commanders.

The generals also thought that the Army was preparing officers to keep pace with weapons of advanced technology, while large numbers of the other officers disagreed, the report said. The lower-ranking officers also wanted more of their peers to receive advanced military education than the generals thought was necessary.

On the other hand, the report said generals and the other officers agreed that "the weakest areas of officer preparation tend to be warfighting, leadership and critical thinking." They also agreed that two-thirds of the colonels and majors would be good combat commanders.●

ARKANSAS' FIRST PRESIDENTIAL VOLUNTEER ACTION AWARD WINNERS

● Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, earlier this week two distinguished Arkansans joined the ranks of recipients of the Presidential Volunteer Action Award—the first ever from our State. Rev. Hezekiah D. Davis Stewart, Jr. and Dr. Kelsy Caplinger III were honored at the White House along with 16 others from across the Nation.

I had the opportunity to meet with both these deserving individuals to let them know how proud all Arkansans are of their dedication and service to those less fortunate.

The Arkansas Gazette carried a story about Dr. Stewart's and Dr. Caplinger's experiences upon receiving this award and I want to share it with my colleagues. Their words sum up much better than I could what volunteerism is all about. I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Apr. 23, 1985]

ARKANSANS GET AWARDS FROM REAGAN, CITE HELP

(By Carol Matlack)

WASHINGTON.—Rev. Hezekiah D. David Stewart Jr. and Dr. Kelsy Caplinger III, the first Arkansas residents ever to win the Presidential Volunteer Action Awards, said Monday that hundreds of other persons in Arkansas deserved to share the honor with them.

Mr. Stewart, who established a self-help program in College Station, and Dr. Caplinger, an allergist who founded a summer camp for youths with medical problems, were among 18 persons who received the awards from President Reagan Monday at a White House luncheon.

After dining on roast duck and rice in the East Room, each received a silver medallion on a red-white-and-blue ribbon from the president.

In interviews afterward, both said their volunteer projects would not have succeeded without help from many others.

"ONLY AS A REPRESENTATIVE"

"I cannot accept this award for me, but only as a representative of all the volunteer efforts on the part of everybody who has assisted us," Mr. Stewart said. "I thank God and the people of Arkansas for giving me an opportunity to share, to care and to love."

ESTABLISHED PROJECT

Mr. Stewart, the pastor of Mount Nebo AME Church in College Station, established a community self-help project called Watershed that offers counseling, job referral and other services, as well as emergency food, clothing and shelter for residents of the predominantly poor, black community. He said numerous individuals, organizations and companies had donated time and money to the Watershed project over the years.

Dr. Caplinger, of Little Rock, is chairman of the Arkansas Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics and is the founder of Med-Camp of Arkansas, which since 1971 has offered a summer program for youths with medical problems at Camp Aldersgate in western Little Rock.

HELPED RAISE FUNDS

Dr. Caplinger helped raise money to build an infirmary and other special facilities at the camp, and recruited health professionals and others to work as volunteers each summer. The camp is operated without federal funds, and more than 2,000 youths have attended since it began.

"I'm very grateful even to be nominated" for the award, Dr. Caplinger said in an interview. "To receive it really adds a great deal of credibility to the program * * * and enhances our visibility." However, he added that the program could not have succeeded without hundreds of others volunteering their time. "I'm really accepting this on their behalf," he said.

APPEARS ON "TODAY"

Besides attending the White House ceremony, Dr. Caplinger appeared briefly on the NBC television "Today Show" Monday morning.

More than 1,800 individuals and groups were nominated for the presidential volunteer awards this year. A total of six individuals, nine private organizations, two corporations and a group of labor unions received the awards.●

FORMER GUARDSMEN IN THE FDN

● Mr. DENTON. Mr. President, during Tuesday's debate about the President's proposal to aid the Contras, a great many charges were made against the Contras, especially the Nicaraguan Democratic Force [FDN]. One of the allegations most often repeated in the Senate and in the House of Representatives was the charge that the FDN is comprised of Somocistas, meaning—in this case—former members of Somoza's National Guard. Specifically, 46 out of 48 of the FDN's leadership were said to be former guardsmen.

I have checked with the Department of State. I have checked with the FDN and reviewed their list of regional and task force commanders, and I have discussed the matter with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Senator DURENBURGER. I believe that it is important that an effort be made to set the record straight on the issue.

Former Somoza National Guardsmen do not dominate, control, or represent either the leadership of the FDN or the FDN at large. Furthermore, in the best American tradition, the military command structure of the FDN is subordinate to civilian political authority.

The FDN has a six-man policymaking directorate. The five civilians on the board are the following: Adolfo Calero, a businessman who was a longtime opponent of Somoza and was imprisoned by him in 1978 for organizing a general strike; Indalecio Rodriquez, who was a member of the FSLN for 20 years; Lucia Salazar, the widow of Jorge Salazar, the former president of the Nicaraguan Superior Council on Private Enterprise [COSEP] who was murdered by Sandinista agents in November 1980; Alfonsin Callejas, who resigned—in protest—as Somoza's Vice President in 1972 and was cleared of any wrongdoing by the FSLN following its July 1979 triumph; and, finally, Marcos Zeledon, an activist in opposition party politics during the Somoza years.

Colonel Enrique Bermudez, a former member of the National Guard and Somoza's military attache in Washington, is the sixth member of the directorate. I should point out that Anastasio Somoza had a well-known practice

of assigning persons he did not trust to overseas posts. Such was the case for Colonel Bermudez. Along with Rodriquez and Calero, Bermudez is also a member of the three man civil-military command, which oversees day-to-day military operations and is answerable to the directorate.

Under the civil-military command is the strategic command, which directs military operations under Colonel Bermudez. No decision on day-to-day operations, however, is made without the concurrence of the civil-military command.

The FDN has 56 regional and task force commanders. Forty-three percent, or 27 of them, are former Sandinistas. Only 32 percent of the FDN's military leadership are former guardsmen. Thirteen of the regional and task force commanders are former guardsmen, all under the rank of lieutenant. Twelve of them are campesinos and the remainder come from a variety of professions: Medical doctor, evangelical minister, university student, and a civilian radio technician. The average age is 24 to 26 years.

The estimated troop strength of the FDN is 15,000. Less than 2 percent of these, or approximately 200 to 260, are former guardsmen, and none of them held a rank above first lieutenant. The overwhelming number of FDN troops are simple peasants, workers, shopkeepers, businessmen, and students who had no previous ties at all with Somoza.

Having said this, I would like to point out that merely being a former member of Somoza's national guard is not an indictment. Some of them were mere traffic cops, and a good many never committed atrocities.

The FDN has come a long way since it was first organized. Its nature and character has changed as the objectives of the Sandinista regime have become clearly apparent. The organization has been frank about the changes in its political and military structure. In 1982, it purged its organization of those former guardsmen who had a record of human rights abuse. The FDN maintains active discipline in its ranks and has dismissed or disciplined members in its ranks who have not acted in accordance with its code of conduct.

I believe it is time for the Congress to make its decision about Contra funding on the basis of accurate information rather than disinformation. To do otherwise does not serve our national interest, and it certainly does not help the people of Nicaragua, who are laboring under a repressive, totalitarian, Marxist regime. The Sandinistas have made a mockery of the sacrifice of the Nicaraguan people to find freedom, Democracy, and prosperity.

I believe that the United States Government, both the executive branch and the legislative branch, should clearly and without hesitation support the many men and women in Nicaragua who are willing to continue to make the great sacrifice for that most precious of all human rights—liberty.●

HIGHER EDUCATION

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the Federal commitment in higher education since the 1965 enactment of the Higher Education Act has been to access and quality in institutions of higher education. Since the mid-1940's the Federal Government has first, through the GI bill, extended access and provided some measure of choice to veteran, low- and middle-income students, and student dependents of disabled, deceased, and elderly Social Security recipients.

The compromise package, agreed upon among some of my distinguished Republican colleagues and the Reagan administration, contains provisions which will heighten and exacerbate the division between public and private higher education. The proposal's inclusion of an $8,000 annual mega-cap on title IV, student assistance, reverses a 30-year commitment to access and choice in higher education. Are we recanting on our obligations to ensure equity and quality for all students in higher education, or are we saying we can spend $2.2 billion on MX missile deployment and almost $6 billion for a single aircraft carrier, but not an equal amount to guarantee the development of our most important natural resources—the minds of our people?

Colleges and universities continue to struggle with the benefits and burdens of providing access. A recent report, "Integrity in the College Curriculum," describes the nature of the problems we face because of unsatisfactory preparation of many high school students in terms of their reading and writing proficiencies. While our long-term objective must be to improve learning of the basic skills in our elementary and secondary schools, we cannot ignore the current crop of high school students who are entering college.

In fact, they are not being ignored. Colleges and universities across America include among their faculties so-called developmental educators. Many students come to college ill-prepared to do college-level work. That deficiency is being partially addressed.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD two articles, "Teaching Basic Skills to College Students," from the Chronicle of Higher Education, and "College on the Rebound," from the April 4, 1985, Cleveland Plain Dealer. Both of these articles outline the need for these special programs and their success in increasing retention and graduation of underprepared students.

The articles follow:

[From the Chronicle of Higher Education, Feb. 20, 1985]

TEACHING BASIC SKILLS TO COLLEGE STUDENTS

(By Nancy Rabianski-Carriuolo)

Many terms have a somewhat negative connotation for professors, and some—such as "budget freeze," "student strike," and even "basic skills"—tend to elicit a slight curl of the lip. My lip curls sometimes, too, but not when it comes to basic skills.

In my experience as a supervisor of developmental programs and as a high-school teacher and later professor of basic English, I have found that because under-prepared students are studying basic skills they are often viewed as not really belonging in college, as having been accepted only to meet enrollment goals.

In reality, such students are much more difficult to categorize, because, in terms of standardized-test scores and psychological characteristics, they vary from campus to campus, depending on each institution's standards. Basically they are students who in one or more areas—usually math, English, study skills, or some combination of the three—do not qualify for mainstream college classes.

Although such students are all deficient in at least one basic skill, the reasons for their deficiency vary widely. As children they may have had a physical impairment, for example, most often because of an undiagnosed need for eyeglasses; or they may have not been developmentally ready to learn reading and writing when they were first taught. They may have lacked motivation because of personal problems or other reasons. They may even have been the victims of poor teaching. In any event, whatever the reason for the deficiencies, most underprepared college students have two things in common: They are weak in basic skills and they are now motivated to improve.

Developmental programs have been around a long time—since the early land-grant colleges in the 1860's—but Americans in general were not much concerned until the last decade, when the back-to-basics movement was widely publicized. When even Ivy League campuses acknowledged providing "bonehead English" classes, professors everywhere began to shake their heads over the quality of the students they were receiving from the high schools; high-school teachers began to protest that they couldn't teach in four short years everything that had been neglected in elementary school; and elementary-school teachers complained about that enemy of education, the television set. No one wants to claim responsibility for the seeming decline in student preparedness, but everyone wants to improve education to the point where basic-skills classes are not needed beyond elementary school.

Programs have been developed, particularly in the last year or so, to raise education standards and remediate where necessary. I applaud such efforts, but as long as we continue to evaluate students comparatively, there will always be a bottom half of every class, and many of the students in that half will want to continue their education. Therefore, successful programs of the sort described by the Department of Education in A Nation Responds will not result in basic-skills classes disappearing from our campuses. Rather, education reform will bring about higher standards in schools and

colleges and, as a result, higher exit standards in developmental classes.

There have always been and there always will be students who don't reach some academic standard. Consequently, let us look at the real question: Should you welcome such students to your campus—and to your own class? (I am sure we all agree it is un-American to deny anyone an education, but we might suggest that an underprepared student try the college down the street.) Are developmental students teachable? Are they worth the effort? Or are they just admitted to college because they pay tuition and, therefore, indirectly pay our salaries?

I have pondered, discussed, and argued those questions with many colleagues, and most of them respond with another: "How can I teach my subject to someone weak in basic language (or computation) skills?" They know the task is not impossible—just not easy.

Even the brightest students have some gaps in their academic training, so my answer is to pretest everyone to discover each student's level of ability before beginning to teach the course. Most campuses have a developmental program or learning center able to assess skills and provide tutoring—if not, teachers can design their own tests, including whatever they think is necessary as a prerequisite for their course.

Early identification and referral for assistance if you don't have time to tutor them yourself are important to the students' success. (If you are feeling resentful at my suggestion that teachers should spend time on pretesting and referrals, remember that in the long run you will be saving time and avoiding frustration for yourself and your students if you insure that they get needed help before they fail either the midterm exam or the entire course.)

There are also ways your teaching can help students who have academic difficulties. Poor self-image is common among such students and often results in problems with performance and attendance. If you really want them to attend your classes regularly and work to the best of their abilities, you must help them see improvement in their work, proof that they are moving toward a goal. One of my students last semester wailed at the midpoint of the course: "I study and study but I still can't get those verb endings right!" I used his pretest to show him that while in September he had made 20 errors in a 200-word essay, in November he had made only 5 in a 300-word essay. He had not been aware of his improvement; obviously I had not given him enough feedback.

Students also need to be taught how to learn—by all of their teachers, not just developmental specialists. For example, follow the announcement of the first test with a discussion of test anxiety and ways to cope with it. Students should also be familiarized with their textbooks. I am certain you chose your test for sound reasons; if you share those reasons with your students, your teaching strategies can become their learning strategies. Students often don't notice or don't know how to benefit from special features such as vocabulary lists and answer keys to exercises. Pointing out such features often helps insure the book will actually be used rather than stored away and sold at the end of the semester in virginal condition.

A complaint I hear occasionally is that teaching students with weak skills takes so much additional time and effort. That may be, but are we teaching or are we just providing the materials that teach? Some students understand a concept immediately, but for others we have to stop and explain a different way and yet another way until we run out of explanations. The students who understood the concept immediately could probably have learned it just as well by reading the textbook; the others are the ones we were really teaching, by using every strategy we could think of to refer the new material to former knowledge or experience.

It is equally important to use a variety of instructional approaches. Not all students have the same style of learning. Some are good readers; others learn more from listening; still others respond well to actual manipulation of the material—for example, there are students who get a C or lower in science class but do B or even A work in the lab. Providing a variety of approaches insures that the needs of all students will be met, and there is probably someone on your campus who can help in preparing instructional materials. If not, the National Association for Development Education can recommend consultants in many areas of the country.

Although no one has ever actually asked me if difficult-to-teach students are worth the effort, I have occasionally asked myself that question after a particularly frustrating day. In considering my question, I think about my own struggle to achieve computer literacy and of the varied professionals who once experienced difficulty with a basic skill. Any developmental educator can tell you success stories about former students and will appreciate your interest and support if you ask. Discussing such students, especially on a frustrating day, will confirm that developmental students are indeed worth a little extra effort.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Apr. 4, 1985]

COLLEGE ON THE REBOUND

(By Naomi Barnett)

Why is Jim, a 34-year-old man, going to college for a course in reading? And why is a college teaching reading?

As an instructor of reading and study skills at a college, these are the types of questions I am most often asked.

As far back as colonial times, college presidents and their faculties have deplored their students' lack of preparation for the demands of higher education. Those attending college in the early days, of course, were well-to-do and among the most academically able young men of their time. In 1985, college presidents and faculties are still decrying their students' lack of preparation.

Our country has always viewed itself as an open, egalitarian society in which education provides the tools for advancement. Community colleges in particular were established to extend educational opportunities to all.

Open admissions, a concept true since the land grant colleges were established, means serving a non-traditional population, compared with those who attended college before World War II. The students are of all ages, economic statuses, and races; they are of all nationalities so that English is not always their first language, instead of only men or mostly men, women now comprise more than half of the college population; and finally, many students are the first in their families to enroll in college.

Our nation's commitment to these non-traditional students carries with it the obligation to help them succeed in their college courses by providing developmental education. And that is the correct term because it helps advance and develop each student beyond his present level of learning. Many would say it is eupbemistic to call this type of education "developmental" rather than "remedial." But the concept of development is to realize potential, to build on what already exists; remediation, on the other hand, involves correcting a fault or curing a disorder, a totally different idea.

Jim is one of hundreds of non-traditional students at the area's community colleges—Lorain County, Lakeland, and the three campuses of Cuyahoga. A large proportion of these returnees are, like Jim, men in their 30s who have been laid off after 10, 15, or even 20 years of work in one of the local heavy industries. In Jim's case, it was a steel mill.

Unlike some who are no longer employed, Jim decided not to sit by the phone passively waiting for a callback. He was realistic enough to understand that his previous type of job and the skills it required would probably not be available again—ever. Seeing no other alternative, he undertook to find a way of "retooling" to prepare himself for a job that would exist.

His first (and only) reaction was to call a community college, less than five miles from his home, to find out how to enroll in classes. He was immediately given an appointment with a counselor.

Setting foot on the campus was a frightening experience for Jim. He had been a poor student in high school, barely getting enough passing grades to receive a diploma. His friends were equally poor students, who found it easier to boast that they hated school than to make an effort to do well.

The counselor put Jim at ease. She was sensitive to his feeling of insecurity. She explored his interests and his concerns. When he stated a particular interest in the field of electronics, she explained several programs available at the college. Although Jim had not brought a transcript of his high school grades, he quickly admitted that his grades had been low.

The counselor suggested that in view of the long hiatus from high school graduation until the present time, Jim might profit from some developmental courses. She administered some standardized tests to measure Jim's current reading, English and mathematics levels. On the basis of his scores, the counselor strongly suggested that Jim take developmental reading, writing and mathematics.

"You'll find that brushing up on all these skills is necessary before you take other college courses," she explained. "There's no job nowadays that doesn't call for the ability to read and write well. And with your interest in electronics, a good math background is especially important."

The counselor was reassuring. "You may feel a bit rusty at first, but you'll find that after an academic quarter spent here, you'll probably be able to tackle any portion of the microelectronics program successfully."

I met Jim a month after this initial appointment. He was a student in my developmental reading course, in which more than half the students were over 21. In the class, which met for five hours a week, Jim's strengths and weaknesses were diagnosed. In spite of a relatively high vocabulary level, his comprehension measured at about an equivalent to eighth grade.

He and the other 19 students in the class were each assigned to whatever modules or units of work that they seemed to require. Each worked at his own pace, under my

guidance, to master the material in the modules. Much of my time, besides helping every student to improve his skills, was to give "injections of confidence." Obviously any praise had to be sincere and warranted by accomplishment.

Jim appreciated being treated like an adult, responsible for completing his work on each module before being evaluated to see if he had indeed mastered the skills listed in the objectives. He found that each session increased his concept of himself as a learner. After his comprehension had improved, Jim undertook to increase his reading speed. By the end of the 11-week quarter, his comprehension was that of a college student and he had doubled his reading skill.

Like Jim, approximately three-quarters of the students enrolled in credit courses at most community colleges are over 21. (The average age in 1984 was 28.) More than 58% are women.

What strengths does this older group of learners bring to their classes? Perhaps the most outstanding feature of the older student is his motivation. He establishes clear-cut, realistic goals for himself as a person, as a student, and as a worker. He is not attending college because his parents have sent him; he has sent himself. He views this trip to school as a road to success, not a mandatory experience. Because of this built-in motivation, the older student, after an initial adjustment, is more apt to stay in school and less apt to fail or drop out than the 18-year-old.

In addition to this sense of purpose, the older student is experienced both in living and in working. He, like Jim, may be married, with children of his own. He has learned to cope with the everyday problems of living, with emergencies, with change itself. He has experienced pain and disappointment. He has had to take responsibility for himself and for others. That commodity affectionately and erroneously termed "common sense" is an attribute of the more mature student.

Finally, the mature student, the one who has picked himself up after hearing the dreaded words, "You're laid off," has proved his resiliency, his power to rise above his problems.

In spite of these strengths, the returning older student is prone to lack one important ingredient: self-confidence. And for good reasons. He's no longer employed; he has discovered that he is unable to land another job without retraining and, worst of all, he is putting himself into a position where he had previously met failure: school.

Given the will to succeed and the support of caring counselors and instructors, Jim and many of his classmates do attain their goals. From the frightened, unsure man who entered my class in September 1984. Jim left in December enjoing reading in particular and learning in general. He convinced his wife that she too should attend college. Jim himself appears destined to be one of the many community college success stories. On the basis of his work in all three developmental courses, it is my prediction that he will experience little difficulty in completing his program in microelectronics. Ultimately, he may even be tempted to transfer to a four-year college for a B.A.

Jim's case history points up the reason for developmental education itself being offered in a college.

Had Jim decided to return to high school for such work, he would have plunged himself back into an atmosphere that would have destroyed whatever self-respect and confidence he possessed. Somehow, the very fact that he was enrolling in a college built his self-esteem. Even if he had needed more than one quarter of compensatory courses before he felt able to enroll in the regular college curriculum, he could tell his laid-off friends, "I'm going to college." Being on campus helped him feel a sense of participation in an institution of higher learning.

In short, attending college becomes in itself, a motivating factor for the Jims who return to school.●

SURVEY OF VIEWS OF ARKANSAS' YOUTH

● Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I conducted a survey in Arkansas recently, taking a sample of views of high school students in 14 schools across the State. The survey was taken in conjunction with a slide presentation entitled, "A Day in the Life of a Senator," that my staff takes to high schools in the spring and fall each year.

As future voters and leaders of my State, I am interested in their perspectives on the type of leadership President Reagan is providing the country, party identification of these future voters, their ideas on how we can address the Federal deficit, and what concerns them most as young Americans.

I thought my colleagues might be interested in the results of my survey of 1,700 Arkansas civics, government, history, and social studies students. I also thank the students at Sheridan, Stuttgart, Dumas, LakeSide (Lake Village), Bismarck, Glenwood, Mena, Greenwood, Eureka Springs, Huntsville, Morrilton, Atkins, Searcy, and Beebe High Schools for their willing participation.

I submit the survey results for the RECORD.

The survey results follow:

SENATOR PRYOR SURVEYS VIEWS OF ARKANSAS' YOUTH

1. What kind of job do you think President Reagan is doing?

7%, excellent; 33%, very good; 45%, fair; 15%, poor.

2. Which political group do you consider yourself to be a part of?

42%, Democratic Party; 25%, Republican Party; 33%, Independent.

3. If you were President, which of the following programs would you eliminate or cut to help balance the budget?

11%, defense; 2%, Social Security; 3%, highway funds; 11%, food stamps; 2%, health programs; 18%, foreign aid; 3%, agriculture support payments; 2%, student loans; 5%, scientific research grants; 5%, school lunch program; 2%, veterans benefits; 3%, small business loans; 4%, housing assistance; 10%, Federal employee salaries and pensions; 2%, Energy conservation programs; 13%, Amtrak service; 2%, environmental cleanup programs; 3%, Job Corps programs.

(Note: Multiple Answers Allowed)

4. Which of the above programs would you cut first?

(Top 5 Responses) Foreign Aid—27%; Defense—21%; Food Stamps—14%; Amtrak—14%; Federal Employee Salaries—8%.

5. Which of the above programs would you cut last?

(Top 5 Responses) Social Security—24%; Defense—18%; Foreign Aid—9%; Food Stamps—8%, Student Loans—7%.

6. Which of the following concerns you most as a young Arkansan?

24%, drug abuse among young people; 31%, threat of nuclear war; 29%, ability to get a job after graduation; 16%, ability to go to college.

7. If you were President for one day and had the chance to meet any individual in the world, whom would you invite to the White House?

(Top Response) Gorbachev, 23%.●

SENATE DEMOCRATIC WORKING GROUP ON TRADE POLICY

● Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, the Senate Democratic Working Group on Trade Policy released their initial report this morning. It attempts to lay the groundwork for a comprehensive, coordinated trade strategy for the United States.

Our lack of a trade strategy is costing us jobs. According to a Library of Congress study, an increase of only 10 percent in our exports 2 years ago would have meant jobs for 800,000 more Americans today.

Our lack of a trade strategy threatens the economic recovery and that, too, threatens jobs. If the trade deficit continues to weaken our economy as it did in the first quarter unemployment will climb.

Our lack of a trade strategy mocks efforts to reduce the Federal deficit. President Reagan, on television last night, urged sacrifice of Americans to bring the budget deficit down by $50 billion next year. The surge of imports into this country, by cutting back economic growth, threatens to add far more than $50 billion to this year's budget deficit.

And I do not have to tell you what the Federal deficit, by pushing up interest rates, has added to the trade deficit. It is truly a vicious cycle.

Our timing on the release of this first report—just as the President leaves for the economic summit conference in Europe—is not accidental.

We have what we believe is a clear and vitally important message for him as he departs.

Mr. President, please do not initiate a new round of trade negotiations at the Bonn Summit. You haven't done your homework. We want a new round. There is a compelling need for one. Existing rules of international trade are inadequate to the task. But the United States doesn't have a clear idea of what such negotiations should accomplish and you can bet that our competitors in other countries know exactly what their goals are.

We believe in free trade. We believe that when trade is free it is a powerful engine of economic growth, bringing

jobs and prosperity to people in all lands. In recent years, though, a number of nations have abandoned our example in favor of a highly protectionist approach, a new mercantilism that has acted not as an engine but as a brake on growth.

As the leader of the Free World, we cannot let this happen. As we say in this report, the United States must formulate an aggressive trade policy that will set the world back on the path of free trade.

Mr. President, as chairman of the working group, I wish to congratulate the other members of the group, including: Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia, ex officio; RUSSELL B. LONG of Louisiana, ERNEST F. HOLLINGS of South Carolina, DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR. of Michigan, MAX BAUCUS of Montana; FRANK R. LAUTENBERG of New Jersey; TOM HARKIN of Iowa; QUENTIN N. BURDICK of North Dakota; THOMAS F. EAGLETON of Missouri; SPARK M. MATSUNAGA of Hawaii; ALAN J. DIXON of Illinois; JEFF BINGAMAN of New Mexico.

Their time and effort made this report a success. And I congratulate them and the working group staff for their excellent assistance.

Mr. President, I ask that the working groups report on trade policy be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The report follows:

THE NEW GLOBAL ECONOMY: FIRST STEPS IN A U.S. TRADE STRATEGY—PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE SENATE DEMOCRATIC WORKING GROUP ON TRADE POLICY

[Charts mentioned in report not reproduced in Record]

INTRODUCTION

The trade dilemma

No other country in the world holds as large a percentage of free world exports as the United States, about 15 percent. Japan's share, which is increasing, is still only slightly over 9 percent. West Germany has slightly over 10 percent. No other free world nation comes close to those three. Yet international trade is the weak link in U.S. economic policy. The largest trade deficit in the largest exporting and importing nation the world has ever known presents the economic dilemma of the decade: Should government help by cutting off imports?

Denying trade relief could leave America stripped of its manufacturing and agricultural capacity, with a human cost in millions of displaced people. Yet, answering every cry for relief will start a firestorm of import barriers here and around the world that could lead to a depression.

Notwithstanding trade deficits for years, Presidents have imposed trade protection mainly as a response to political pressure. The current Administration, which has imposed more trade barriers on U.S. imports than any Administration since the 1920's, is now facing the largest trade deficits ever, without any apparent strategy. We are concerned that the Administration may be forced to respond to a future crisis of the moment, such as a decline in the U.S. economy, by imposing harsh and harmful import overprotection because of the current lack of trade policy direction.

A great trading nation needs a world of trade growth, not trade collapse.

The world's greatest trading nation, a global power with global economic interests, needs a trade policy that is strong and dependable under all circumstances and conditions.

A Trade Policy for the Nation

At the beginning of the 99th Congress, a Senate Democratic Working Group on Trade Policy under the Chairmanship of Senator Lloyd Bentsen of Texas began work on the question of whether U.S. Government policies affecting trade serve the national interest. This preliminary report contains the conclusions developed thus far.

As Democrats, we are mindful that President Reagan recently won a resounding victory based on a soaring economy. To those who argue that the current lack of direction in trade policy should not be challenged because the President's election represents an endorsement of his position on trade, we would point to an earlier generation of victorious Republicans.

In 1929, Republican Congressman Willis Hawley, the author of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, observed:

"During the campaign of 1928, the Republican Party proposed to the country that a readjustment of the tariff would be effected, and special reference was made to a readjustment of the tariff as a part of the program of relief for agriculture. The country responded by the election of President Hoover with a tremendous vote and by a greatly increased Republican membership in this body. Construing the results of the election as an authorization and direction to this Congress to readjust the tariff duties, upon its assembling in December, 1928, it was decided to begin promptly this work."

The crash of 1929 had not yet come, much less the Depression induced by these "readjusted" Republican tariff rates, when Senator Cordell Hull fearlessly wrote in June 1929:

"American economic policy can no longer ignore the fact that since 1914 we have changed from a debtor and small surplus Nation to the greatest creditor and actual or potential, surplus-producing Nation in the world . . .

"When Republicans assert that tariff protection has become the accepted policy in this country, they do not mean reasonable, or adequate, or moderate protection, but inordinate, air-tight, superprotection intended to exclude every item of imports remotely competitive, which invites retaliation and which largely cuts us off from all markets for our surpluses. They dare not defend it upon grounds of revenue of equity or morals.

"This is the first economic issue tendered to Democrats. We must first halt and drive back the movement to fasten this unsound and destructive policy of extremism upon the country, by a demand that the Nation face in the opposite direction of lower tariffs, more liberal trade policies, and systematic efforts to develop an increasing export trade."

It was right to challenge superprotection in 1929, and we believe it is right to challenge disregard for trade in 1985.

If the trade barriers are going up, America must find a way to tear them down. They came down once before through hard-headed bargaining. It will take a hard-headed trade strategy to bring them down again.

As public servants who believe deeply in the workings of open markets, we have set out to find American policies affecting trade have gone wrong . . . and what can be done about it. We intend to understand how the world has changed in the last 15 years and to prescribe policies that Republicans as well as Democrats will support because they serve American interests today.

I. THE NEW GLOBAL ECONOMY

We are in an era of reduced U.S. influence, flexible exchange rates, interdependence, and mercantilist trade practices; a new global economy. Although the global economy has great potential to improve U.S. living standards, these changes are dangerous as well. Today they create windfall winners and losers among trading nations and generate protectionists pressures.

"Fact: The U.S. deficit on the current account—basically the difference between the goods and services this country sells to foreigners and those it buys from them—is an extraordinarily large $100 billion and climbing. In only two instances in the last 15 years, involving the United Kingdom in 1974 and Canada in 1975, have developed countries run current account deficits that were as large relative to their Gross National Product (GNP) as that of the United States in 1984." ("The Externalization of the U.S. Economy: Fact and Fiction," John D. Paulus, Chief Economist, Morgan Stanley Economics Department, Economic Perspectives, November 26, 1984.)

The United States faces a new Global Economy today. It is an economy that, in a very real sense, the world has never seen. Here are the four major changes:

Huge exchange flows

The change was born on March 11, 1973 with the breakup of the Bretton Woods system of regulated exchange rates. In place of Bretton Woods came a new flexible exchange rate market, a world market in currencies enormously different from what preceded it. Today, world currency flows may be as much as 25 times the size of world trade in goods, $50 trillion a year versus $2 trillion a year in trade.

This is a remarkable turn of events. Instead of competitive prowess or resources driving exchange rates, exchange rates determine whether the world's most efficient farmers and most productive manufacturers can find a buyer.

Now the price of goods is influenced by whatever currency speculators and investors look to; one day it may be the safety and security of the United States or Germany; the next, America's deepening budget deficit or Japan's burgeoning trade surplus; the third day, record U.S. real interest rates or sagging French exports. The tail now wags the dog.

Moreover, with the exchange rates driving trade flows, it is dawning on businessmen, farmers, and workers that they may never be able to become competitive. American firms cut costs by 50 percent in one year, and then find they must locate abroad. Workers settle for pay freezes and learn new technologies, only to find the exchange rate has made their product more expensive. A sense of distress derives not from the fact that the dramatic, daily change now placed upon competitors is beyond their control, but that it may be beyond any control at all.

Global interdependence

The second change has been the growing interdependence of world trade. The explosion in world trade since the 1960's that has meant a larger share of jobs and income than ever before is, in most nations, inextricably linked to foreign trade.

In combination with flexible exchange rates, this interdependence has added a striking degree of volatility to domestic economies. Foreign economic policies are no longer muted by inflexible exchange rates. Quite the opposite: they have been magnified by flexible rates. And domestic economic policies have become less potent because they tend to "leak" into the world economy, weakening their domestic effects almost immediately.

This volatility can be reduced if the United States exercises its strong leadership abilities to effect closer coordination of fiscal and monetary policies between the major trading countries.

New mercantilist trade practices

Notwithstanding the dangers of floating exchange rates and increasing interdependence, the possibilities for growth in a world economy are enormous. But it will take a truly open trading system to unlock this potential. That is where the potential is being lost.

Worldwide, government industrial stimulation to affect foreign trade—a new mercantilist trade policy—has increased. Export markets are highly prized for the income and employment they produce; imports are discouraged to protect infant industries and jobs, and to conserve scarce foreign exchange. Trade becomes a one-way street.

New mercantilist trade strategies of other countries depend on selling to the United States, the largest open, fully-integrated market in the world. U.S. trade policy treats such government involvement as benign, attacking such policies tangentially only when they openly constitute well recognized trade barriers and export subsidies.

The most effective practitioner of the new mercantilist trade practices is Japan. Japan has become the free world's second largest economy in good measure on the strength of its export sector. In 1984, its exports rose to nearly 80 percent of the level of U.S. exports, based on an economy only one-third as large. Yet, it imported fewer manufactured goods than the Netherlands, an amount scarcely equal to a bare 15 percent of U.S. manufactured imports.

Japan's tight-fisted access policies are deeply rooted in its government bureaucracy and highly nationalistic business practices. They are a source of great frustration to world class American exporters. According to the Department of Commerce, Japanese trade barriers cut U.S. exports to Japan by $12 billion last year. That cost the United States 400,000 jobs, including 27,000 in semiconductors alone.

The success of Japanese trade practices have encouraged the so-called newly industrializing countries (NIC's) along the Pacific Rim and in Latin America to emulate the market access policies of Japan. As a group, the NIC's are easily the fastest growing economies in the world.

These mercantilist trade practices, like their 18th Century predecessor, are inherently protectionist, designed to convert two-way trade to a one-way street. The success of such practices rests squarely on manipulation to generate a trade surplus. Thus, there is now a growing segment of the world market in goods in which governments compete, the twin of the world market in currency. No international agreement controls either of these markets.

Changing the role of the United States

The United States has industrial policies, especially in defense and agriculture, and some marginal subsidies that assist exports. But these programs are not supported by major schemes of protection, nor were they developed mainly to produce growth through exports.

The United States, in other words, is still the leader of an open, reciprocal trading system. But there has been a change in the role of the United States.

While it is clear that the United States is still powerful enough to affect the world's markets, by itself it cannot control currency markets, not can it simply order other governments to change their mercantilist trade practices. America must find new ways to use its power to convert the Global Economy into an engine of growth. The Global Economy holds out the hope that our grandchildren can inherit a life as much improved over ours as our lives are over those of our grandparents: But we have to make that happen.

THE TRADE DECLINE

The domestic economic policies of the current administration have ignored the existence of the global economy. The result: Huge trade deficits, unprecedented borrowing, and stalled world trade growth.

In Brasilia, Brazil, an American business aircraft sales team learns there is a 60 percent Brazilian duty and strict licensing of business aircraft imported into Brazil, and it gives up trying to sell there. In the United States, the same company completes against Brazilian aircraft exports, yet there is no U.S. duty on aircraft and no import licensing restrictions.

The record $123.3 billion merchandise trade deficit for 1984 hit America like a thunderbolt. An Administration living on borrowed money and ignoring the realities of the new world economy has responded by asserting these trade myths:

Myth one: The flood of foreign investment since 1981 has been attracted entirely by economic strength, not interest rates. That is incorrect. Over one-third of the dollar's appreciation occurred during the recession because real interest rates were rising sharply even as the economy plunged into its most severe post-war downturn.

Myth two: The bloated dollar is not harming the U.S. economy. In reality, it is responsible for two-thirds of the trade balance deterioration since 1980 or nearly one-half of the current trade deficit, and for the sharp fall in American competitiveness in world markets. Moreover, while the price of a barrel of oil has declined from $35 to under $30 in the United States, the high price of the dollar has raised the price of a barrel in Europe to the equivalent of $48, helping to stall growth there.

Myth three: The trade deficit is a temporary, healthy development. In the current trade environment, U.S. industries are moving offshore or being encouraged to buy more of their components offshore. Reestablishing these productive facilities, even if favorable trade conditions can be restored, will be prohibitively expensive. Current passive trade policies, if continued, will further discourage the return of these facilities, by tolerating foreign mercantilist trade practices and leaving the U.S. market relatively wide open. The trade deficits are likely to worsen, not improve, this year.

Myth four: The lagging Japanese and European economic recoveries are the cause of the trade deficit. Lagging growth abroad has had an impact on U.S. trade, but it is not the major factor. Weak Administration efforts to achieve greater market access have limited U.S. exports to Japan. The European recovery is lagging, in part due to high U.S. interest rates, but is responsible for no more than one-quarter of the trade deficit deterioration.

Myth five: The Administration has not resorted to protectionism. The Administration has imposed more trade barriers than any President since Herbert Hoover. Its budget and trade policies are largely responsible for the trade deficit. Yet, protectionism by default has become the Administration's major policy response to the trade deficit.

America: An international debtor

This year for the first time since 1914, the United States has become an international debtor. Each night, the Administration drinks up more foreign capital to bridge the next day's gap between imports and exports. "Vampire economics," Harald Malmgren, the former Deputy U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), calls it.

As in all Administration deficit matters, this will not be done in moderation. Borrowing fully 19 cents of every dollar it has proposed to spend, the Administration has pushed real interest rates up, and the dollar is at dangerous, record levels. By the end of 1986, the United States could well have more foreign creditors than Mexico and Brazil together. Like all nations who live beyond their means, servicing that debt will impose a lifetime burden on each man, woman, and child. Americans face reduced future standards of living, less growth, and higher rates of interest in order to transfer real resources abroad to satisfy these obligations.

If America waits five years to attack its external debt, it may need an export surplus of as much as 2.5 percent of GNP to stop the debt compounding. The current account deficit is now about 2.6 percent of GNP. To obtain such a turnaround in five short years will require a monumental shakeup in the U.S. economy. The Chief Economist for Kemper Financial Services, Mr. David Hale, wrote recently in the Wall Street Journal, "The problem is that the longer this trend persists, the greater will be the economy's adjustment problems when the U.S. ceases to be an automatic recycling center for the world's surplus savings."

Unemployment

The trade deficit has inhibited growth sufficiently to leave unemployment stalled higher than any recovery in history. It is hovering far above the low point of 5.7 percent attained in the previous extended recovery from the 1974 recession. Indeed, while growth has been good in three of the preceding four years, unemployment from 1981 through 1984 has averaged 8.6 percent—nearly 40 percent above the 6.2 percent average unemployment rate during the 1970's. Virtually all of that shortfall rests squarely with the more than 2 million jobs lost in recent years by our eroding foreign trade sector.

Entrance of the current so-called baby generation to the labor force has greatly eased the need to generate employment opportunities since 1980. The labor force is growing a scant 1.6 percent annually this decade compared to the robust 2.6 percent annual growth which occurred in the 1970's. Had that previous pace been sustained, unemployment would be hovering over 10 percent today under current policies. Not since the 1950's has the U.S. labor force been expanding so slowly. Even so, unemployment has stalled above 7 percent for nearly a year, due to the trade imbalance.

Eroding American competitiveness

The immediate impact of the dollar crisis in farming and manufacturing is obscuring its longer term impact. Administration foreign economic policies are eroding the American competitive base, jeopardizing the nation's ability to remain a first-rate international economic power and to provide future employment growth. Since 1980, American industry after industry has lost its foreign trade edge. Semiconductors, shipbuilding, telecommunications, textiles—the list is long and growing. It includes high technology as well as basic industries.

The stalled engine of growth

In the post-war period until 1980, trade was an engine of world growth. Between 1965 and 1980, world exports expanded from $189 billion to a peak of $2.043 trillion, an increase of over ten-fold in 15 years. Even exports from developing nations were impressive, soaring nearly 7 percent a year since 1965. They have propelled developing nations like Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, Mexico, and Brazil into modern industrial economies.

But world export growth ceased between 1980 and 1983. It did not just fall back to a position in step with world growth of production; the value of world exports actually fell. This is the single greatest trade contraction since the 1930's.

In 1984, when final data are in, world exports may again have increased, but if so, this will be primarily because of American imports, a development that is simply not sustainable. Trade is no longer a locomotive of growth; it has become a brake on growth.

A lack of balance

The world trade decline has occurred in spite of stupendous American trade deficits and large national surpluses elsewhere. This is because major trading countries have not followed internationally responsible economic policies, as measured by the large deficits of the United States and the large surpluses of others in their "basic" balance of payments—merchandise trade, services, return on investment and capital flows taken together.

Collectively, large imbalances have created a global problem. Trade barrriers to protect infant industries in Japan constitute a bilateral issue. But when they and other causes of imbalance spread to the five leading NIC's and beyond, the problem becomes worldwide, and the result is the slowdown in the growth of trade. The huge trade and current account deficits in the United States and the huge surpluses in these measures in Japan are important contributors to the current lack of balance.

Some of these imbalances are said to be necessary to resolve the debt crisis in the developing world. In many heavily indebted countries, unreasonable and unjustifiable import restrictions and determined export-promotion drives are combined with other austerity policies to pay off the debts of these countries. Such a combination produces slow growth in their domestic markets and large international trade surpluses. The import barriers and export subsidies tend to become entrenched.

And since the United States now imports nearly 60 percent of non-OPEC developing country exports, and Japan only 8 percent, the burden of debt crisis protectionism, austerity and export promotion in the developing world is borne by the U.S. trade deficit.

There is another way. Growth in world trade requires more responsible, cooperative and growth-oriented solutions to the debt crisis, such as more cooperation in opening industrialized markets, and faster growth in world trade. An examination of the causes and of cooperative approaches to the debt problem is needed. These are the responsible solutions to the debt crisis, not the current go-it-alone policy of the Administration.

As a global power, the United States must be concerned about trade slowdowns. As an individual trader, the United States should be alarmed as well, for our open markets have borne the brunt of these one-way policies.

The possibilities

The new world economy presents enormous possibilities. Reaping the trade and growth benefits of this new and highly interdependent world economy is in the interest of the United States. Foreign government trade strategies that cause wrenching adjustments in this country and wide fluctuations in trade patterns will not disappear because the U.S. Government announces it is for "free trade." Some control over the excesses in the world marketplace are essential. The challenge is to develop a trade policy, as well as economic policies, that promote stability and free trade.

III—ERODING INTERNATIONAL RULES

International trade rules are as necessary to free trade as rules of the road to free travel. But the existing rules do not reckon with the global economy. Yet international trade rules, such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), have to be strengthened if possible, not abandoned.

"In a recent survey of 49 countries, 27 were found to maintain local content requirements for automobiles. In Mexico, for example, 70 percent of the value of cars and 80 percent of trucks must be of local origin. Australia requires 85 percent. Most of Western Europe and Japan do not maintain local content requirements." ("Issues in U.S. Trade Policy," Congressional Research Service, April 23, 1982, Report No. 82-77E.)

Trade rules are very much like rules of the road: "In international trade, just as in road traffic, following accepted rules actually enhances everyone's freedom of action," according to the report of seven eminent persons appointed by the Secretary General of the GATT in 1984 to study and report on problems facing the international trading system.

An absence of rules

International trade rules, such as they are, do not cover many areas of world commerce, including some of the most important:

The estimated $30 to $50 trillion in annual world currency flows are subject to no significant international agreements.

Trade in petroleum, the most valuable commodity trade in the world, is driven by the rules of an international cartel that does not consult the hundreds of millions of people adversely affected by those rules. The cartel can hardly be called "international law."

Trade in services is not for the most part covered by international rules.

Barter and trade by corporations owned by governments are not subject to significant GATT control.

As much as 90 percent of the trade protection in the world was not carried out in accordance with GATT rules.

International agreements on the protection of intellectual property exclude many nations and generally fail to provide effective protection, even though technological advantage—an essential component of competitiveness—can be easily lost in the world economy without effective agreements.

It is no surprise that the GATT advisers concluded earlier this year:

"From the beginning, the GATT rules were flexible and pragmatic. But in recent years some countries have abused the system's built-in flexibility to avoid complying with the spirit of its basic rules. Others have sought trade advantage by taking measures not adequately dealt with in normal negotiations or covered by the rules of GATT."

In a special meeting with this Democratic Working Group, the Chairman of the Trade Committee of the President's Commission on Industrial Competitiveness reported that whereas GATT covered 20 percent of world trade in 1950, it covers less than 5 percent today.

Failure to take account of the New World Economy

The GATT assumes a world that no longer exists, of fixed exchange rates and countries that do not protect infant industries; a world where customs duties make a significant difference. That world is gone forever.

First, there is a whole new set of players. A system that only 20 years ago consisted mainly of the industrialized West and Japan now includes the newly industrialized countries, Korea, Singapore, Taiwan, Brazil, Mexico, and others. These countries now export twice as much to the United States as a percentage of trade as they did in 1960. By 1995, they will be engaged in twice the trade with the United States as the United States is now with Europe, according to estimates done for the President's Commission on Industrial Competitiveness. To a large extent, GATT rules do not apply to those countries, under the special provisions of Part IV of the GATT, "Trade and Development."

Moreover, where tariffs were once the trade barrier, now countries use anything but a tariff as their main trade barrier. Called "nontariff barriers" or "NTB's," there is no limit to the variety of these NTB's excempt the human imagination. NTB's are extremely difficult to control, because they can take almost any form, from requiring needlessly detailed customs inspections to unattainable health standards. Notwithstanding efforts to control NTB's in the Tokyo Round of Trade Negotiations (1973 through 1979), NTB's are growing faster now than anytime in the last 10 years.

In addition, world trade is affected by dozens of agreements other than the GATT intended to manage explosions of exports. The most pervasive form of trade management agreement—the bilateral "voluntary" restraint agreement (VRA)—is now a commonplace. Indeed, notwithstanding its free trade rhetoric, the Administration has itself negotiated a worldwide network of VRA's that will be the opposite of "free trade" in U.S. steel trade for the next five years. Since non-GATT VRA's actually guide practice much more than the basic rules of GATT do, the United States is now in an environment where the international law to trade tends more toward trade management than allowing it to run "free."

Finally, in place of the GATT free trade model now stands the model of import restraints and export promotion, the new mercantilist trade practices. To many countries, the GATT is simply a gauntlet of technicali-

ties, easily breached because even its greatest defender, the United States, often devises ways around the rules.

Even so, keep the GATT

Yet GATT is not dead, nor is it irrelevant; it is a marketplace of ideas, not a set of rules. It is an influence rather than a policeman. Even this limited capability can be useful to the United States.

For example, in some cases, GATT provides a forum in which some limited consensus can be generated:

In a recent case, a panel of experts advised the GATT that Spanish taxes on soy oil did not deny the United States the benefits of tariff concessions on soybeans, one of the most important U.S. agricultural exports. However, in the GATT, the United States at least convinced other members not to adopt this decision.

In another case, when the United States complained that Canadian investment regulations were undermining the benefit of prior Candian tariff concessions to the United States, GATT actually agreed, and Canada was forced to change the regulations to the satisfaction of the U.S. Administration.

Of course, this process has great limitations. With varying levels of obligation among members, and numerous exceptions to exceptions, GATT represents more a continuing negotiation on trade rules than a constitution for trade. Breaking down trade barriers through the GATT process of discussion, or any other negotiating process, suffers from a lag. Typically, as a barrier is understood, complained about, and eventually reduced, new barriers replace it. The same is true of export promotion schemes.

More fundamental than the institution, however, is the one basic understanding that many believe lies behind GATT: That growing trade means improving living standards so long as the growth is stable. Stability is tested by the ability of trading nations to cooperate by avoiding major international economic imbalances. This simple idea is as true in the new Global Economy as it was at the end of the Second World War.

Therefore, a legitimate objective of U.S. policy is a stronger, more comprehensive GATT. But we must not be misled into assuming that the only solutions are multilateral. Multilateral consensus on the old forms of trade was built on a basis of bilateral trade agreements. Multilateral consensus on the new Global Economy must be built on the same basis.

IV—THE LOSS OF TRADE LEADERSHIP

American trade laws can be made to respond to the global economy with relatively little change. Moreover, we know from experience that tough trade strategies can open up trade. The missing element is trade leadership.

In Washington, D.C., the Administration pushes Congress to reduce U.S. import duties on gasoline imported from the People's Republic of China, even though the Chinese gasoline does not meet U.S. octane standards, U.S. refineries oppose the idea, and the Chinese offer no concession in return. Meanwhile, 12,000 miles away, the Japanese Government prevents a Japanese petroleum trading company from importing a single shipload of gasoline into Japan from Singapore, where gasoline is refined more cheaply than in Japan, to protect Japanese refineries from a 10-cent per gallon drop in the price of gasoline.

U.S. trade law was not intended to deal with the Global Economy. This body of law is a hodge-podge descended from turn-of-the-century unfair trade practice statutes; the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program of the 1930's; and the laws of the 1950's, 1960's, and the 1970's designed primarily to implement the GATT and protect U.S. rights under the GATT.

Yet the laws are broad enough to deal with most aspects of the current condition. What little authority might be required is not lacking because of Congressional resistance but because no recent President has pointed out that there is a problem, much less proposed a way to deal with the problem.

Similarly, current American trade policy takes little account of the Global Ecomony. What was, in the 1930's, a hardheaded strategy of bargaining for reductions in trade barriers, has gradually become a policy of leading by example—a kind of unilateral disarmament in trade. Few follow the example. After all, running $150 billion trade deficits, damaging domestic industries, and overvaluing currency is hardly inspiring to others.

The danger of protectionsim

There are many ways to hide from a $123 billion trade deficit. The worst is protectionism. Yet the danger of protectionism is greatest now, with surging trade deficits.

The first source of danger is political. In the new world economy, there is much that destroys support for international trade. Rapidly fluctuating exchange rates make adjustment difficult. Surging imports tear down linkages in the economy, putting workers in the competing domestic company out of work first and then displacing workers who supplied the industry with materials, services and technology. Finally, exporting industries, deprived of foreign markets by forces beyond their control, lose their interest in trade, and revoke their support of the open trading system.

The second source of danger is economic. As foreign debt mounts, and investment in industry declines, it becomes necessary to protect domestic industry, so it can rebuild and develop export industries that can, eventually, pay off the debt. This is the argument of Brazil and Mexico for protection today. Will it be America's tomorrow?

These are potent forces, and it will take potent strategies to channel them in positive directions over the next few years. But it is clearly in the national interest to do so.

In combating protectionism, we believe that import barriers and protectionism are not necessarily the same thing. Import barriers are recognized by international trade rules, and can serve legitimate purposes of promoting competitiveness, dampening especially harsh effects of economic change, and leveraging other governments into opening their markets. The danger in the current situation is "superprotection," airtight protection of industries without requiring they become competitive. What we fear is that the current lack of coherent trade policy will leave the Administration with no alternative except superprotection.

Infirmities of current law

Current U.S. trade law provides a variety of import and export remedies and programs, but these have been outdated by the realities of the new Global Economy. Two examples:

Unfair trade practice laws.—Since most international unfair trade practice law merely offsets that part of the price of the import shown to be unfair, such laws do not offset the 40 percent subsidy given to imports in the last few years by the overvalued dollar.

Thus, while the huge deficits are driving companies to unfair trade relief laws in unprecedented numbers, frustration with the operation of the laws is reflected in a lengthening list of reforms put before each convening Congress.

Escape clause.—U.S. law also provides that when an entire industry is threatened with serious injury by increasing imports, then the government may provide relief even though there is nothing unfair about the imports. This is the "escape clause." In effect, escape clause relief is to provide time to adjust to the competition. Most such petitions have been regularly denied. In some cases, politically powerful industries, such as automobiles and steel, have managed to obtain relief, unfortunately outside the regular channels of U.S. law and international agreements. But they are the exceptions. Since 1975, 54 petitions for so-called escape clause relief have been filed; some form of relief—almost always less than enough to completely remove the harmful impact—was provided in only 13.

Part of the problem is that the escape clause law is written in such a way as to severely limit eligibility. For example, current eligibility requirements resulted in a decision in 1980 that imports were not a substantial cause of serious harm to the domestic automobile industry. Yet four months later, the Reagan Administration found it necessary to strong-arm the Japanese Government into limiting automobile exports to the United States for four years.

But more often the problem is that Presidents deny relief unless there is overwhelming political pressure for it. Few industries can muster such pressure. In the scramble for such clout, industrial adjustment—the purpose of the law—is usually given short shrift.

A lack of program

In several areas, the United States lacks significant programs that have become virtual necessities in the current world trading system. For example:

Export programs.—The United States hardly has an export policy worthy of the name, let alone export subsidies. There is no effort to coordinate the export market tools that exist. There is an export tax exemption—enacted first at the instance of the Nixon Administration in 1973 and revised at the instance of the Reagan Administration in 1984—but it hardly offsets the disadvantages placed upon U.S. exporters by border tax rebates and adjustments of other countries. There is a modest export financing scheme for capital goods, the Export-Import Bank (Eximbank), which is not sufficient to compete with foreign subsidies of the same nature (and which the Administration wants to reduce further). And there is an agricultural export subsidy program used when the agricultural export subsidies of other countries—particularly the European Common Market (the European Communities, or EC)—so interfere with traditional U.S. agricultural export markets that some retaliation is plainly necessary.

What the United States does have is barriers to exports.

The main barrier today is the 40 percent "tax" on exports represented by the overvalued dollar. But there are others.

The export incentives pale by comparison with a system of direct export controls for national security, foreign policy or short supply. Through at least two Administrations, these laws have become increasingly arbitrary; application times have become

prohibitive; and the effect abroad has as often as not been the opposite of that intended. Food embargoes have damaged U.S. markets abroad more than they have helped the stated policy objectives of the embargo. President Reagan's embargo of pipeline equipment to the Soviet Union in 1982 did not prevent the Soviets from building the Yamal pipeline; it did deepen rifts in the delicate and strategically important Atlantic alliance.

The pipeline embargo also hurt U.S. exports by making American producers appear to be unreliable suppliers. For example, major European firms, such as Creusot-Loire, which had purchased American products for a century, found it necessary under the circumstances to undertake an assessment to determine their reliance on American products. Not surprisingly, they found their reliance was too great.

Displaced worker programs.—The United States currently has no significant displaced worker program. The Trade Adjustment Assistance program, which included payments to workers laid off by reason of trade pressures, as well as training, job search and relocation allowances for workers and small loans and technical assistance to firms, is scheduled for final burial in the Administration's fiscal year 1986 budget. The Job Training Partnership Act that is supposed to do the job does not have the funding to undertake the tremendous task of job adjustment now taking place in America. The U.S. Employment Service, through inadequate funding and lack of Administration commitment to it, has been set up to fail, regardless of the agency's intentions.

It is now estimated there may be as many as one million U.S. displaced workers per year in America. These are workers with a demonstrated attachment to work. They have the proven capacity to learn the new jobs that will keep America competitive. Many of them have already taken tremendous pay cuts in import-sensitive industries. We believe it is fundamentally unfair to give these workers no way out except unemployment as the price for the benefits of free trade. The nation will benefit from efforts to develop effective, cost-conscious programs of training, job search, and job relocation for them.

Industrial adjustment conditions.—We must find ways to promote favorable, positive industrial adjustments in this country. To compete, the United States must insist upon industrial changes that promote international competitiveness. But the escape clause is often not used as an adjustment program. Consumers and workers should be assured that relief under the escape clause will lead to industrial progress, such as modernization. In the recent Administration program placing quotas on basic steel imports, there were no such conditions. But Democrats insisted on a quid pro quo from industry, and got it, in the Omnibus Trade and Tariff Act of 1984.

Japan has such programs for industries in decline. The programs provide both protection and a phaseout of uneconomic facilities. Indeed, these programs frequently represent barriers to U.S. exports. America needs to make better use of the escape clause.

The information gap.—One aspect of the trade barrier-identification problem is the surprising lack of trade information within the U.S. Government. There is no law to regularly provide the Government with the information it needs to formulate active trade policies. The General Accounting Office (GAO) reported last year that laws to help provide such information are not being enforced.

Trade information is an area ideal for assistance by computers, but the process of introducing and adapting data processing technology to trade policy analysis is slow and piecemeal. The United States now has what is probably the best trade data in the world, but it has limited staff resources to analyze or even process the data.

Finally, we see a need to link trade data and production data. Trade data are available on a more timely basis than production data, but the current situation results from inattention, not technical barriers. Input/output information—the kind of data Japan relies on to do its strategic trade planning—was not yet available in this country in the fall of 1984 for any year later than 1977.

Other programs.—The United States lacks many other programs to help cope with the new economy, many of which other countries now have. But we must be cautious. Many of these programs will not adapt well to America, or would tend more to undermine than build up trade. For example, U.S. law does not provide a remedy such as the one available in most of the trading world for "infant industries": Protection from imports in the early phases of a business. But we believe such programs should be thoroughly considered before they are suggested. At this time, notwithstanding the obvious unfairness of other countries having such programs, we believe the right approach is to try to break down the trade barriers such programs present, rather than to imitate them.

The current trade policy vacuum

Current Administration actions affecting trade are limited to initiating only narrowly targeted trade programs. The trade actions of the Administration show it has no uniform strategy for dealing with the current problem.

Responding to petitions.—There is a great deal of American trade law; unlike many other countries, we do the government of trade in the sunshine. Most of these laws can be used affirmatively by the President, but they also permit private persons to petition for government assistance or relief. In most cases, the President has been waiting for petitions, avoiding trade problems on an *ad hoc* basis. But the growth of the mercantilist trade practices requires a more affirmative response than waiting for petitions. This is not only because in most cases American companies fear foreign government retaliation if they complain about barriers, but because the United States must assert leadership. The alternative is to have American trade policy made by majority vote of the GATT.

Caribbean Basin and Israel.—The Administration's trade initiatives, such as they have been, widely accepted by Members of both political parties. The Caribbean Basin Initiative and the free trade area agreement with Israel were (or shortly will be) approved by Congress with the active cooperation of many Democrats. But these programs are hardly responses adequate to the enormous problems presented by the new Global Economy. There, the Administration has fallen short.

The "new round."—The Administration has called for a new round of trade talks for the past three years, but it has done little if anything to actually make it happen. Often its actions have appeared to conflict with its works. For example, it astonished fellow trading partners when, barely a month after an economic summit pledge to resist protectionism, it gave escape clause relief to the domestic specialty steel industry.

Moreover, a new trade round is not, in itself, an answer to the current situation. For example, the Administration's list of objectives for the new round is the same list that almost turned to tragedy at the 1982 GATT meeting of Trade Ministers—a list that virtually ignores current issues of the international economy. We do not argue with what is on this list, as far as it goes—trade in services, trade-related investment, agriculture, improvements in escape clause provisions. We argue with what is not on the list.

Where is a discussion of efforts to control current fluctuations of currency prices, the international trade development that most hurst American farmers? Where is a discussion of efforts at promoting adjustment, controlling export credits, protecting U.S. intellectual property, and pushing back the effects of the new mercantilism?

In some cases, other countries have demanded international discussion of these issues. It required an active refusal by the Administration to avoid discussing these issues. At this time, the Administration position still seems to be to avoid putting such issues on the GATT agenda. Therefore, the agenda for the "new round" is not complete.

Finally, the Administration has not taken adequate steps to build a national, domestic consensus on what America wants from a new round—and what it is willing to pay. It has sought no legislative authority for the new round.

Japan.—At the beginning of 1985, apparently realizing the trade deficit was at least a political problem, the Administration identified four narrow sectors in which Japan has the most obvious and egregious kinds of protectionism. The Administration tactic was basically to embarass Japan into reducing these barriers, first by releasing Japan from any obligation to limit the number of automobiles exported to the United States and then by publicly criticizing the Japanese for refusing to open wide these sectors.

Aside from the fact this strategy did not work—at least by the first of what will probably be many "deadlines" for Japanese market-opening—the action was much narrower than the current economic situation calls for.

Japan tends to set the standard of new mercantilism, but it is not the only example. Our largest bilateral trade deficit may be with Japan, but it is not our only large bilateral trade deficit. A global trade strategy is called for, not piecemeal tactics.

Trade strategy that works

In fact, the Administration has failed to present to the American people a strategy for saving the open world trading system. In order to revive the open world trading system, the American Government will have to understand the Global Economy. Only then can it see the need to act affirmatively.

The old strategy.—The old tactic was effective in its time: Reciprocal agreements to reduce tariffs, the "Reciprocal Trade Agreements" program. This strategy has recently run up on two rocks.

First, there is an increasing number of free riders, especially in the tariff-cutting system. For example, when the United States "deregulated" its telecommunications industry, other countries got greatly increased access to the huge U.S. market, while the United States got nothing in

return. When countries can get trade benefits from the United States free, why should they "pay" for them?

Second, U.S. tariffs are now so low, they provide little bargaining leverage; and the United States has relatively few of the NTB's that are the heart of mercantilist trade practices. Moreover, NTB concessions are often worthless, since barriers negotiated away are often replaced by equally effective NTB's not covered by the agreement. For example, if Japan agrees not to employ inspection on the dock— a form of nontariff trade barrier—but later institutes a requirement for design certification of imports, they have merely traded on NTB for another.

New tactics.—As a result, in the Trade Act of 1974, Congress set forth new general and specific trade negotiating objectives, and new system to accomplish these objectives, tactics that were to be used in combination with the old tactic of reciprocal trade agreements. Some of the new Congressionally-authorized tactics included:

Bilateral trade agreements (instead of multilateral agreements) (section 105);

Limiting membership in new agreements to only those countries that accept the obligations of the agreement (no "free riders") (section 102(f)).

Sector-by-sector negotiations (section 104);

Authority to cut U.S. rates of duty (section 101);

Some of the tactics Congress provided were utilized. For example, when the Carter Administration was unable to get general agreement on various "Codes" to control NTB's and subsidies, it entered into the Codes with those countries that were willing to accept higher levels of discipline, using the Congressional "no free riders" tactic. This tactic allegedly breached the cherished unconditional most-favored-nation doctrine. But without it, there probably would have been no Subsidies Code. Thus, although the results were limited, the Tokyo Round showed that the constuctive use of new, tough trade tactics could result in trade liberalization, even though this might upset to some degree certain GATT doctrines.

Now, even tougher tactics are necessary because the obstacles to open trade are greater. Instead of merely denying greater access to the U.S. market, we will have to be prepared to reduce access to the U.S. market for a proper purpose. We know this will work. In 1981, the Multifiber Arrangement (MFA) was renewed in part because under U.S. law, had the MFA not been renewed, duties would have snapped back to their 1975 levels.

As the leader of the world trading system, the United States must attempt to use tactics that ultimately expand total trade or at least defend a specific, palpable U.S. strategic interest. Random import restraints imposed for no more reason that political expediency—such as the Administration decision to raise duties on heavy motorcycles—hurt America's ability to make progess in the new world market. Countries that find import barriers hard to resist were given an argument to hide behind.

The trade strategy law

One major statute lends itself to a trade strategy for controlling the excesses of foreign government trade strategies. This is section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974, which essentially authorizes the President to restrict imports or take any other action within his power to retaliate for foreign actions that deny U.S. exports "fair" and equitable market opportunities." The statute was amended in 1984 to add the "market opportunities" language, and to require annual estimates of U.S. trade opportunities, and the barriers to them.

In its pre-1984 form, section 301 was used mostly at the request of U.S. exporters, much in the manner of a foreign claims settlement provision. It led mostly to negotiations, not retaliation. But used affirmatively by the President, such actions can lead to consultations that open markets. For example, the President has initiated a GATT case on his own motion which reached the successful conclusion of forcing Canada to change its investment laws, thus promoting U.S. exports. (The Canadian law in effect required U.S. persons who invested in Canada to buy their supplies from Canadians.) Despite many other barriers to U.S. exports worldwide, the tactic has not been employed consistently.

There have also been isolated incidents of action to promote U.S. exports in the face of foreign unfair competition—for example, a subsidized sale of wheat flour to Egypt in 1982 to knock out the sale of French wheat flour subsidized by the EC. But such actions have so far been too few and isolated to work a change in EC policies—although such tactics can be effective if they are part of a larger strategy.

Therefore, we know section 301 and similar actions have the potential to serve as tools for creating effective but temperate American trade strategies. They have not been used to do the job so far.

U.S. trade organization

The President has it within his power to make trade a priority. It is important he have the organization, as well as the power to do the job.

The U.S. domestic organization to deal with trade, often criticized by those within government as well as without, is a creature of law as well. It consists of three distinct parts: The interagency process to be presided over by the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), a Cabinet officer who sits in the White House; the advisory process, a network of industrial, agricultural, intergovernmental, and labor private sector technical experts, to keep the process serving American interests; and the Congress, whose trade committee members have statutory status as members of U.S. trade delegations, as well as being consultants on trade agreements and arbiters of the laws that make or break American trade policy.

This is a system intended to be responsive to direction from the top. There is a vacuum of such direction now; there is no consistent U.S. trade policy. Ad hoc committees can only prepare options. If the President waits for consensus to decide the issues, America will never use the tactics in its arsenal.

No reorganizational suggestions can fill the void left by the current lack of leadership on trade. The Congressional mandate on trade has always been clear: There should be one trade voice, who reports to the President.

The Administration has compounded the problems of American trade policymaking. In 1981, it created a nonstatutory trade advisory group—the Cabinet Council on Commerce and Trade—chaired by the President, with the Secretary of Commerce as Chairman Pro Tempore. Then, in 1982, the Administration formed the Senior Interdepartmental Group on International Economic Policy. The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Interior, and the National Security Adviser sat on the statutory Trade Policy Committee but not on the Council on Commerce and Trade. The Secretary of Energy and the Attorney General sat on both—but were not on the Senior Interdepartmental Group. The Vice President sat on the Cabinet Council on Commerce and Trade, but when the President was absent, the Secretary of Commerce sat as Chairman. No wonder there is confusion in American trade policy.

Recently, the Administration abolished the Cabinet Council on Commerce and Trade and folded these functions into a new, larger Cabinet Council, chaired by the Secretary of the Treasury. This latest reorganization may or it may not reduce the confusion, but it certainly gives trade even less priority than it has now, and it does not, moreover, assure any greater Presidential attention to this vital area of concern.

V—RECOMMENDATIONS

The United States must formulate a consistent trade strategy. It would champion an open reciprocal trading system, getting its own house in order, reducing exchange rate volatility, promoting international economic coordination, and utilizing international law and domestic law strategically.

Principles and specific trade recommendations

The United States is a robust, competitive, productive, and innovative nation, and the leader of the free world. It is in this nation's self-interest—and it is its responsibility—to promote a system of free and open trade.

We are failing in efforts to achieve this goal. A new mercantilism of trade manipulation, inherently protectionist, is spreading throughout the world.

The United States remains the champion of an open trading system, but many nations no longer follow our lead. We are in an era of eroding international rules of trade, a time of economic difficulty nearing the crisis stage.

The United States is the largest exporting and importing nation in history—and we are burdened by the largest international trade deficit in history. Our response is critical, but there is no clear indication of when or how we will use our enormous economic authority. Used carelessly to confront a crisis, we could lead the world to economic ruin. Used wisely and carefully, it can lead back to the path of prosperous open trade.

Trade must become a priority concern of this Government. We believe the following principles and recommendations will build a solid base for a wise, new beginning in the trade history of the world.

Many of the tools needed in this endeavor are already authorized by law. Our failures in the field of trade are due primarily to simple neglect by the current Administration, as well as the lack of policy of previous Administrations. Thus, the most needed change in American trade policy is a change in attitude, not law.

Principles of a new U.S. trade policy

Recognize the existence of a new Global Economy.—Characteristics of today's Global Economy are reduced U.S. influence, huge capital flows, trade-distorting mercantilist trade practices, and a growing economic interdependence among nations. Recent Administrations have largely failed to recognize the existence or the implications of this new economy. The goal of free trade remains valid, but the strategy for reaching it must change under these new conditions.

Avoid wide imbalances.—We must revive the basic consensus which produced growth

after World War II—the avoidance of wide imbalances in such basic measures as merchandise trade and external debt. Whenever and wherever they occur, these deficits and surpluses of trader nations must be brought within reasonable limits and kept there.

A trade strategy, not a trade mythology.—The United States must use its enormous leverage—including both incentives and penalties—to move other nations toward an open trade system. American trade policy has proceeded as if the nations of the world follow and open their markets behind us. In reality, Japan has become the worldwide model.

Trade must expand faster than the GNP.—The trade policy of this nation must be directed toward expansion of the total trade of the world, now about $2 trillion, to the point that trade produces growth for the United States and the rest of the world.

Correct our domestic economic problems.—Existing trade problems are compounded by domestic problems of low savings, huge Federal budget deficits, relatively tight money and our status as an international debtor. These are roadblocks to international cooperation and successful trade, and they must be corrected.

TRADE POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

International measures

(1) The Administration should prepare a catalog of trade-related benefits and penalties that are available for use as leverage in rebuilding the world trading system. It should identify powers already delegated to the President, and he should use those powers to improve the domestic economy and world trade.

(2) The President should exercise his existing authority to enter into bilateral trade agreements. While the ultimate goal of the United States should be tough, worldwide trade agreements, bilateral agreements are valuable tools in building a consensus or improved international rules. The President should proceed to consult with statutory private sector advisers, Congress, and others on possible bilateral agreements. Such discussions should move forward while homework on a "new round" of multi-county trade discussions is completed.

(3) The United States should determine where it (as well as other countries) could expand exports under the "most-favored-nation" principle of trade concessions, but are not doing so because of unreasonable and unjustifiable foreign trade barriers. This nation should then formulate strategies that offer special credit for increasing imports of U.S. products and carefully targeted trade retaliation against these barriers.

(4) We believe the United States should not proceed with a new round of trade negotiations at this time because certain basic preliminary steps have not been taken. Steps that should precede such negotiations include the following:

First, major international trade influences, such as the international currency market, should be on the agenda of the new round. The agenda should also include methods of controlling the effects of the new trading practices of many countries. Options for preventing domestic problems that affect trade should be considered, as well as techniques to insure coordination of economic policies. The Administration should encourage discussions for overhauling the international financial system.

Second, a special Presidential Commission on U.S. trade Policy should be established and consulted. This Commission should consist of representatives of both major political parties, including Members of Congress, and of interested private persons, including consumers. The Commission should be charged with identifying the trade objectives of the nation. The statutory Trade Policy Advisory System should be fully consulted on the new round.

Third, upon consideration of recommendations of the Commission and the Trade Policy Advisory System, the President should submit legislation setting forth the objectives of the United States in the new round and act pursuant to the authority Congress gives him.

Domestic law and policy changes

(1) The escape clause law should be used to promote increased U.S. competitiveness. Current law provides that when an entire industry is threatened with serious injury, or is actually injured, by increasing imports, the government may provide import relief under this law. It should be as easy as international trade rules permit for a domestic industry to qualify for trade relief. Then, relief should be provided on the condition of strict programs of new industrial investment by the industry assisted. Emphasis should be on maintaining the economic health of industries important to the national economic welfare.

(2) A comprehensive program is needed to support displaced workers—those persons with a history of attachment to the workplace and whose employers certify them as permanently unemployed. Up to one million such workers per year left jobless deserve a better alternative than an unemployment check or assistance by the underfunded Jobs Training Partnership Act. They are jobless because of structural problems beyond their control.

(3) The present layering on non-statutory trade panels within the Executive branch should be removed. Congress should consider legislation strengthening the authority of the USTR—giving him the authority to take certain trade actions. Just as other major White House advisers have jurisdiction over their areas of concern, the USTR should manage trade in cooperation with the President. Congress should also consider a small White House coordinating staff on trade.

Technically qualified advisers from industies and labor and agricultural groups concerned with trade should be appointed to the Trade Policy Advisory System. The System was designed as a panel to assist the Administration on trade matters, and it should be used in this important effort.

(4) The United States should coordinate export incentives as needed to achieve a national export policy. Export incentives include expanded Eximbank financing and carefully targeted agricultural export subsidies. U.S. policy should attempt to assure, if not actually obtain, export opportunities for U.S. exporters. The government should consider the effects on the economy before interrupting exports for any reason. Efforts should be made to authorize the Eximbank at levels sufficient to offset subsidy programs of foreign governments.

A study should be instituted to examine whether and how to establish a market in export-credit documents. In exchange for buying our goods, we sometimes offer to buy-down interest rates on loans to other nations. We should determine whether there is a market for this international indebtedness—as there is a market for similar domestic transactions. It may thereby be possible to give the U.S. taxpayer more bang for his buck by leveraging larger transactions.

(5) Undisputed facts on international trade would be valuable in planning our trade strategies, but such reliable information is not now available in a usable form or timely fashion. The government should initiate a program to collect information on American and foreign production and trade, maintained under conditions of appropriate security by an independent, nonpartisan trade information service. Statistics should be compiled to identify potential export opportunities, measure them, and assign priorities of value and importance. Government efforts should be targeted at such export opportunities.●

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

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

THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate to my colleagues in the Chamber and those who may be listening in their offices that we intend to call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 within the next 15 to 20 minutes. I am waiting for Senator DOMENICI, the chairman of the Budget Committee, and right now he is involved in a meeting and will be free in a few moments.

It would then be my intention to call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 and offer a series of amendments so that we might have a vote on the so-called leadership package. Of course, we invite cosponsors on both sides of the aisle. We think it has a lot of merit. There may be a few flaws in it, which will be found in any large package. We hope it would indicate, not just from a partisan standpoint, but also as a reflection of the general consensus in this Chamber, that we need a deficit reduction package.

Someone has to start and, as I understand, that obligation generally falls to the majority. If you want to be the majority, you have to start. So we intend to do that, to try to get a vote on the package, if I do not mess it up along the route sometime later this evening.

I guess the maximum it could take would be around 7 hours, after we start. No, I guess that is not the maximum, since Senator BYRD just indicated with his eyes that it could be much longer. [Laughter.] I am reminded that he is correct. It could happen within 7 hours. It could be less, but it also could be a great deal longer. It is my hope that we could have a vote on the package before the day is out; if not, tomorrow.

Before I call up the resolution, if the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee or anyone else wants to speak, I am prepared to yield the floor. As I understand it, the chairman wishes to put something into the RECORD before I call up the resolution.

Mr. DOMENICI. I should like to say a few words. It will not add to the 7 hours by any appreciable amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, obviously, I will have plenty of time in the next few days to talk about the nature of the event we are starting in the Senate today, and I do not want to use too much time. We have used a great deal of time already in getting where we are.

Frankly, I am pleased that we are about to start; because it seems to me that anyone who has looked at the fiscal policy of our country and is concerned about the future and the well-being of our people would have to conclude that the time has come for us to do something about it.

If we have reasonably good economics, we might have deficits or $240 billion for the next 8 or 9 years. If we do not have good economics, deficits might be in excess of $300 billion.

I do not think we can succeed too long with those kinds of deficits. Interest rates are unusually high at this particular time in the recovery. To have real interest rates at 7 percent or 8 percent is beyond anything we have had in history. To find foreign money coming into America by the billions, not to help our industries but to pay our debts, is unparalleled, and it was never expected by anyone.

You add all those up, and it is obvious that this is a rather historic time. We have to do something now about the deficits. It will not be easy. Nothing of this magnitude is ever easy. It will be very difficult.

But frankly, I will take the following approach throughout this debate. I will ask these questions of myself, and I will hope that others in this Chamber will also ask themselves these questions: For every program that we seek to change, modify or eliminate, would we create it today with our $200 billion to $250 billion deficits? Is the program in the general interst of America? Is it based on some general policy that we feel is absolutely imperative, like helping the poor of the country and those who are vulnerable. With whatever benefits a program has for Amtrak riders or small businessmen and business women or others, would we see our way clear to start that program today with these kinds of deficits?

If the answer is no, it seems to me we have to do something about it.

Mr. President, I understand that there are many ideas as to how we should solve this problem. It is not easy for me. And it is not easy for the leader, for Senator BYRD, or Senator CHILES, in their respective capacities, to come up with a budget proposal that pleases everyone.

I certainly would not think I could do that even if the times were not difficult, but when they are difficult and when the problem is this large, and when we have let it get this bad, it is very difficult to prepare a budget with recommendations that would please everyone.

But I do believe we will have before the Senate a reasonably good package.

Two or three months ago everyone said let us put everything on the table. Some said the President did not put defense on the table. I think it is on the table. Some said he did not put all the pension programs on the table, only part of them. They are on the table. Some said that he had too many domestic programs that he wanted to terminate or cut. We have developed with the President a compromise on many of those in an effort to get a package together that has everything on the table.

Frankly, I think it is a reasonably good package. And I submit that the change that will occur for all Americans with prosperity continuing and interest rates coming down justifies our asking that we change our ways, whether it be on SBA, Amtrak, or other Federal programs.

So I am prepared, I hope I can be patient and considerate, and I will listen to everyone else's views, and we will do our very best as we move through the ensuing days to see if we cannot arrive at a consensus on what we should do for deficit reduction.

I know there are many people with good ideas and I know there are other packages that some want to offer.

I submit that for everything that is said about the package of budget reductions that the leadership will offer, for every other package that others have, there will be some kind of complaints that we will hear about ours, maybe more. For those who have taxes in their packages, and a number of them do, there will be complaints about taxes. There are some who complain because we do not have any taxes in our package. For those packages which would not reduce entitlements as much as the leadership package, there will be complaints that entitlement must be reduced more because that is where the Government is growing and out of control.

For those who do not want to reduce Amtrak, there will be others saying, "Why should you not; you are reducing my farmers' payments," and it will go on and on.

Somehow I am hopeful, however, that this institution, which has a real capacity for eventually arriving at consensus, will do that. I hope we will. I stand prepared to work with anyone on either side of the aisle in an effort to do that.

Obviously, defense is of broad, general interest, and it is on the table. Obviously, Social Security and pensions are of broad interest, and they are on the table. There are people on both sides of the aisle who think we should restrain them somewhat without cutting anyone below where they are. There are some on our side who think a 1-year freeze is better. There are some on the other side who think the 1-year freeze is better.

All of this makes arriving at a consensus difficult, but clearly there is some consensus developing as you look at all the different packages that are proposed. I think there is an awful lot more support for proceeding totally on the expenditure side than I thought there would be some 2 or 3 months ago when we started.

As I indicated, I will have far more to say as we move through the hours and far more things to talk about that have come to my mind over the last couple of months, but suffice it to say that we will be ready in a few minutes to proceed. Certainly I stand ready. At this point, I have nothing further to say, and I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. 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. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, it is my understanding the leader will be ready shortly to submit a series of amendments setting the stage for the vote in several hours, either later tonight or tomorrow, on the Republican leadership package which I earnestly support and which I commend to my colleagues for their attention, sponsorship, and approval in due course.

But I also understand, Mr. President, that once that process begins it is not the intention of the leadership to necessarily have extensive debate until we have a chance to get close to the vote itself. So until the moment comes for the majority leader to present those amendments, I just wanted to make a couple of observations.

As we begin this budget process, I found myself thinking of Lucy Vanpelt. I wonder if Senators recall who Lucy Vanpelt is. Lucy is the person in the cartoon strip "Peanuts" who each year at the football season holds the football for Charlie Brown. You all know that year after year poor old gullible Charlie Brown gets ready to kick with Lucy holding the football and he comes charging down the path

ready to boot it right out of the stadium and, just as he gets there, Lucy snatches away the ball and he falls and makes a fool of himself. And year after year this goes on and each year poor old Charlie Brown goes through this agony and each year Lucy fools him.

And he comes back the next year and says, "Now, you're not going to do that to me again, are you? You are not going to pull the ball away at the last instant and make a fool of me. You are not going to make me disgrace myself again."

The reason I am thinking about that, Mr. President, is because that is sort of the way it has been with the budget. Every year we come in here and say, "This is the year we are going to get tough on this budget. We are going to solve this problem. We are not going to let these deficits mount up and put the country through a wringer and have higher interest rates and unemployment and inflation. We are going to be responsible. We have sworn off all that deficit spending. This year we are going to do something."

Then, at the critical moment, just about the time we are ready to kick the ball, somebody snatches it away.

Well, I will admit that I am probably as gullible as Charlie Brown, but I have been convinced that this year at the last instant the prize will not be stolen away from us; that within several days, maybe next week, or certainly within a very short period of time, this Senate is going to pass a very, very large deficit reduction package. I think, in fact, I believe, I hope that it is going to look just about like the leadership package which is going to be presented very soon by the majority leader and in which the chairman of the Budget Committee will join in sponsoring and which I am privileged to join and which I believe will be presented to the desk for consideration under the sponsorship of maybe as many as 25 or 30 more Members of the Senate, just indicating the depth and breadth of the support for this measure.

Maybe at the last minute Lucy or somebody is going to come around and snatch this victory away from us, but I do not think so, not because the Lucys of the Chamber have necessarily reformed, but because I think there is a broad recognition in this country that it is time for us to mend our ways.

I talked to so many people who, in years past, have been here lobbying for the extension or expansion or even the enlargement of various Federal programs, who have been in this year and said, "If you have got to cut something and if you are cutting everybody and it is absolutely fair and every segment of the economy bears it, then we are willing to take our lumps, too."

I have had people from farm areas of Colorado, many of whom are trying to make a living on farms that have been in their families for 80 to 100 years, who are now very deep in trouble, people who you might expect would come in here and say, "Please, please increase and in no event cut farm subsidies," who, nonetheless, come in and say, "If you have got to cut the farm subsidies in order to make this package work, we are ready to take it and we will find some way to make ends meet on the farm if it is fair. If everybody is in the same boat, we are ready to take our share of the problem."

Mr. President, this morning I had the privilege of joining a group of distinguished leaders of the business community who presented an endorsement of this leadership package on behalf of more than 200 organizations, who have looked at it, who have come to the conclusion that, while there are things in there they do not like, that the best and wisest course for the future of the country is to get behind this package. It is instructive that they have done so because there are a lot of things in there that are going to be hard on the companies and industries and segments of the economy which are represented in this budget.

When you get business people, small business concerns, for example, saying, "Yes, if we have to we are ready to give up SBA lending, ready to give up the Small Business Administration," when you get large concerns saying, "OK, if it is part of the package, we are ready to do without some of the defense contracts on which our companies and our prosperity depend," when you get companies that may even depend on Exim financing saying, "We are ready to do without that," when you have concerns who have prospered and grown from large building projects under subsidized housing and UDAG, saying, "OK, if it is in the national interest we are ready to back off and join in an effort to even cut back these programs that are in our own interests," I think that is a remarkable thing.

I find it, Mr. President, such a gesture of statesmanship that I would like to at this time ask unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD and ask that there be printed following my remarks a list of the constituent companies and organizations which make up the Deficit Reduction Coalition as of this moment, organizations and companies representing millions of American businessmen and women, workers, managers, and investors, who are prepared to take a step of faith in supporting this package because they believe it to be in the best interests of our country's economy. And I do, Mr. President, send that list to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—would the Senator from Colorado be good enough to yield for a question before proceeding forward with his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes, I would have no objection, although the Senator from Colorado would freely confess that to respond under these circumstances to a question from the Senator from Ohio is a high-risk strategy because the Senator from Ohio is wiser and better informed and more skillful in the posing of questions than I am in the answering of them.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I do not intend to be any of those things. But I just want to be certain——

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before he poses his question, I just want to be sure he is not going to pull the football out from under me the way Lucy does for Charlie Brown. If the Senator would assure me that is not his intention, I would be pleased to yield.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I might be inclined to do that. I would not promise that.

I wanted to really ask a very simple question. The Senator from Colorado has sent to the desk a statement, I think it is from the deficit reduction coalition?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk and asked unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a list of organizations and companies which, as of today, constitute the deficit reduction coalition. I have not sent any statements, but merely a list of those groups that are backing the Republican plan which will be presented by the majority leader in due course.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Is the Senator from Colorado aware that there are 13 corporations that are signers to that document urging us to balance the budget who had a free ride from their Government for the last 3 years, who have not paid a penny in taxes, notwithstanding that they have profited to the extent of about $9.9 billion; that the Government has given them back in tax refunds something like $741 million, and they have the audacity and, if I may call it more than that, the hypocrisy and the brazen gall to say to us, "Cut Social Security, cut programs for the poor, cut programs for maternal health, cut programs for children, cut programs for everyone else, but be darned sure you don't make us pay any taxes." Now, are you aware of the fact that 13 corporations that have signed and are part of that list are getting a free ride, and they are making billions of dollars, and do you not think that does indicate some kind of hypocrisy on their part?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, after being a Member of this body for

nearly 7 years I must say that I look back upon the moments, hours, days, months, and years that I have spent with my friend from Ohio as a time of intellectual enrichment, a time of enlightenment, a time which has given me many memories which I will carry with me always. I appreciate his friendship, but before I respond to his question, I want to know, is he going to let me put the list in the RECORD or not?

Mr. METZENBAUM. Indeed I am.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the Senator. I will be pleased to respond.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I have not yet withdrawn my reservation. The Senator just asked if I am going to. That is a statement as to what I am going to do in the future.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio is a wily old fox, [laughter] and I note that he has reserved his right to object but has told me that he will not. So I will answer his question. The answer is no, I am not aware of any such thing. I am aware that the companies to which he has referred in fact may not have paid any income tax but they have paid hundreds of millions of dollars of taxes of other kinds including Social Security, payroll, and local excise taxes.

I am aware, I say to the Senator, that these companies have created jobs for hundreds of thousands of people in this country, that these companies have been the economic lifeblood of many communities. I also say to the Senator that the President of the United States has proposed a loophole-closing tax plan. I think he is on the right track. I believe that over the last two or three decades, decades, I may say to the Senator from Ohio, when his party, not mine, was in control of the Congress of the United States, decades in which Republicans did not control the Senate Finance Committee or the House Ways and Means Committee—there grew up not entirely because of the responsibility of his party, but under the leadership of his party, under the direction of his party, a Tax Code of enormous complexity which with every good intention resulted in many, many, many loopholes. I am also aware, let me say to the Senator from Ohio—because I do not think this is the end of the discussion of the issue, and it is just the start, I judge—that we have already begun to make efforts in 1982 to pass measures of loophole closing and not all Senators on either side of the aisle voted in support of those measures. The Senator from Colorado, for one, did so. When President Reagan said that he wants to have a simplified tax program which will lower the marginal tax rate for people in this country and close loopholes, then I say, "Hurrah, let us get on with it." But I hope that will not become the occasion to take any revenue that might be raised from loophole closing away from their intended purpose which is to broaden the base and lower the marginal rates for individual taxpayers.

At the right time, Mr. President, I would like to pursue this matter with the Senator from Ohio and anybody else because I think tax reform is an important priority of the U.S. Senate, an important item on the agenda of this country, but I do not think this is the moment to go further on it other than to say that I do not accept—indeed, I earnestly reject—the notion that these companies are not paying any taxes under the laws enacted by this Congress. Some of them, a handful, may not be paying any income taxes, but for most companies their payroll taxes are two or three times as much as their income taxes, just as Social Security taxes are a much larger dollar tax amount for the average American family than is their personal income tax. Maybe that ought to be reformed, too, but I do not think we ought to leave the impression that these companies pay no taxes.

Mr. President, I see that the leader has returned to the Chamber, and I think that means he is ready to offer his amendment, and I have suggested to him that I wanted to speak only until he was ready to proceed. I have a few other things on my mind, but if he is ready to go, I would like to defer that discussion for another time and just close again as I began urging support for the amendment which the Senator from Kansas is about to present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator's request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority leader.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I did get unanimous consent to put my list in, did I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

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

DEFICIT REDUCTION COALITION

Abbott Laboratories.
Aetna Life & Casualty Co.
Air Products & Chemicals Inc.
Allied Corp.
Aluminum Company of America
AMAX Inc.
American Bakers Association.
American Bus Association.
American Business Conference.
American Council for Capital Formation.
American Cyanamid Co.
American Electronics Association.
American Farm Bureau Federation.
American Furniture Manufacturers Association.
American Gas Association.
American Insurance Association.
American Iron & Steel Institute.
American Home Products Corp.
American Mining Congress.
American Paper Institute.
American Petroleum Institute.
American Plywood Association.
American Pulpwood Association.
American Retail Federation.
American Trucking Association.
American Wood Preservers.
Amway Corp.
Appalachian Hardwood Manufacturers, Inc.
Armco, Inc.
Armstrong World Industries, Inc.
ASARCO.
Associated Builders & Contractors.
Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc.
Association of the Wall & Ceiling Industries.
Atlantic Richfield.
Automotive Service Councils.
Ball Corp.
Bethlehem Steel Corp.
Boise Cascade Corp.
Borg Warner Corp.
Bristol-Myers Co.
Brown & Root, Inc.
The Business Roundtable.
California Redwood Association.
Caterpillar Tractor Co.
Celanese Corp.
Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.
Champion International Corp.
Chase Manhattan Bank.
Chevron Corp.
CIGNA Corp.
Cincinnati Insurance Co.
Citizens For A Sound Economy.
Coalitions for America.
Competitive Enterprise Institute.
Commercial & Industrial Association of Northern New Jersey.
Construction Industry Manufacturers Association.
Damson Oil Co.
Dana Corp.
Dart & Kraft, Inc.
Dayco Corp.
Delta Air Lines.
Diamond Shamrock.
Dow Chemical USA.
E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Co.
Eastman Kodak Co.
Eaton Corp.
Electronics Industries Association.
Equitable Life Assurance Society of the U.S.
Exxon Corp.
Financial Executives Institute.
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.
Florists Transworld Delivery Association.
Flowers Industries.
FMC Corp.
Food Marketing Institute.
Food Processing Machinery & Supplies Association.
Ford Motor Co.
The Gates Rubber Co.
GATX Corp.
Gen Corp., Inc.
General Foods Corp.
General Mills.
General Motors Corp.
BF Goodrich Co.
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.
Greyhound Corp.
Grocery Manufacturers of America.
GTE Corp.
Hammermill Paper Co.
Hardwood Manufacturers Association.
Highway Users Federation for Safety & Mobility.
Honeywell Inc.
Houston Lighting & Power.

Hughes Aircraft Co.
Ibero-American Chamber of Commerce.
Illinois Savings & Loan League.
Insulation Contractors Association of America.
International Business Machines Corp.
International Paper.
ITT Corp.
James River Corp.
Leadership Foundation.
Eli Lilly and Co.
Litton Industries.
Martin Marietta Corp.
Mead Corp.
Merck & Co.
Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc.
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.
Mobil Oil Corp.
Monsanto Company.
Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association of the United States.
Nabisco Brands, Inc.
National Asphalt Pavement Association.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Association of Minority Contractors.
National Association of Plumbing, Heating & Cooling Contractors.
National Association of Realtors.
National Association of Retail Druggists.
National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors.
National Automobile Dealers Association.
National Electrical Contractors Association.
National Electrical Manufacturers Association.
National Federation of Independent Business.
National Forest Products Association.
National Hispanic Association of Hispanic Construction Enterprises.
National Independent Dairy-Food Association.
National Insulation Contractors Association.
National Intergroup, Inc.
National Paint & Coatings Association.
National Particleboard Association.
National Retail Merchants Association.
National Soft Drink Association.
National Spa & Pool Institute.
National Tax Equality Association.
National Tax Limitation Committee.
National Taxpayers Union.
National Wooden Pallet & Container Association.
National Woodwork Manufacturers Association.
NL Industries.
Northern Virginia Apartment Association.
Northern Independent Forest Manufacturers.
Northwest Pine Association.
Olin Corp.
Owens Corning Fiberglass Corp.
J.C. Penney Co., Inc.
PEPSICO, Inc.
Phelps Dodge Corp.
Phillips Petroleum Co.
Potlatch Corp.
Printing Industries of America.
Private Sector Council.
Procter & Gamble Co.
Prudential Insurance Co. of America.
Ralston Purina Co.
Rockwell International.
Rubber Manufacturers Association.
Scott Paper Co.
Sears Roebuck & Co.
Shell Oil Co.
Society of American Wood Preservers.
Sperry Corp.
Standard Oil Co. (Ohio).
Stone Container Corp.
Southern Forest Products Association.
Sun Co.
Tax Council.
Texaco, Inc.
Texas Lathing & Plastering Contractor's Association.
Times Mirror Corp.
TRW Inc.
Truss Plate Institute.
Union Camp Corp.
Union Carbide Corp.
Uniroyal, Inc.
United States Brewers Association.
United States Business & Industrial Council.
United States League of Savings Institutions.
United States Steel.
United Telecommunications.
Western Wood Products Association.
Weyerhaeuser Co.
Xerox Corp.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I do want to call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, but I want the minority leader to be present. So I would just indicate while he is coming to the floor that we will probably have a lot of good debates in the next few days about a lot of things that are very interesting, but I just hope that we can end up, whatever may happen in the interim, with a strong bipartisan tax-free package of deficit reduction. It seems to me that it is time to get on with that. The President made his speech last night. The phones are ringing, the telegrams are coming, the mail-grams are coming, and they are running 5 to 6 to 1 in favor of deficit reduction. I am not certain where the one is and I cannot find many people who do not want to do this package or something very like it. They want to do it their way rather than some other way. But it would seem to me with that strong public support, it is incumbent upon us on both sides of the aisle to respond, and again I encourage my Democratic colleagues to look at our package carefully. I am certain there are some areas of agreement, some areas of disagreement. But in the final analysis, we may either fail or succeed depending on whether we are willing to work together.

It is my hope also—and I say this to my Republican colleagues—that when we finally reach a vote on the amendments, amendment No. 5 later on this evening, that we will have unanimous Republican support. The question before us at that time will be whether or not the leadership is going to set the agenda. You may have difficulties with the package. You still have a right to offer amendments. But I would hope that we would sort of have a united front, that we ought to be looking at a $300 billion deficit reduction package, and we should demonstrate very clearly at the outset that we are serious about it. That might help us slow down the erosion of the next few days.

Mr. President, while we are waiting for the distinguished minority leader, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. METZENBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. METZENBAUM. I will yield the floor back when you are ready.

Mr. DOLE. I withhold the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I just thought that the leader was on the floor. I did not want to engage in further colloquy with my good friend from Colorado. But he made a great speech about how important it was that we move in this direction, that this was such a major action on the part of the body if we adopt the compromise so-called of the President and the Republican leadership. If we win, we lose. Lucy will have taken the ball even if you pass, even if you kick the ball all the way down the field because the President of the United States promised us as a candidate he would have a balanced budget by 1983 and then he indicated he would have a balanced budget by 1984. But the facts are that even with all this you would still have a deficit in fiscal 1986 of $177 billion. That is hardly a great accomplishment.

I would say to my friend from Colorado, he talked to us about the President's having sent up his proposal to close tax loopholes. That is the best-kept secret in Washington and the United States, because I do not know of anybody other than you, my friend, who says that he sent up a package to close tax loopholes. Indeed, President Reagan addressed himself to that subject, but as of this moment, I do not know of one single loophole that the President has proposed closing. And, in fact, he said just last night that if you send anything to him that raises taxes, and he claims that closing loopholes is raising taxes, he will veto it. Tell me, where is the proposal of the President to close tax loopholes, which some of us have been talking about for months and months and years and cannot get any action on the part of the President of the United States; although, in 1982 in Montana he made a great speech about the fact that corporations should not be permitted to get by without at least paying something on their profits?

In 1984 I advocated a 15-percent income tax on corporate profits over $50,000, and when I came to the floor and offered that amendment last year, all of you ran for cover and the President was not heard from either.

Tell me, when, where, and how does the President have a proposal to close tax loopholes? I cannot find it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. METZENBAUM. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before responding, may I inquire if this will delay things? If the leader is ready to go forward, I do not want to take the time.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I said to him I would give up the floor as soon as he was ready.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In view of the fact that we have a necessarily lengthy technical process in order to get to the vote, as soon as he is ready to do that, I would want to do that. In the meantime, I welcome the chance to chat further with the Senator from Ohio.

First, let me say that we need to keep in perspective how those loopholes got into the law. In general, each of those so-called loopholes got into the law because somebody thought there was a socially desirable purpose to be served. Somebody thought that what we need is more energy production in this country; that it was unwise for us to become excessively dependent upon overseas sources of natural gas and oil so we ought to have tax incentives in the law to take care of that problem.

Somebody else said, "You know, really, our best energy resource is solar energy, so wouldn't it be a great idea if Congress passed a solar energy tax credit?"

Somebody else came along and said, "You know, the biggest problem we have in this country is economic deprivation in the inner cities. If people just had jobs, a lot of these problems would go away. We cannot get the Federal Government to do the task of providing job opportunities; the private sector ought to do it. Let us give them a tax incentive to create jobs."

Then somebody said, maybe the Senator from Colorado, that we really ought to have more volunteers for the Cancer Society and disaster work, so we ought to give them an automobile mileage allowance.

I am not avoiding the answer but I am leading up to it.

Out of this process of truly well-intentioned amendments to the Tax Code, each of which taken individually is believed to have a socially beneficial effect, we have created an enormously complex and in my judgment inherently unfair tax system. I say inherently unfair because anything that is as complicated as what we have now is bound to be unfair because most people cannot understand it and most people are unable to take advantage of all of its complex provisions.

The worst of it, let me say before I get around to responding to the Senator's question, is not only that it is unjust in an economic sense, but that it encourages the most talented people in our country to spend a disproportionate amount of their time trying to figure out how to jockey the tax system, rather than doing other more socially beneficial kinds of work. In other words, figuring out how to shelter their income instead of making a better mousetrap or building better widgits.

That is where we are. We got here over a long period of time. I understand the Senator's impatience of why can we not fix this up.

We have made some progress. We have closed some loopholes. We need to do more.

I cannot share his feeling that, because we have not in a couple of years corrected the inequities of the Tax Code that built up over 25 years, we have failed. We are taking a step.

Very recently, about 3 or 4 weeks ago, President Reagan, in one of his Saturday radio broadcasts, said he intended to send up legislation based upon the so-called Treasury 1 proposal to close loopholes. He did not endorse Treasury 1, which was the result of a year-long study by Secretary Regan and others. But he indicated the broad parameters under which he wanted to reform the Tax Code.

I do not today endorse without seeing such a proposal. I do not know if I am going to agree with everything he is going to send up here in a few days. But I do share the basic idea that we ought to simplify the Tax Code, close the loopholes or at least a lot of them, and after doing so, lower the marginal tax rates, broader based and lower rates.

I think that is the action we are going to take. I believe at the right time the vast majority of Senators will want to support that.

That is not the task we have before us today. The task we have before us today is to adopt a budget resolution which will bring these deficits under control.

I see that the majority leader is now on his feet and, I believe, prepared to proceed with that task.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a list of 13 companies who had $9.9 billion in profits and $741 million of refunds in the last 3 years.

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

1981–83 (dollars in millions)

	Profit	Refund	Tax rate (percent)
Air Products and Chemicals Inc	$294	$13.6	−4.6
Allied Corporation	404	7.0	−1.7
American Cyanamid Co	298.7	6.2	−2.1
Celanese Corporation	296	45.0	−15.2
Champion International Corp	167	7.8	−4.7
DOW Chemical	776	228	−28.7
Dupont	2,591	132	−5.1
Greyhound	290.8	42.1	−14.5
International Paper	1,028.4	89.4	−8.8
Martin Marietta	490.2	94.3	−19.2
Texaco, Inc	1,669	58.0	−3.4
Union Carbide Corp	613	70.0	−11.4
Xerox Corporation	1,051.2	2.7	−0.8

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I wish to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD more complete information about total taxes paid by American corporations. It was reported in the Senate today, and in nationwide television last night that large U.S. corporations are not paying Federal income taxes. Specific companies were named.

Mr. President, my staff has called each of the 13 companies that have been named, asking them for their total taxes paid, including Federal, State, and local income taxes, Social Security taxes, unemployment compensation taxes, Superfund—toxic waste clean-up—taxes, windfall profits taxes, foreign income taxes, property taxes, production taxes, excise taxes, workers' compensation and other taxes. The information furnished to me is completely at variance with the impression being created. That is, that large firms with huge profits pay no tax.

Mr. President, it was asserted that a number of companies, among them Texaco, Inc. "had a free ride from their Government for the last 3 years who have not paid a penny in taxes."

But according to Texaco, this is not the case. Let me quote from a Texaco press release:

TEXACO CHALLENGES FACTUAL ACCURACY OF TAX STUDY BY PARTISAN RESEARCH GROUP

WHITE PLAINS, NY, April 15.—The allegations contained in the partisan-funded Citizens for Tax Justice Study that Texaco Inc. paid no Federal income tax during the years 1981–83 are grossly inaccurate, Texaco said today.

Texaco paid Federal income taxes in each of the years 1981–83 aggregation over $120 million. These payments were in addition to the $2.3 billion of Federal windfall profits tax the company incurred in those years. The Federal windfall tax is directly deductible in computing Federal income tax so the Federal income tax payments would have been significantly higher were it not for the billions of windfall tax incurred by Texaco.

In addition, Texaco had major capital investment expenditures during 1981–83. Under the Federal program to encourage investment, these expenditures generated tax credits which also reduced the amount of Federal tax in both the current year and prior years. Investment tax credits have been a major contributor to the Nation's economic growth and job creation.

Texaco also paid $1.9 billion in other U.S. direct taxes during the 1981–83 period. These taxes on its operations also are deductible for Federal income tax calculations.

Overall, the company's worldwide direct taxes for the 3-year period totaled $15.1 billion, compared with its reported net profits of $4.9 billion.

Xerox, Inc. was also said not to have paid any income taxes and in fact, was said to have received a large Federal tax refund between 1981 and 1983. According to Xerox on information that was available for 1983, it is true they paid no Federal income tax and received a $4 million refund. It is also true, however, that the company paid:

$132 million in Federal and State payroll taxes; $20 million in State corporate income taxes; $50 million in State and local property taxes and $8 million in miscellaneous State and local income taxes.

A principal reason that Xerox received a refund in 1983 because they acquired a subsidiary—Crum and Forster Insurance Co.—which had financial losses. But this subsidiary in 1983 paid some $63 million in State and Federal taxes.

Greyhound is another company in which the charge has been made they paid no Federal taxes. But, again, according to company figures, between 1981 and 1983 Greyhound paid $551 million in Federal, State and local income taxes, Social Security payroll taxes, property taxes, sales and use taxes, workman's compensation, unemployment and Federal taxes. That is right * * * more than a half of a billion dollars.

Mr. President, I have asked each of the 13 companies to provide me with total taxes they paid between 1981 and 1983. I will supply the information as it becomes available.

But there are a couple of key points to stress:

First, a number of companies contacted told me that taxes they paid would have been higher were it not for the 1981-82 recession.

Second, I am not arguing whether the taxes the companies paid is the ideally correct share of taxes that they can or should pay. My point is that while some assert no taxes were paid that in fact the companies did pay taxes, and at times large taxes.

Third, Mr. President, I favor tax reform, which I define as lower rates, simpler tax schedules and, yes, closing loopholes.

Since 1985 may prove to be the year in which tax reform is enacted, I encourage my colleagues to look at the full and complete picture of total taxes paid by corporations and individuals in the United States.

For example, 1981 is the latest year in which extensive IRS statistics are available on corporate taxes actually paid. In that year, active corporations filed some 2.8 million returns, reported $102 billion in income taxes and claimed some $44 billion in offsetting tax credits resulting in a total U.S. income tax from corporation of $58 billion. That is about 10.2 percent of total Federal receipts and 2.1 percent of gross national product.

Some 80 percent of the total corporate income tax burden is carried by 49,000 of the 2.8 million corporate tax returns filed yearly according to the IRS publication Statistics of Income—1981. According to the Senate Finance Committee, some 40 percent of the corporate income tax is paid by 800 large corporations. While there are exceptions, the larger corporations pay most of the tax.

Keep in mind that this does not tell the full story on taxes paid by corporations. Most corporations pay more in Social Security, unemployment compensation, and other payroll taxes than they do in income taxes.

Mr. President, at the right time I will have more, much more, on this subject. For now I merely urge Senators to avoid unduly emotional appeals and closely study the facts.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988 and revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1985.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 37

(Purpose: An amendment proposing a complete substitute to the resolution)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] for himself and Mr. DOMENICI, proposes an amendment numbered 37.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will not say that I will require the reading of every amendment as we go through this, but in this instance I would be constrained to object so that we can better understand what this amendment is about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will read the amendment.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The text of the amendment follows:

S. CON. RES. 32

That the Congress hereby determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 is revised and replaced, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1986 is established, and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1987 and 1988 are set forth.

(a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1984, October 1, 1985, October 1, 1986, and October 1, 1987:

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

Fiscal year 1985: $736,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $793,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $866,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $956,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1985: $0.
Fiscal year 1986: $1,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $2,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $3,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1985: $44,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $51,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $56,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $61,300,000,000.

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 1985: $186,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $200,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $216,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $248,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1985: $1,055,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $1,070,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $1,133,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $1,210,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1985: $949,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $964,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $1,010,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $1,058,500,000,000.

(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 1985: $212,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $170,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $143,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $102,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1985: $1,849,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $2,090,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $2,316,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $2,529,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1985: $25,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $241,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $226,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $212,400,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1984, October 1, 1985, October 1, 1986, and October 1, 1987, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $53,500,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $69,300,000,000.
(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $33,900,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $73,600,000,000.
(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $32,700,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $73,600,000,000.
(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $32,200,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $78,300,000,000.
(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
(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 1985 through 1988 for each major functional category are:
(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $292,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,000,000,000.
(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, $302,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $273,100,000,000.
(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, $323,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $292,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $346,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $313,000,000,000.
(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 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $25,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $10,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $21,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $20,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $20,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $9,100,000,000.
(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.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $8,800,000,000.
(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.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $9,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,000,000,000.
(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 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $1,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $5,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $4,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $5,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $5,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(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, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,400,000,000.
(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, $12,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $24,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $20,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $20,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $19,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $6,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $26,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $4,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $28,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $5,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $29,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $29,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $27,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $28,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $28,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $6,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $31,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $28,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $29,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $29,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $33,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,500,000,000.
(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, $34,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,000,000,000.
(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, $37,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $40,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medical Insurance (570):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $71,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $82,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,700,000,000.
(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, $90,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $93,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,000,000,000.
(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 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $162,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $128,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $155,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $116,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $165,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $174,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $195,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $189,300,000,000.
(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, $211,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $194,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $226,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $206,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $266,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,200,000,000.
(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 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $27,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $26,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $27,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $17,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $27,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $6,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,400,000,000.
(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, $6,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,700,000,000.
(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, $6,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $7,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,000,000,000.
(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 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,800,000,000.
(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, $5,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,200,000,000.
(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, $5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $5,400,000,000.
(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.
(18) General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (850):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $6,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,400,000,000.
(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, $4,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $4,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $2,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $129,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $129,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $142,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $151,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $151,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $153,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,200,000,000.
(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 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $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, −$2,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,200,000,000.
(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, −$2,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,900,000,000.
(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 1985:

(A) New budget authority, −$32,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$32,400,000,000.

(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, −$35,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$35,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

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

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, −$37,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$37,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

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

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, −$41,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$41,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

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

RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2. (a) Not later than June 18, 1985, the committees named in subsections (b) through (bb) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committees on the Budget of their respective Houses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committees on the Budget shall report to the House and Senate a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SENATE COMMITTEES

(b) The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $1,189,000,000 in budget authority and $990,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,764,000,000 in budget authority and $2,420,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $2,179,000,000 in budget authority and $3,390,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(c) The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to achieve savings of $531,000,000 in budget authority and $639,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $745,000,000 in budget authority and $1,210,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $838,000,000 in budget authority and $1,718,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(d) The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $8,640,000,000 in budget authority and $4,083,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $9,387,000,000 in budget authority and $6,685,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $10,178,000,000 in budget authority and $8,287,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(e) The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $1,998,000,000 in budget authority and $1,653,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $407,000,000 in budget authority and $403,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $510,000,000 in budget authority and $536,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(f) The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $2,962,000,000 in budget authority and $2,253,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $2,723,000,000 in budget authority and $2,569,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $2,720,000,000 in budget authority and $2,814,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(g) The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $719,000,000 in budget authority and $306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,208,000,000 in budget authority and $1,451,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,720,000,000 in budget authority and $2,112,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(h) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in budget authority and $12,054,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $0 in budget authority and $17,541,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $0 in budget authority and $22,267,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(i) The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $447,000,000 in budget authority and $357,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,076,000,000 in budget authority and $626,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,379,000,000 in budget authority and $530,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(j) The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, or (3) any combination thereof, sufficient to achieve increases in contributions and savings in budget authority and outlays as follows: $375,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $4,276,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,325,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $8,843,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,370,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $10,417,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(k) The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $2,975,000,000 in budget authority and $1,168,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $3,452,000,000 in budget authority and $3,009,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $4,078,000,000 in budget authority and $3,872,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(l) The Senate Committee on Small Business shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $1,443,000,000 in budget authority and $978,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,385,000,000 in budget authority and $1,611,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,900,000,000 in budget authority and $1,735,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(m) The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws

within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $973,000,000 in budget authority and $1,059,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,213,000,000 in budget authority and $1,514,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,312,000,000 in budget authority and $1,596,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(n) The Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $192,000,000 in budget authority and $87,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $201,000,000 in budget authority and $151,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $213,000,000 in budget authority and $181,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

HOUSE COMMITTEES

(o) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $1,189,000,000 in budget authority and $990,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,764,000,000 in budget authority and $2,420,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $2,179,000,000 in budget authority and $3,390,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(p) The House Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to achieve savings of $531,000,000 in budget authority and $639,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $745,000,000 in budget authority and $1,210,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $838,000,000 in budget authority and $1,718,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(q) The House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $7,581,000,000 in budget authority and $3,860,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $8,192,000,000 in budget authority and $6,242,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $8,850,000,000 in budget authority and $7,586,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(r) The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $2,409,000,000 in budget authority and $1,185,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $2,809,000,000 in budget authority and $2,765,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $3,336,000,000 in budget authority and $3,506,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(s) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $4,714,000,000 in budget authority and $7,128,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $3,464,000,000 in budget authority and $8,975,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $3,618,000,000 in budget authority and $11,977,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(t) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $447,000,000 in budget authority and $357,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,076,000,000 in budget authority and $626,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,379,000,000 in budget authority and $530,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(u) The House Committee on Government Operations shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in budget authority and $1,737,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $0 in budget authority and $2,594,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $0 in budget authority and $4,632,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(v) The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $540,000,000 in budget authority and $292,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $559,000,000 in budget authority and $402,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $636,000,000 in budget authority and $526,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(w) The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $251,000,000 in budget authority and $229,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $43,000,000 in budget authority and $102,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $44,000,000 in budget authority and $100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(x) The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, or (3) any combination thereof, sufficient to achieve increases in contributions and savings in budget authority and outlays as follows: $375,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $4,212,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,325,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $8,694,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,370,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $10,170,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(y) The House Committee on Public Works and Transportation shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $1,991,000,000 in budget authority and $507,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $2,311,000,000 in budget authority and $1,808,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $2,935,000,000 in budget authority and $2,718,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(z) The House Committee on Small Business shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $1,443,000,000 in budget authority and $978,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,385,000,000 in budget authority and $1,611,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,900,000,000 in budget authority and $1,735,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(aa) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spend-

ing authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $973,000,000 in budget authority and $1,059,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,213,000,000 in budget authority and $1,514,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,312,000,000 in budget authority and $1,596,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(bb) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in budget authority and $9,904,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $0 in budget authority and $14,488,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $0 in budget authority and $17,260,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. (a) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective Committee on Appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, to exceed $303,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; aggregate total budget authority to exceed $324,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and aggregate total budget authority to exceed $347,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(b) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective Committee on Appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for nondefense discretionary activities to exceed $136,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; aggregate total budget authority to exceed $140,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and aggregate budget authority to exceed $145,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(c) The provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section may be waived or suspended in the Senate by a majority vote of the Members voting, a quorum being present, or by unanimous consent of the Senate.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 4. If the Congress has not completed action by October 1, 1985, 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 1986, 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 of such Act.

SEC. 5. It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate during fiscal years 1986 and 1987 to consider any bill, resolution, or amendment, except proposed legislation reported in response to reconciliation instructions contained in this resolution, authorizing new direct loan obligations or new loan guarantee commitments unless that bill, resolution, or amendment also provides that the authority to make or guarantee such loans shall be effective only to such extent and in such amounts as are contained in appropriation acts.

SEC. 6. It is the sense of the Congress that the previous distinction between "unified budget" and "off-budget" spending be ended, and that budget authority and outlays for the so-called "off-budget" agencies be included in the budget totals.

SEC. 7. (a) The Senate finds that—

(1) the existing tax structure of the United States distorts economic activity, leading to an inefficient use of national resources and a weakening of our domestic economic vitality and competitive posture in international markets;

(2) the relative tax burdens among various taxpayer categories are manifestly unfair insofar as they arise from differences in the capabilities of taxpayers to take advantage of complicated tax laws;

(3) the ability of the Federal Government to plan and conduct rational fiscal policy is frustrated by elaborate schemes to avoid taxation and the unintended effects of tax incentives and penalties;

(4) progressive erosion of voluntary compliance threatens the fiscal integrity of our public finances and the confidence of our citizens in the Federal Government's capacity to govern; and

(5) a number of plans, each designed to simplify and reform the Tax Code, have been before the Congress for a time sufficient to allow for extensive analysis and evaluation.

(b) It is therefore the sense of the Senate that tax reform should be adopted as soon as possible, and that it should incorporate the following principles and objectives:

(1) efficiency and responsiveness to market conditions in the economic activities of American businesses and consumers;

(2) simplicity of structure and lower marginal tax rates;

(3) a fair and equitable distribution of the tax burden among all taxpayers, with relief for those below the poverty level, and incentives to bring them into the work force;

(4) a broader tax base, with deductions essential to avoid genuine hardship or to protect the economic security of the American people; and

(5) increased incentives for work, saving, and investment.

SEC. 9. It is the sense of the Senate that because the Senate requires timely reporting of legislative action on spending bills, and because the Senate requires continual control over the budget, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall issue a weekly report during periods when the Senate is in session detailing and tabulating the progress of congressional action on bills and resolutions providing new budget authority and changing revenues and the public debt for a fiscal year, including, but not limited to the requirements set forth in Public Law 93-344, section 308(b).

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on this amendment, 2 hours, is equally divided between the mover of the amendment and the manager, unless the manager of the bill is in favor of the amendment, at which time it would be managed by the minority leader.

Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished minority leader is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. I yield myself time off the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader has that right.

Mr. BYRD. I will be brief. I do this for the information of my colleagues.

I ask the distinguished majority leader, to what will his next amendment be addressed?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, to respond to the distinguished minority leader, amendment No. 2 will be a perfecting amendment to amendment No. 1. It would in effect be the Senate leadership-White House budget package with a June 19 reconciliation reporting date. In other words, it is the package we have worked on which has a June 19 reconciliation date. The pending amendment, I might add, is the Senate Budget Committee resolution with one change. It changes the reconciliation reporting date from June 15 to June 18.

Mr. BYRD. Then the distinguished majority leader's next amendment which he would hope to call up would be a perfecting amendment to the substitute which he has just offered?

Mr. DOLE. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, so that my colleagues will be refreshed in their memories concerning the time structures in connection with the budget resolution. On this budget resolution, there will be 50 hours of debate overall. Quorum calls will be charged against the 50 hours unless a quorum call occurs immediately prior to a rollcall vote, in which case that quorum call time would not be charged against the 50 hours. Rollcalls, when they occur, will be outside the 50 hours so far as the charging of time is concerned. The 50 hours will be equally divided between the distinguished majority leader and the minority leader.

The majority leader and the minority leader may yield time to designees or they may yield from their time to other Senators who wish to have additional time on amendments, debatable motions, or appeals.

There will be a 2-hour time limit on any amendment to the resolution. There will be a 1-hour time limit on any amendment to an amendment or debatable motion or appeal. In that instance, the time will be controlled by

the mover of the amendment, the debatable motion, or the appeal. If Mr. DOMENICI, the chairman, agrees with the mover, the control of time in opposition to that particular amendment, debatable motion, or appeal will go to the minority leader.

No motion to recommit will be in order, except a motion to recommit with instructions to report back within not to exceed 3 days of Senate sessions.

A motion to further limit the time on an amendment or on the overall resolution is not debatable. Amendments must be germane.

What the distinguished majority leader is doing here may be seen by my colleagues if they will open the book on Senate procedure to page 70. The chart indicates that a total of seven amendments may be pending before the Senate at any one time. Of course, as each amendment in that lineup is disposed of, a Senator may come in with another amendment at that point. So that it could require a considerable length of time to get all the way back to the text of the substitute to be inserted, which Mr. DOLE has just offered.

Mr. DOLE informs me that his next amendment will be shown as C on the chart. In other words, he is not going to offer amendments A and B. He will offer C, he will offer D, he will offer E, and he will offer F. On each of those amendments, they being amendments to amendments, with the exception of E, there will be 1 hour, to be equally divided. Of course, the time may be yielded back or may be used.

I should like my colleagues to keep in mind that although the time on an amendment is limited to 2 hours in the case of an amendment to the resolution and 1 hour in the case of an amendment to an amendment, the majority leader and the minority leader may yield time from the overall 50 hours, which is under their control, to any Senator who wishes additional time on an amendment, debatable motion, or appeal.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, will the minority leader yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BUMPERS. Is it now the parliamentary situation that the majority leader has called up the budget resolution that was reported by the Budget Committee?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. BUMPERS. And that he has also offered now an amendment which will be an amendment in the first degree?

Mr. BYRD. The amendment he has offered is a complete substitute for the text of the resolution, and that substitute is a freebie—in other words, zero degree. It is still open to amendment in two degrees.

Mr. BUMPERS. Why is it a zero amendment if it is an amendment to the budget resolution of the Budget Committee?

Mr. BYRD. Because it is a complete substitute.

If the distinguished Senator will look at page 70, that complete substitute shows no degree. The first amendment that shows a degree is A, which is an amendment to the resolution. B is an amendment to an amendment. The perfecting amendments to the basic substitute—in other words, the committee reported budget resolution—are in the first and second degree, C and D.

Then Mr. DOLE goes on the left side and comes down the left lane, and there he has two perfecting amendments. The Senator will see that E is an amendment to the resolution, F is an amendment to an amendment; and he will in his instance make F his most important amendment, which will be the amendment that has been worked out between the Republican leaders in the Senate—Mr. DOLE, in particular—and the White House.

Mr. BUMPERS. Does this mean that both the original resolution and the complete substitute are both amendable in two degrees?

Mr. BYRD. They are.

Mr. BUMPERS. So we are two-tracking now?

Mr. BYRD. We are two-tracking. That is perfectly legitimate, and the majority leader is certainly within his rights, if he can get recognition. He has the power of recognition. He can get recognition at certain stages and line up the entire five amendments, in this instance, rather than seven.

Ordinarily, a manager of a bill would probably prefer to have his key amendment as amendment A. But I would say that Mr. DOLE has chosen a preferred course of action; and his favorite amendment, will be F—which he hopes to win and carry to completion unscathed, untouched, and unharmed.

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not have any desire to take further time. I yield the time now on this amendment to Mr. CHILES, because I presume that the chairman favors the amendment that has been offered by Mr. DOLE.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, will the minority leader yield for one more question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BUMPERS. Is there not 2 hours permitted on the resolution, and the amendment pending?

Mr. BYRD. Two hours may be taken on any amendment to the resolution, and the amendment that Mr. DOLE has just offered is an amendment to the resolution. The majority does not have to use its time, nor does the minority.

Mr. BUMPERS. An amendment to an amendment is not in order until all the time has been used or yielded back. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, will the minority leader yield for another question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. METZENBAUM. As I understand the procedure, is the Senator from Ohio correct that the purpose of going through the seven steps is in order to bring the issue to a vote without any amendments being offered?

Is the Senator from Ohio not correct in his understanding that at the conclusion of that period no Senator could be denied the right to be recognized for the purpose of offering a motion to recommit with instructions to return the proposal with a particular amendment attached to it?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I am correct. So that all of this seven step so-called procedure will not achieve anything as far as the issue of which is obviously the intent of the leadership on the majority side to go to a vote on the package without anyone having an opportunity to put in issue an amendment having to do with, for example, Social Security or other COLA's, or whatever, and that the motion to recommit is a priority motion and that has precedence and the Senator offering such a motion to recommit would have a right to have a vote on his or her motion prior to a vote on the package.

Am I correct in that?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct. The motion to recommit has precedence over amendments. If the distinguished Senator, and I know he is well aware of what the rules provide, if he will look at rule XXII, he will see laid in the first paragraph of rule XXII, precedence of motions and so on. The one at the bottom is the amendment. So an amendment does not have precedence over anything else insofar as that list is concerned. The motion to recommit an amendment has precedence over a vote on the amendment.

Mr. METZENBAUM. If he can gain recognition.

Mr. BYRD. If the time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. METZENBAUM. But even at the conclusion of the time the amendment has expired and assuming that the majority leadership has consumed the seven steps or six, as the case may be, in this instance, no Member could at that point be denied the opportunity to offer a motion to recommit with instructions, and I am attempting by making this inquiry of the leader to indicate to the leadership that it seems to me that we are going to spend an entire day in an exercise in futility because I believe that each

Member of the Senate would have an opportunity to put in issue that amendment which he or she might want to offer, or is the Senator from Ohio mistaken about that?

Mr. BYRD. Let me put it this way. The Senator from Ohio may offer a motion to recommit with instructions to report back within a time period not to exceed 3 days of actual Senate session.

I have an interest in considering that option myself.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I thank the Senator, the minority leader, and appreciate his knowledge in connection with the parliamentary procedures.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, is the motion to recommit a debatable motion?

Mr. BYRD. The motion to recommit with instructions is debatable.

Mr. BUMPERS. Under the resolution what is the time limit on such a motion?

Mr. BYRD. One hour equally divided.

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say again that additional time from the overall 50 hours may be offered or yielded to any Senator who wishes additional time on an amendment, motion, or appeal—yielded by the leader on either side or his designee.

I want it to be understood, Mr. President, that the time I have used is not to be charged against time on the amendment. It is to come out of the time under my control on the overall resolution, and Mr. CHILES and I have discussed that matter and for reasons which both he and I know to be good I will yield time to him out of the overall 25 hours which remain under my control. I will yield to him with the understanding that at any time I wish to utilize time under the debate on the resolution, if he is not on the floor, or if he is on the floor, I will not have to ask him for that time.

If there is any question on the part of the Chair, I ask unanimous consent to do that. I do not think I need it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to do that.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CHILES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I yield myself such time on the amendment as I might use.

Mr. President, in the next several days we will throw a lot of numbers around this Chamber. I suppose that some will be called——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will withhold temporarily, it is the Chair's understanding that the minority leader has yielded to the Senator from Florida on the resolution and not on the amendment.

Mr. CHILES. The Senator from Florida asked for recognition. The Senator from Florida yielded himself time on the amendment such time as he might use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on the amendment is under the control of the minority leader.

Mr. BYRD. The time on the amendment is under my control because the chairman of the committee agrees with the offerer of the amendment. I thought I made clear earlier that it would be my intention to yield control of time on the amendment to Mr. CHILES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not the Chair's understanding. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia has yielded control of the time on the amendment to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. BYRD. I do yield that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is in control of the time in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CHILES. I thank the Chair, and I yield myself such time on the amendment as I might use.

Mr. President, in the next several days we will throw a lot of numbers around the Chamber, and I suppose some will be called objective numbers and others will be called doubtful numbers. But maybe we should start off with a Department of Commerce number to put this debate in perspective.

It is a very small number compared to some of the ones that we will hear. That number is 1.3 It is the percentage rate that the gross national product grew during the first quarter of this year, and it is a number smaller than it has been since the recession of 1982. It was so small because of a $12.7 billion decrease in net exports and it was small because fixed investments were only a third of what they were in the fourth quarter of last year.

So I am worried about that little number 1.3 as I am about the big $300 billion number. And if we are going to make the small number larger, then we have to make the large number smaller. It is as basic as that, and that is what this budget debate is all about.

In the next few days we will hear a lot of the same "either/or" arguments about how we have to cut the deficits "either" by cutting spending "or" raising taxes. Mr. President, neither one by itself will do the job.

Unless we start putting everything on the table, we cannot get a real package.

Some people have also said you have a choice of either cutting the deficit, or of making the investments we need for economic growth. That just is not so. With a hard-headed look at programs, and a little creativity, you can do both. In fact, I think you have to do both. If has been said that in a progressive country, change is constant.

It seems to me the real test of a progressive nation is how well prepared it is to master change, and renew itself for the future.

That is the standard by which the budget has to be judged.

Our challenge is to advise a credible and balanced mix that includes a role for government that is appropriate to the 1980's and gives us a clear national vision. That is the first commandment of budgeting. Decide where you want to go, then develop a budget to help you get there.

Right now, I am sorry to say, we are going in circles. We have been around and around on the deficit so long we've lost our sense of direction.

In the past several years, the budget has become an instrument of national retrenchment rather than an investment in our future.

The budget today is now used—almost exclusively—to cut spending without a real connection to the kind of country we want to build, and without a sense of the role the Federal Government should play in that effort.

THE LEADERSHIP BUDGET

If you look through the leadership budget it is clear that the architect's tools have been replaced by scissors. We are reducing what's in front of us, without planning for what's ahead of us. Here are some examples:

The Republican package freezes NASA, the National Science Foundation, and general science energy programs.

This budget essentially terminates the Strategic Petroleum Reserve Program.

The Senator from Arkansas has been concerned, as a number of us have over the years, about the strategic reserve program. We found ourselves sometime back facing an embargo on the importation of oil. We found ourselves without sufficient supplies, and we decided as a national concern that we were going to set up a strategic petroleum reserve. We were not going to be caught that way again. So we scurried around to find places to store oil as a safeguard against a foreign shutoff.

But in the last few years, we have continually said, "Well, we will cut back on the plan we had for filling the strategic reserve."

Why? Are we really saving money? That oil we put in reserve is an asset. It is really like putting money in a savings account. It is there. It is worth something. It is worth what you are paying for it, every dollar. It is also an insurance policy that this country will not be held hostage by a group of sheiks or someone else who decide they are going to cut off our oil supply.

But in this budget, because you can make a paper transaction to show savings by not having that reserve, we think we have achieved something. I

think that is a pretty shortsighted policy.

Things have not changed much from the scenario we faced in 1973-74. The same set of circumstances could reemerge any time. And if we find ourselves without that cushion, without that ability to supply ourselves, we are in trouble.

This leadership budget will sharply cut soil and water conservation programs just at a time of growing worry about the destruction of our topsoil.

Superfund, the key program for reclaiming our land from chemical ruin, is frozen, leaving no room for the bill reported to the Senate.

I do not think there is any way, Mr. President, we can sustain rapid industrial development unless we protect ourselves from the byproducts we now know are so hazardous to our health.

Education programs will shrink along with job training efforts.

Biomedical research will receive $1.2 billion less over the next 3 years, and the number of grants will be cut.

Despite a seething influx of drugs into this country, law enforcement programs will be frozen. Maybe we should hope the drug pushers will accept a voluntary freeze of their own.

Mr. President, that is just not going to happen. My State is still deluged by drugs coming into the country. The cost of cocaine is dropping continually which should give us some indication of the tremendous supply. Even in the cocaine raids, where we used to find so many ounces or a few pounds, we now talk about seizing tons of cocaine.

We now find that there are dangerous new drugs, designer drugs, the chemical cousins to other drugs now being found in Florida as well as in California.

Mr. President, designer drugs are those that a chemistry lab, by a simple change of one molecule, can produce the horrible illegal substance, heroin, it can suddenly become legal because it is not listed as a deleterious substance under the law. Even under emergency procedures, it can take 30 days to list as a banned substance. Yet, Mr. President, we see a freeze on DEA agents, we see in fact a reduction on the number of Coast Guard people involved in law enforcement.

The Senate Committee on Justice and Commerce has been holding hearings. At those hearings the Attorney General has appeared, and said we are winning the war on drugs. Mr. President, that was challenged by virtually all members of the committee that were there. I can tell you we are not winning the war in my State, and I do not think we are winning it anywhere in this country.

But at a time when we see that the druggers are increasing their efforts, that they are becoming more sophisticated and producing this tremendous influx of drugs, what are we doing to our law enforcement arm? We are actually cutting back on our efforts.

Is that what a blueprint for the national policy of this country should be? Is that the signal we want to send, that because we need to cut deficits we are going to cut back on law enforcement? I think that is a dreadful mistake. I think that is a choice that we cannot and should not make.

Law enforcement and other efforts essential to improving the future of the Nation have been cutback in the name of tight budgeting with little regard to calculated planning for the future.

In the days ahead, we will argue long hours about cuts in social programs. We will talk about fairness, and we will talk about balance. We will ask how we can be so concerned about cutting program expenditures while tax expenditures in the form of tax breaks to the comfortable have grown fourfold in the last 10 years.

But I am afraid we will still overlook two serious questions. Is cutting the deficit related to any positive diagram of the Nation's future? Do we really want to do nothing more than preshrink the Federal Government, or are there national aims that can only be achieved with Government as an involved partner?

These are critical issues. And it has been a long time since they have been debated.

If we are not careful about the way we cut the deficit, we run the risk of taking a foxhole approach to the role of Government just when we are faced with a shifting theater of operations.

THE NEW UNITED STATES

The world of the near future will run on high-tech circuits. We cannot afford to cut back our science and research efforts and still hope to maintain our technical leadership. But when you look at our record since 1979, you will find that Federal expenditures on nondefense research and development have dropped 25 percent in real terms. We have lost our dominant market share in 7 out of 10 high-tech sectors. We are spending less on R&D as a percent of our gross national product than most other industrialized nations.

And there is a telling figure that should make all of us stop and think. If you examine the way we distribute public money for research and development, you will find that only three-tenths of 1 percent is targeted for industrial growth in the United States. By contrast, West Germany applies 11 percent of its R&D money for that purpose. In both Japan and the United Kingdom, the figure is at least 6 percent. In France, it is 12 percent.

We simply are not doing enough. This budget proves we aren't. But we could do better, and the budget could help. It has helped before.

In 1961, President Kennedy met with his Cabinet to discuss the budget for the following 2 years. He saw the budget as an investment in the country's future, and he told the heads of the Federal departments we could not short-change education and science. He said:

> The scientific and technological gains that will be achieved as a result of our national research effort . . . will be of the utmost importance to the future growth and strength of our Nation.

Just 3 months later in a special message to Congress, Kennedy said:

> The education of our people is a national investment. It yields tangible returns in economic growth, an improved citizenry, and higher standards of living.

Mr. President, last night in his eloquent message to the American people, President Reagan quoted President Kennedy and the remarks President Kennedy made in his inaugural address when he talked about sacrifice. I wish President Reagan would look a little further into what President Kennedy had to say about investing in the future. As we enjoy some of the benefits today produced by the scientists we trained, of the products we have developed, think back to the 1960's when we invested money in those programs. And think back to the time that we started the space program.

Today we profit because of technological advancements in computers and those gains spring from money invested in the 1960's. What are we doing now about the year 2000? What are we doing about the late nineties? We are talking about freezing education programs. We are talking about cutting back in math and science. We are talking about cuts in biomedical and biotechnical programs.

Mr. President, if there is one place this country has a potential advantage, a potential trade and commercial advantage, it is in the work we have done in biomedical and biotechnical areas.

Mr. President, we are not alone now in pursuing progress. The Japanese are investing money in science. The Germans and the French are doing their experiments as are the British. Are we going to sit back now and say because we save a few bucks we are going to cut those programs? What does that say to our young people choosing a career? I think it says to them, do not go into engineering, do not go into science, there is not any future for you in those areas. Train yourselves to be in the service industry because that looks like the only industry we are going to have left.

We are exporting many of our other jobs overseas. That is not the direction we should be taking in this country.

In the last twenty years we have been to the Moon. We have made com-

puters a part of our homes. We have triggered biomedical breakthroughs, and we have paved the way for manufacturing in space. We do all of these things now because 20 years ago we decided it had to be done. Our present is a product of our earlier vision, and our future is going to be a product of how clearly we see today.

We must not overlook those facts, even in the face of unprecedented deficits. The deficit must be reduced. But as we do the job, we must be careful to have a plan to guide us.

And I am afraid the so-called Republican leadership budget is not the answer.

The budget now before the Senate claims big cuts in the deficit. But those cuts are based on economic assumptions that would have us believe the economy will just keep pouring on the coal. If you ask the Congressional Budget Office what they think of the assumptions, you get a different picture.

The White House says economic growth will keep going at a rate of 4 percent a year. But CBO says it will likely be in the 3.2-percent range. Many think that is an optimistic figure.

The White House says interest rates will go down dramatically. In fact, they take the common measure of Treasury bills and suggest the rate on 90-day bills will be down to 5 percent by 1990 and mortgages will be available at 7 percent.

Mr. President, I want to be the first one to sign up for one of those 7-percent mortgages, if they are going to be available in the year 1990. The Congressional Budget Office does not think that will happen.

In fact, they say we can expect the Treasury bill rate to be closer to 8 percent.

Some of my friends on the other side will say today as they have argued before that the differences do not matter. The fact is they matter very much. The leadership budget plan promises deficits under $100 billion by 1988. CBO says the deficit in 1988 under the leadership plan will be $145 billion in 1988.

Mr. President, we could argue these points all day and people would still say the issue is really politics and the numbers are deceiving. Alright. If you don't believe the numbers, then look at the record.

In 1981, the administration said we could achieve a balanced budget even with huge tax cuts. But instead of a balanced budget in 1984, we wound up with a $185 billion deficit. In fact, between 1982 and 1984 the deficits grew by $521 billion. What we had was the White House promising us Mount Olympus, but we ended up with Death Valley.

Mr. President, the leadership budget just doesn't come to grips with the problems we face.

Our high deficits have kept interest rates high. And although there are some who argue those deficits have fueled the economic recovery, they have also drained our export vitality.

The real value of the dollar has risen 40 percent since 1980, and that has undermined our trading position. The U.S. current account deficit has grown from $9.2 billion in 1982 to well over $100 billion in 1984. We are flooded with foreign imports and American producers are hurting.

What our deficit has done is spring a generous leak, and helped to create jobs and opportunities overseas. Foreign producers have gained a big competitive advantage because the strong dollar makes American goods expensive. So other nations are selling more in the United States, and we are helping them do it.

(Mr. COCHRAN assumed the chair.)

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, it is not as though we are not exporting. We are exporting. The only problem is we are now exporting our jobs, and we are finding more and more of our industrial companies beginning to "outsource." That is a term which means that they send their manufacturing facilities overseas and they simply become the sales company. As they manufacture overseas, whether it is Taiwan, Korea, or Japan, or Hong Kong, those jobs that would be here and have been here in the past go to that nation and we simply have the jobs of the salesmen in servicing those goods.

Mr. President, we cannot continue to be a strong industrial nation if we do that. We are now producing less than 60 percent of the steel we consume in the United States. What happens, Mr. President, if we have another emergency, if we have a war? We cannot get by with 60 percent of the steel. We would have to tremendously increase our steel production. But we would not have the capacity to do that.

Look at concrete. You will find probably close to 30 to 40 percent of the concrete we use in this country now is being manufactured here. The rest is coming from overseas.

So in area after area we are exporting those jobs and adding to that tremendous trade deficit.

TACKLING THE FUTURE

Our economy is a victim of bad habits.

We gorge for a few years, then we crash diet. We are either eating ourselves out of house and home, or starving ourselves.

Within the administration's budget, both bad habits are rolled into one. some get the feast and some get the carrots afterward.

In modern America, you would think the administration would have learned something from the physical fitness craze, and start doing something about fiscal fitness.

Mr. President, the deficit is a hurdle to growth. We have to do two things: lower the hurdle and make sure we've got the legs to continue the race once we have passed the obstacle.

What we want is to take weight off the Federal budget, and keep it off. But it has to be done with a sensible program of less fat, a balanced revenue diet, both woven together under some larger vision and clear understanding of the future.

We are not doing that now. We really do not have any plan at all. We are not thinking about the future.

AN ALTERNATIVE INVESTMENT BUDGET

At some point during the debate on the budget I will propose an alternative. It differs from the proposal of the White House because it will be a fair budget that invests in growth. Its major components are these:

First—and this is the major premise—it ties serious deficit reduction with a positive program for economic growth. It will give us something to reach for, not just something to run from.

TRADE

Second, consistent with that aim, it will provide a $1 billion fund for the Eximbank to tackle predatory credit practices used on the United States by foreign competitors.

I am among those who have offered legislation to encourage the Japanese to reduce trade barriers to American goods. What puzzles me is why some in Congress want to cut back on Eximbank funding without making it a more effective tool to help American producers enter foreign markets.

The country must grow. It has to reach out for markets. It is a continuing effort, and our economic future depends on our ability to produce here and sell overseas. Why try to pull down the shades over the future by pulling the plug on Exim now?

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Third, we will invest funds in research for computer development, for math and physics, biotechnolgy and biomedical research, and in space and energy. And the aim in all that is to put the weight of the Federal Government behind an effort to do the basic kind of work that private industry and business can use to create new and marketable products.

Mr. President, it seems to me the Federal Government has always played a constructive part in getting the Nation ready for its future. Whether it was the Northwest Ordinance which encouraged the building of schools, or the Morrill Act of 1862, or the Space Program, the Government made commitments that helped the Nation improve itself.

Who are we to turn our backs on a tradition that is not only proud but proven?

Fourth, we will invest adequate funds to develop and safeguard our natural resources as a necessary companion to industrial growth.

TRAINING FOR PROGRESS

And fifth, we will invest nearly $1 billion to help educate and train a work force that must have the skills to find and master the new high tech jobs.

What better investment can the Nation make in its own security than helping to equip people for the world in which they live? Figures indicate that 25 percent of our adult population is functionally illiterate, not able to deal with the everyday demands of present society. Do we not have some obligation to the people of this Nation—not to hand them a ticket—but at least give them a chance to read it?

We must be ready to put some money "in" today, to get some results back "tomorrow." That is an American tradition. And it has helped to make America strong. We must make sure it gets stronger.

And there is more to this alternative plan.

ENTITLEMENTS

It will include a 1-year freeze on all entitlement programs except those for the low income. For social security it includes a provision to set aside some of the money saved from the freeze to safeguard the low-income elderly threatened with poverty. My overall plan provides protection for the low-income elderly in a variety of programs, including Medicare, Medicaid, SSI, food stamps and housing. Most of these programs are in the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee, which will have to write the details of any particular program. Recognizing that the details of these programs interact in complex ways, we provide a 20-percent set-aside—$1.4 billion in fiscal year 1986—so that the Finance Committee can work out the best way to protect the low-income elderly.

And let us talk about another safeguard. This plan safeguards the retired elderly from bearing the load of deficit on their backs alone. The freeze in the cost-of-living allowances will be put in place only if we get added revenues and a commonsense approach to defense spending.

In other words, the retiree will not have to sacrifice unless, and only unless, the big corporations and the wealthy individuals who now escape paying taxes each year, and the Pentagon, are each forced to pay their fair share, are forced to equally share in this deficit reduction plan.

It also includes safeguards for programs that serve the poor, the young, and the handicapped from the effects of a freeze.

There are certain social programs this country has developed because some people are struggling, doing the best they can, but need some help along the way. If Democrats want to take credit for those programs, if Republicans want to take credit, they will both be wrong. The Nation deserves the credit for taking the steps to give people a chance to make it on their own.

That in itself is as much an expression of the kind of Nation we are as it is an investment in our future. We believe nobody in this country should get a free ride. But if we can give them a lift along the way, we should do it. If we can help people participate in our economy, they will pay us back in the tax dollars their jobs will help create.

AGRICULTURE

My proposal will trim farm programs and put a halt to the massive growth in poorly managed agriculture policy that is bankrupting both the farmer and the Treasury.

Mr. President, the administration has roundly condemned agriculture in this country by saying Federal expenditures have grown but farm performance has not grown with it. I think that is a bad rap. The administration seems to forget that wonderful program they called PIK, the most costly farm program in our history, born and bred at the White House.

Now the administration is willing to trade its PIK for an axe and chop farm programs to pieces while blaming the farmers for inefficiency.

Sure there are inefficient farms. But there are inefficient farm programs. It is in our best interest to trim the programs and help American agriculture produce for a hungry world.

CREDIT

Economic growth requires that capital be available to the small, innovative firms which have set the pace for American enterprise.

My program rejects the deep cuts in programs that provide credit to the farmer and the small businessman. And it includes language that will prevent the administration from retreating on the enforcement of antitrust laws. We must redirect the attention of our business managers to developing the best products, producing them efficiently, and marketing them aggressively around the world. Right now, all their creative energy is going into designing, or preventing, financing and merger schemes.

DEFENSE

Defense will be held to zero real growth. We will still spend every penny necessary to keep America safe, and that translates into some $300 billion annually. But every dollar we spend next year and the years after that will be money spent to make us strong and not dollars spent to make us look foolish, with $100 light bulbs and thousand dollar toilet seats.

REVENUES

Finally, it will include a fair-share freeze on tax expenditures. They are growing right now at $40 billion a year, and that is money spent just as surely as money spent on any government program. Our language provides that marginal rates will not climb, and a revenue bill will not be considered until the spending cuts pass. But they will be linked. That is something the White House has been preaching, but has not been willing to practice.

Ambitious? Yes, very ambitious. Costly? Well, with this combined program, deficits will be reduced by $45 billion in the first year, and by 1988, the deficit will fall below $100 billion. And the White House has not promised anything better than that.

Let us make some things clear. People must pay their fair share. Many are not.

Right now, some big corporations, with a stable of attorneys big enough to make Churchill Downs blush, can avoid paying any tax at all—and even get refunds. But the smaller companies pay their own way, pay their own salaries, and are still at a disadvantage in the competition for markets and in the competition with the IRS.

And I do not think that's fair, either.

So there are the main features of the alternative I intend to offer. We are late in the game. But it is finally time we ask if the Government really has a role in shaping the future. I believe it does. It always has.

The Government was the only possible entity that could acquire the land to build a continental nation. The Government was the only possible entity for using that land to induce the railroads to open up the interior to private investment and growth.

When we met the Great Depression, only the Government had the resources to lead a national effort to overcome our problems. Some things cannot be done patchwork and piecemeal. And some things never get done at all without government involvement.

Today, Government must act again. It must be a catalyst for a new national commitment to high-tech superiority. The jobs of the future are in our hands.

THE TASK BEFORE THE SENATE

The Republican leadership budget is flawed.

It does not set a goal, and it promises more than it can deliver. We reported this budget earlier than any time in the history of the process. But we really are not ahead of the game. It is almost as if we were just more eager than ever before to wash our hands of all this.

At the end of my remarks today, I will insert in the RECORD a detailed analysis of the budget we now have on

the floor together with a description of my alternative.

You can look closely at the leadership budget and ask yourself if everyone is assigned a role to play in cutting the deficit. The answer, I am afraid, is no.

Ask yourself if the deficit is really as low as the sponsors of the leadership budget say it is. The answer, I'm afraid, is no.

Ask yourself if the leadership budget is really a thoughtful plan for our future. And again, I am afraid the answer is no.

Our job on the Senate floor is to try to find positive answers to all those questions. And, if we cannot, then we shall have to answer to the American public.

I say to my friends on the Republican side what is obvious to everyone: You hold the majority in the Senate. If you can agree among yourselves on a budget plan, you can pass it. You can win. But is a victory for your party a victory for our Nation? Can any of us be so sure of ourselves that because we have the votes, we must therefore have all the right answers?

Democrats are willing to share your burden. We are willing to face the hard choices with you. The budget will be better if you let us help. The public is more likely to support a budget constructed by both parties than a budget passed because one party had a larger membership.

Whether this budget falls on deaf ears or is built with open minds, it is the Nation that will have to live with it.

We owe it to the country and to the country's future to do the best we can. We certainly must do better than we have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the detailed analysis of the budget and the description of my alternative to which I referred earlier.

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

THE CHILES PLAN: A FAIR BUDGET THAT INVESTS IN GROWTH

Growth initiative: Ties serious deficit reduction with a positive program for economic growth. Sense of Congress language directs the use of $3.7 billion above freeze levels for:

Promoting U.S. exports ($1.3 billion): A new $1 billion "war chest" in the EXIM-Bank to tackle predatory credit practices by foreign competitors; technical assistance to exporters.

Science and technology ($1.1 billion): A broad range of investments in computers, math and physics, biotechnology and biomedical research, energy supply and space science, with an emphasis on developing marketable products from fundamental research; joint public/private efforts.

Labor force development ($0.7 billion): Funds for education and training to provide the skills necessary to deal with changing technological demands in the workplace.

Resource development ($0.8 billion): Superfund for hazardous wastes and other programs to protect against environmental impacts of industrial growth.

Competition and credit: Sense of Congress language calling for better enforcement of antitrust laws and appropriate actions by the Federal Reserve and SEC to limit unproductive use of credit for takeovers and mergers.

Defense: Zero real growth in fiscal year 1986, redirecting Congressional attention to wasteful spending practices; provide inflation adjustment for procurement, research and development, and for "combat readiness" accounts. Assumes savings from recent decision to reinstitute pre-1981 method of cash payments to contractors for work in progress.

COLA's: 1 year freeze on all entitlement COLA's except "means-tested" programs for low income; provide 20 percent offset for Finance Committee to protect low-income social security recipients. No means-testing or permanent change to principle of full COLA.

Medicare/Medicaid: Medicare provider freeze saves $12 billion, reject increased beneficiary out-of-pocket costs. No cuts in Medicaid for poor and elderly.

Protect poor, elderly and handicapped: Full inflation adjustments where caseload would be cut under a funding freeze: "caseload freeze" protects supplemental feeding for mothers and children [WIC], Head Start, Veterans Health Care, Elderly Nutrition Programs, education of the handicapped and disadvantaged, housing for the elderly and handicapped (sec. 202).

Fair farm policy: Restrain massive growth in poorly managed farm programs which are bankrupting both the Treasury and the farmer; protect income and credit for the small farmer who is threatened with losing his land. One-third Republican savings.

Fair credit policy: Reject deep cuts in programs which provide credit to small businessmen and farmers; reject administration's rollback of antitrust policy which directs credit and entrepreneurship away from making American products competitive in world markets (Sense of Congress language).

"Fair share" freeze on tax expenditures: Reduce projected growth in tax expenditures, which has been averaging about 8 percent a year, so that sacrifice of deficit reduction is slowed by businesses who currently avoid paying taxes. Improves fairness and economic efficiency of tax code. Less than one-third of deficit reduction comes on revenue side of budget.

Marginal rates for individuals not raised.

Revenue bill not considered until spending cuts passed; sent to President as single bill.

CHILES PLAN VERSUS REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN

Growth initiative: Chiles plan offers a positive vision for economic growth and competitiveness. Provides room for investments in export promotion, science and technology, labor force development, resource protection, competition and credit. Republicans cut or freeze programs in all these areas, and endorse administration policies of not enforcing antitrust laws and of encouraging nonproductive mergers and acquisitions.

Deficits: Chiles plan reduces deficits by $22 billion more over 3 years. Down to $95 billion by fiscal year 1988 ($141 billion using CBO economics). Cuts $45 billion in fiscal year 1986 ($58 billion using Republican accounting).

Shared sacrifice: Republicans cut $160 billion in domestic (68 percent) only $46 billion in Defense.

Chiles saves: $83 billion in Domestic (32 percent)

Chiles saves: $72 billion in Defense (28 percent)

Chiles saves: $67 billion in Revenues (29 percent)

Chiles saves: $28 billion in Interest (11 percent).

Protection for poor and elderly: Republicans cut many key programs—child nutrition, Medicaid, Veterans Health Care, education of the disadvantaged and handicapped, housing for the elderly and handicapped—increase beneficiary out-of-pocket costs for Medicare, Chiles plan protects all these programs.

Defense: Republicans take no real sacrifice in Defense, adding $10 billion of real growth on top of a $10 billion inflation adjustment in fiscal year 1986—exert no pressure to reduce excessive spending by contractors. Chiles plan eliminates real growth and requires savings from reform of progress payments to contractors.

Farm programs: Republicans force drastic cuts of $18 billion including $4 billion in first year, which requires immediate cuts in credit programs. Overall, Republicans cut 41 percent of spending for rural programs over 3 years. Chiles plan makes substantial but fair savings of $6 billion.

Other domestic programs: Republicans totally eliminate key programs like rural housing, Amtrak, Small Business Administration, UDAG, Strategic Petroleum Reserve, rural electrification, postal service.

Revenues: Republicans raise $6.3 billion from increased compliance and receipts from employer payments on retirement programs. Chiles plan saves $67 billion by reducing growth in tax expenditures; requires everyone to pay a fair share, but not raise individual tax rates.

COMPARISON OF CHILES PLAN TO REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN

	Chiles plan			Republican Leadership Plan			Difference between plans, fiscal year 1986 (billion dollars)	Difference between plans, 1986–88 (billion dollars)
	Fiscal year 1986	3-year total fiscal year 1986–88	3-year total, percent deficit reduction	Fiscal year 1986	3-year total fiscal year 1986–88	3-year total percent deficit reduction		
Baseline deficit	214.0	675.5		214.0	675.5			
Defense: zero percent real growth	−10.9	−72.0	−27.9	−5.8	−46.2	19.6	−5.1	−25.8
COLA's	−5.8	−21.9	8.5	−4.0	29.7	12.6	−1.8	+7.8

COMPARISON OF CHILES PLAN TO REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN—Continued

	Chiles plan			Republican Leadership Plan			Difference between plans, fiscal year 1986 (billion dollars)	Difference between plans, 1986–88 (billion dollars)
	Fiscal year 1986	3-year total fiscal year 1986–88	3-year total, percent deficit reduction	Fiscal year 1986	3-year total fiscal year 1986–88	3-year total percent deficit reduction		
Civilian pay: 1-year freeze	−1.2	−6.7	2.6	−1.2	−5.9	2.5	0.0	−0.8
Medicare: Provider freeze	−2.6	−11.7	4.5	−3.7	−17.8	7.5	+1.1	+6.1
Farm programs	−0.1	−5.8	2.2	−3.8	−17.9	7.6	+3.7	+12.1
General revenue sharing	0.0	−8.4	3.3	0.0	−8.4	3.6	0.0	0.0
Other domestic savings	−7.3	−28.5	11.0	−17.3	−80.0	33.9	+10.0	+51.5
Interest savings	−2.1	−27.3	10.6	−1.8	−24.1	10.2	−0.3	−3.2
Subtotal: Spending changes	−30.0	−182.3	70.6	−37.6	−230.0	97.3	+7.6	+47.7
Tax expenditure freeze	−12.0	−67.0	25.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	−12.0	−67.0
Total deficit reduction	−45.0	−258.3	100.0	−38.5	−236.3	100.0	+6.5	+22.0
Remaining deficit	169.0	94.8		175.4	99.2		−6.4	−4.4
Deficit as percent of GNP	4.0			4.2				
Remaining deficit: CBO	(177.0)	(140.8)		(183.4)	(145.2)			
Total defense savings	−10.9	−72.0	27.9	−5.8	−46.2	19.6		
Total domestic savings	−17.0	−83.0	32.1	−30.0	−159.7	67.6		
Total interest savings	−2.1	−27.3	10.6	−1.8	−24.1	10.2		
Total spending changes	−30.0	−182.3	70.6	−37.6	−230.0	97.3		
Total revenue changes	−15.0	−76.0	29.4	−0.9	−6.3	2.7		

Prepared by Minority staff, Senate Budget Committee, Apr. 24, 1985.

SUMMARY: MAJOR PROVISIONS OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN

Revenues: increase $6.3 billion over 3 years, due to increased compliance and collections, as well as the effects of their cuts in retirement programs which require greater employer contributions to various trust funds.

Defense: three percent real growth in FY86 provides an inflation adjustment of $10 billion BA, plus $10 billion real growth; this is $10 billion below the President's request. Republicans show 3 percent real defense as producing $97.6 billion savings from their "Rose Garden" baseline. However, CBO calculates the defense savings as only $46.2 billion, using last year's budget resolution—which was adopted after a compromise involving Senate, House and White House—as base.

Domestic: total cuts of $160.8 billion over 3 years; $51.6 from freezing both entitlement and discretionary programs, $114.5 from cuts below a freeze. Rural and farm programs are particularly hard hit—our preliminary estimate is a 27 percent cut overall in FY86, 41 percent over the next three years.

Deficits: reduced $52 billion in FY86 using Republican accounting, $39 billion per CBO; remaining deficits of $175 billion (OMB) in FY86 ($183 using CBO), $99 billion in FY88 ($145 billion using CBO).

	Fiscal year—			3-yr total 1986–88	Percent of total
	1986	1987	1988		
Baseline deficit [1]	$214.0	$225.3	$218.2	$657.5	
Defense: (from CBO baseline)	−5.8	−14.8	−25.6	−46.2	
Cola reductions	−4.0	−9.9	−15.8	−29.7	
Civilian pay: 1-yr freeze	−2.6	−4.2	−5.0	−11.8	
Medicare	−3.7	−5.8	−8.3	−17.8	
Farm programs	−3.8	−5.7	−8.4	−17.9	
General revenue sharing	.0	−3.5	−4.9	−8.4	
Other domestic savings	−15.9	−25.6	−32.6	−74.1	
Interest savings	−1.8	−7.3	−15.0	−24.1	
Subtotal: Spending changes	−37.6	−76.8	−116.6	−230.0	
Revenues	−.9	−2.0	−3.4	−6.3	
Total deficit reduction	−38.5	−78.8	−119.0	−236.3	

	Fiscal year—			3-yr total 1986–88	Percent of total
	1986	1987	1988		
Remaining deficit	$175.4	$146.7	$99.2	$421.3	
Deficit as percent of GNP	4.2	3.2	2.0		
Remaining deficit: CBO	($183.4)	($166.7)	($145.2)	($495.3)	
Total defense savings	−5.8	−14.8	−25.6	−46.2	−19.6
Total domestic savings	−30.0	−54.7	−75.0	−159.7	−67.6
Total interest savings	−1.8	−7.3	−15	−24.1	−10.2
Total spending changes	−37.6	−76.8	−115.6	−230.0	−97.3
Total revenue changes	−.9	−2.0	−3.4	−6.3	−2.7

[1] Uses CBO defense baseline, SBC/OMB economic assumptions.

RURAL BUDGET REDUCTIONS UNDER THE REPUBLICAN PLAN

[Outlay reductions; in billions of dollars]

PROGRAMS	Years—			Total
	1986	1987	1988	
Terminations/phaseouts:				
Rural housing	−2.0	−3.1	−3.6	−8.7
EDA/ARC	0	−.2	−.3	−.5
REA	−.1	.2	−.6	−.9
Major cutbacks:				
Farm price supports	−1.0	−2.1	−4.9	−8.0
Farm credit	−2.8	−3.0	−3.5	−9.3
Crop insurance	−.1	−.2	−.3	−.6
Soil/water conservation	−.1	−.2	−.3	−.6
Total	−6.1	−9.0	−13.5	−28.6
Percent of baseline outlays	27.0	39.0	57.0	41.0

DEFICIT PROJECTIONS—SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE AND REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLANS—MAJORITY (OMB) VERSUS CBO ECONOMIC AND DEFENSE BASELINE ASSUMPTIONS

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		
	1986	1987	1988
Deficits:			
Senate Budget Committee resolution:			
OMB Economic Assumptions	171	143	102
CBO Economic Assumptions	180	164	146
Republican leadership plan:			
OMB Economic Assumptions	175	147	99
CBO Economic Assumptions	183	165	145
Deficit reduction:			
Senate Budget Committee resolution:			
OMB economics and "rose garden" defense baseline	−57	−101	−142

DEFICIT PROJECTIONS—SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE AND REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLANS—MAJORITY (OMB) VERSUS CBO ECONOMIC AND DEFENSE BASELINE ASSUMPTIONS—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		
	1986	1987	1988
CBO economic and defense baseline	−40	−76	−111
Republican leadership plan:			
OMB economics and "rose garden" defense baseline	−52	−98	−145
CBO economic and defense baseline	−37	−75	−112

Both the Committee reported Budget Resolution and the Republican Leadership Plan claim to achieve major reductions in the deficit over the next three fiscal years. However, these deficit projections are based on the Administration's (OMB) economic assumptions that are far more optimistic than those of either the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) or the consensus of private economic forecasters. For example, OMB claims that real economic growth will be 4.0 percent per year over the next three years, whereas both CBO and the consensus of private forecasters put the growth rate at between 3.2 and 3.3 percent. The most important disagreement affecting the budget outlook has to do with interest rates. The Administration paints a picture of continually declining interest rates with the 90-day Treasury bill rate falling to 5 percent and home mortgage rates to 7 percent in 1990. Both CBO and the consensus of private forecasters see the Treasury bill rate staying near 8 percent over the same period.

These differences in economic projections are crucial for the budget outlook. Using its own unbiased economic assumptions, CBO has estimated that the majority's budget resolution will give us deficits that are $180 billion in 1986, $164 billion in 1987, and $146 billion in 1988. This is a far cry from the majority's projection, which shows a deficit of $102 billion in 1988. Over the three year period, there is a $73 billion difference between what the majority is claiming and what CBO tells us. As for the Republican Leadership Plan, it will leave deficits of $183 billion in 1986, $165 billion in 1987, and $145

billion in 1988. For the three years, this is $73 billion greater than claimed by the Republicans.

The Republicans based their use of the Administration's optimistic economic assumptions on the claim that the enactment of their budget package would lead to the economic performance that they had assumed. But private economic forecasters also make their projections assuming enactment of a deficit reduction package. Some forecasters assume more deficit reduction and some less than envisioned by the Republicans. But even those that assumed more deficit reduction projected far less optimistic economic performance than hoped for by the Administration. Many of us believe that we will have to reduce deficits well below CBO's current policy projections of $200 to $300 billion just to keep interest rates from rising further.

Equally misleading is the size of the deficit reduction that is achieved through their budgets. The Republicans have calculated their savings against a baseline that is artificially high. The current services level for defense is based on the Administration's prior year requests, not the actual appropriations and the amounts agreed to in the lastest Congressional resolution. Their particular number is the "Rose Garden" level which was negotiated between the Administration and the Republican leadership last year. For all other parts of the Budget, baseline spending levels are calculated from actually enacted authorizations and appropriations. The CBO baseline for defense is the agreement negotiated among Senate, House and White House last fall, which reduced FY86–88 defense spending by $51 billion. When deficit reduction is calculated against the CBO baseline, rather than achieving a $57 billion saving in 1986, the Committee Resolution saves only $40 billion. For the three years, actual deficit reduction under either plan is $73 billion less than claimed by the Republicans.

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN—CBO ECONOMIC AND DEFENSE BASELINE

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			
	1985	1986	1987	1988
Revenues:				
CBO baseline	735	788	855	934
Republican plan		790	857	938
Revenue increases		+2	+2	+3
Outlays:				
CBO baseline	950	1,008	1,095	1,191
Republican plan		973	1,022	1,083
Outlay reductions		−35	−73	−108
Deficits:				
CBO baseline	215	220	240	257
Republican plan		183	165	145
Deficit reduction		−37	−75	−112

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN—OMB ECONOMICS AND DEFENSE BASELINE

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			
	1985	1986	1987	1988
Revenues:				
OMB baseline	736	793	864	952
Republican plan		794	866	956
Revenue increases		+1	+2	+3

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN—OMB ECONOMICS AND DEFENSE BASELINE—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			
	1985	1986	1987	1988
Outlays:				
OMB baseline	949	1,020	1,109	1,196
Republican plan		969	1,013	1,055
Outlay reductions		−51	−96	−141
Deficits:				
OMB baseline	213	227	245	244
Republican plan		175	147	99
Deficit reduction		−52	−98	−145

SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE RESOLUTION—CBO ECONOMIC AND DEFENSE BASELINE

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			
	1985	1986	1987	1988
Revenues:				
CBO baseline	735	788	855	934
Committee resolution		790	857	938
Revenue increases		+2	+2	+3
Outlays:				
CBO baseline	950	1,008	1,095	1,191
Committee resolution		970	1,021	1,084
Outlay reductions		−38	−74	−107
Deficits:				
CBO baseline	215	220	240	257
Committee resolution		180	164	146
Deficit reduction		−40	−76	−111

SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE RESOLUTION—OMB ECONOMICS AND DEFENSE BASELINE

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			
	1985	1986	1987	1988
Revenues:				
OMB baseline	736	793	864	952
Committee resolution		794	867	956
Revenue increases		+1	+3	+3
Outlays:				
OMB baseline	949	1,020	1,109	1,196
Committee resolution		964	1,010	1,058
Outlay reductions		−56	−99	−138
Deficits:				
OMB baseline	213	227	244	244
Committee resolution		170	143	102
Deficit reduction		−57	−101	−142

SENATE-WHITE HOUSE AGREEMENT

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			
	1985	1986	1987	1988
050: National Defense:				
Budget Authority	292.6	312.8	334.9	359.6
Outlays	252.0	276.1	298.4	321.4
150: International Affairs:				
Budget Authority	25.3	21.0	20.2	20.5
Outlays	18.0	17.8	17.1	16.6
250: General Science, Space, and Technology:				
Budget Authority	9.1	8.8	9.0	9.3
Outlays	8.7	8.7	8.8	9.0
270: Energy:				
Budget Authority	1.6	5.3	5.3	4.6
Outlays	6.5	5.2	4.7	3.9
300: Natural Resources and Environment:				
Budget Authority	12.7	12.1	2.5	12.7
Outlays	13.1	12.4	12.2	12.3

SENATE-WHITE HOUSE AGREEMENT—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			
	1985	1986	1987	1988
350: Agriculture:				
Budget Authority	24.8	16.5	16.4	13.6
Outlays	21.0	13.8	14.5	11.5
370: Commerce and Housing Credit:				
Budget Authority	12.6	7.2	3.9	4.3
Outlays	5.6	2.6	0.1	2.0
400: Transportation:				
Budget Authority	29.6	26.6	27.1	26.3
Outlays	26.1	25.6	27.0	26.5
450: Community and Regional Development:				
Budget Authority	8.4	5.4	5.8	6.2
Outlays	8.7	7.6	6.8	6.2
500: Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services:				
Budget Authority	31.6	28.4	29.1	29.5
Outlays	30.3	29.7	28.5	28.7
550: Health:				
Budget Authority	33.6	34.9	37.1	39.2
Outlays	33.5	35.0	36.7	38.7
570: Medical insurance:				
Budget Authority	71.8	81.6	90.5	93.3
Outlays	65.2	68.0	74.1	81.6
600: Income security:				
Budget Authority	162.8	156.3	166.5	174.7
Outlays	128.6	118.1	121.9	125.6
650: Social Security:				
Budget Authority	195.5	207.6	225.3	266.2
Outlays	189.3	197.7	206.5	216.1
700: Veterans Benefits and Services:				
Budget Authority	27.2	26.9	26.9	26.9
Outlays	26.3	26.3	26.3	26.4
750: Administration of Justice:				
Budget Authority	6.6	6.8	6.9	7.0
Outlays	6.4	6.7	6.9	7.0
800: General Government:				
Budget Authority	5.8	5.3	5.4	5.6
Outlays	5.8	5.3	5.3	5.5
850: General Purpose Fiscal Assistance:				
Budget Authority	6.4	6.5	2.0	2.1
Outlays	6.4	6.5	3.2	2.1
900: Net Interest:				
Budget Authority	129.7	142.3	153.0	155.2
Outlays	129.7	142.3	153.0	155.2
920: Allowances:				
Budget Authority	0.3	−1.4	−1.2	−0.2
Outlays	0.3	−1.4	−1.2	−0.1
950: Undistributed offsetting receipts:				
Budget Authority	−32.4	−35.0	−37.8	−41.1
Outlays	−32.4	−35.0	−37.8	−41.1
Total:				
Budget Authority	1,055.6	1,075.9	1,138.8	1,215.5
Outlays	949.1	969.0	1,013.0	1,055.1
Revenues	736.2	793.6	866.3	955.9
Deficit	212.9	175.4	146.7	99.2
Public debt	1,849.3	2,088.0	2,316.2	2,528.6

REVENUES

	1986	1987	1988	3-years
SBC baseline	792.7	864.3	952.5	
SBC/Domenici vs. baseline	793.8	866.6	956.2	
	+1.1	+2.3	+3.7	+7.1
Republican leadership vs. baseline	793.6	866.3	955.9	
	+0.9	+2.0	+3.7	+6.6

DISCUSSION

SBC/Domenici plan

Accepts most of President's revenue raising proposals. Increases receipts by $7.2 billion over 3 years through taxation of rail industry pension benefits ($0.16 billion), increase in black lung fees ($0.68 billion), extension of UI to railroad employees ($0.48), IRS revenue initiative ($2.01), increase in civil service payments ($3.1 billion), and acceleration of state deposits of FICA taxes ($0.68). Rejects President's proposals to increase tax expenditures from baseline through tuition tax credits, higher education tax incentive, enterprise zone initiative, dependent care tax credit and extension of R&E credit. Plan excludes IRS user fee proposal and reauthorization of taxing authority for hazardous substance response trust fund, both revenue raising proposals.

Republican leadership proposal

Assumes same revenue proposals as SBC/Domenici plan. Differences in revenue marks due to changes in technical assumptions.

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN—SUMMARY OF RECONCILIATION SAVINGS BY SENATE COMMITTEES

[In millions of dollars and fiscal years]

Committee	1986		1987		1988	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	−3,780	−4,491	−3,723	−6,490	−4,524	−10,591
Armed Services		−376		−894		−1,424
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs	−10,122	−4,213	−11,353	−7,416	−12,509	−9,566
Commerce, Science, and Transportation	−2,622	−2,216	−1,416	−1,077	−1,633	−1,368
Energy and Natural Resources	−2,962	−2,253	−2,723	−2,579	−2,720	−2,814
Environment and Public Works	−719	−306	−1,208	−1,451	−1,720	−2,112
Finance		−8,117		−18,934		−28,137
Foreign Relations	−192	−47	−275	−109	−282	−140
Governmental Affairs		−3,101		−7,332		−9,097
Labor and Human Resources	−3,404	−1,299	−3,826	−3,446	−4,291	−4,231
Small Business	−882	−1,258	−2,034	−2,101	−2,594	−2,275
Veterans' Affairs	−858	−791	−1,332	−1,496	−1,725	−1,987
Select Indian Affairs	−192	−87	−201	−151	−211	−181
Total reconciliation savings	−25,733	−28,555	−28,091	−53,476	−32,209	−73,923
Total contributions		+375		+1,325		+1,370

FUNCTION 050: NATIONAL DEFENSE

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
CBO baseline:				
Budget authority	324.7	359.8	397.8	1,082.3
Outlays	281.9	313.2	347.0	942.1
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	292.6	315.5	341.2	949.3
Outlays	269.6	286.7	307.2	863.5
SBC First Round (Zero Real) (Hollings):				
Budget authority	303.7	326.9	352.0	982.6
Outlays	273.5	293.9	315.4	882.8
SBC (Domenici) (Zero Real) Plan:				
Budget authority	302.5	323.4	346.8	972.7
Outlays	273.1	292.1	313.0	878.2
SBC vs. CBO Baseline: [1]				
Budget authority	−22.2	−36.4	−51.0	−109.6
Outlays	−8.8	−21.1	−34.0	−63.9
SBC vs. Rose Garden: [2]				
Budget authority	−31.1	−48.5	−74.6	−154.2
Outlays	−21.5	−38.3	−55.5	−115.3
SBC vs. President: [3]				
Budget authority	−19.7	−39.9	−64.7	−124.3
Outlays	−12.6	−29.1	−45.4	−87.1
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	312.8	334.9	359.6	1,007.3
Outlays	276.1	298.4	321.4	895.9
Republican leadership package vs. baseline [1]				
Budget authority	−11.9	−24.9	−38.2	−75.0
Outlays	−5.8	−14.8	−25.6	−46.2
Republican leadership vs. Rose Garden [2]				
Budget authority	−20.8	−37.0	−61.8	−119.6
Outlays	−18.5	−32.0	−47.1	−97.6
Republican leadership vs. President [3]				
Budget authority	−9.4	−28.4	−51.9	−89.7
Outlays	−9.6	−22.8	−37.0	−69.4

[1] This represents true reductions to deficit as estimated by CBO.
[2] This represents reductions to Republican Leadership Baseline.
[3] This represents reductions to President's request.

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PACKAGE

Adds $10 billion over FY85 for inflation, plus $10 billion for 3 percent real growth; outlays up $23 billion equals 9 percent.

First Round SBC (Hollings Mark) (SBC approved this mark by a vote of 18–4. Eight Republican members voted for this plan.)

Zero real growth in FY86, 3 percent real growth in FY87 and FY88.

Used CBO inflation assumptions. Provided DoD purchases with $11 billion increase over FY85.

Assumed no military/civilian end strength increases in FY86.

SBC DOMENICI PLAN

"0" real growth in FY86; 3 percent real growth in FY87 and FY88.

Budget authority will grow nominally by 3.4 percent, outlays will grow nominally by 8.4 percent.

Uses DoD/OMB inflation assumptions. Provides DoD purchases with $10 billion inflation increase over FY85.

Assumes no military/civilian end strength increases.

Denies civilian pay cut, freezes military/civilian pay in FY86, uses CBO pay raise assumptions of 3.7 percent FY87, 4.8 percent FY88. Pay raise delayed to January.

Assumes full funding of all strategic programs, i.e., MX, SDI.

Assumes military retirement reform permitting military personnel to remain in service to age 55—regardless of promotion to higher grade (reform of "up or out" provisions). Claims outlay savings from reform of $100 million FY86, $200 million FY87, $300 million FY88.

COMPARISON: REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN

The Republican Leadership Plan would increase defense budget authority at a rate of 3 percent above inflation from FY1986–FY1988.

Over the three years, outlays under this plan will grow by $45.3 billion or 16 percent. This is an annual rate of increase of over 5 percent.

The defense budget spending commitment to our NATO allies is tied to actual expenditures or outlays. In order to fulfill this commitment, the allies common understanding is that actual defense expenditures or outlays should increase at an annual rate of * * * exceeded that commitment by $118 billion. Had we just held to this spending target defense outlays would have been approximately $40 billion lower in FY1985.

Since 1976, we have conducted the largest and most sustained build-up in post-World War II history. In FY1985 the total DoD budget is at a post World War II high. After inflation, it is $35 billion higher than the Vietnam War peak year of 1968, and $81 billion higher than the peak year of the Kennedy build-up.

The current build-up has focused primarily on defense investment. FY1985 defense procurement spending has almost doubled since FY1980, and after inflation, is 98 percent higher than 1980 after inflation. Current year spending for procurement is $27 billion higher than the Vietnam War peak and is $32 billion higher than the peak year of the Kennedy build-up.

This heavy emphasis on procurement has resulted in great benefits for the defense industry. New orders for defense goods in 1984 totaled $89.8 billion, up 10 percent from 1983. Shipments of defense goods in 1984 had an aggregate value of $72.4 billion. As a result of the excess of orders over shipments, the backlog of unfilled orders increased from $113.8 billion in 1983 to $131.1 billion in 1984. The ratio of unfilled orders to monthly shipments to monthly shipments is 19 months. By contrast, this same ratio for non-defense capital goods industries was 4 months.

The industry's backlog of orders at year end 1984 was also at an all time high.

In December 1984, capacity utilization in the electrical machinery industry was 91.6 percent, well above its average of 80 percent and high enough to lead to spot shortages and increased delivery times.

DoD's balance of funds obligated but not expended from the procurement accounts totaled $105 billion, up $15 billion from the end of FY1980. The unpaid obligation balance is more than the total appropriated for procurement in FY1985. Thus, the current procurement backlog is larger than the annual flow of new orders for procurement.

FUNCTION 150: INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	24.3	23.9	24.5	72.7
Outlays	18.1	18.5	18.7	55.3
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	23.5	23.0	23.5	70.0
Outlays	17.8	17.9	18.0	53.7
SBC first round:				
Budget authority	22.0	20.0	20.4	62.4
Outlays	17.8	16.7	16.1	50.6
SBC (Domenici) Plan:				
Budget authority	21.2	20.1	20.5	61.8
Outlays	17.6	17.1	16.8	51.5
SBC versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−3.1	−3.8	−4.0	−10.9
Outlays	−0.5	−1.4	−1.9	−3.8
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	21.0	20.2	20.5	61.7
Outlays	17.8	17.1	16.6	51.5
Republican leadership package versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−3.3	−3.7	−4.0	−11.0
Outlays	−0.3	−1.4	−2.1	−3.8

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN

The Republican Leadership Plan includes the following modifications to the SBC passed mark:

The Export-Import Bank direct loan program is replaced by the interest rate subsidy program originally proposed by the White House. This modifies the Domenici proposal which included $1.250 billion in budget authority for Export-Import Bank direct loan programs.

Assumes foreign aid, State Department programs, USIA, etc., programs are some $100 million above the levels already reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. These levels are some $80 million above the level passed by the Senate Budget Committee.

The Republican Leadership Plan includes the following assumptions which are the same as included in the SBC passed plan:

$525 million in military assistance increases for Israel and Egypt are included.

Enactment of supplementals for African famine relief, embassy security and payments to several regional development banks is assumed.

A supplemental to deal with Israel's current economic crisis is expected to be transmitted by the President and the function totals will be adjusted to accommodate it at that time. This supplemental is anticipated prior to conclusion of the Budget Resolution conference.

FIRST ROUND SBC

The Committee at first accepted a Chiles mark (vote 17 to 1) which made the following assumptions:

The Export-Import Bank direct loan program was eliminated and replaced by a larger and more flexible interest rate subsidy program along the lines proposed by the Administration and a new, $1 billion "war chest" to help counter predatory competition against U.S. exporters.

$525 million in military assistance increases for Israel and Egypt was included.

All non-Israel/Egypt security assistance was frozen at FY1985 levels.

Less effective development assistance programs were consolidated or eliminated.

Funding for foreign information and exchange activities was reduced to FY83 levels.

Enactment of Senate-reported supplemental assistance for African famine relief, embassy security and payments for multilateral development banks was presumed.

FUNCTION 250: GENERAL SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND SPACE

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	9.2	9.4	9.6	28.2
Outlays	9.0	9.2	9.4	27.6
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	8.8	9.0	9.3	27.1
Outlays	8.7	8.8	9.0	26.5
President's request:				
Budget authority	9.5	9.7	10.0	29.2
Outlays	9.2	9.4	9.8	28.4
SBC first round:				
Budget authority	8.8	9.0	9.3	27.1
Outlays	8.7	8.8	9.0	26.5
SBC (Domenici) plan:				
Budget authority	8.8	9.0	9.3	27.1
Outlays	8.7	8.8	9.0	26.5
SBC versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−0.4	−0.4	−0.3	−1.1
Outlays	−0.3	−0.4	−0.4	−1.1
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	8.8	9.0	9.3	27.1
Outlays	8.7	8.8	9.0	26.5
Republican leadership package versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−0.4	−0.4	−0.3	−1.1
Outlays	−0.3	−0.4	−0.4	−1.1
Republican leadership package versus President's request:				
Budget authority	−0.7	−0.7	−0.7	−2.1
Outlays	−0.5	−0.6	−0.8	−1.9

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN

The Republican Leadership Plan freezes FY1986 program levels at FY1985 levels. In this function, this means that all programs including the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and Department of Energy (DOE) general science and basic research programs are frozen at the FY1985 budget authority level. This will indefinitely defer construction of the new manned space station and halt real growth in basic science and research programs. This is the same level passed by the SBC, but substantially below the President's budget request.

FIRST ROUND SBC

The Committee accepted a Domenici proposal which freezes FY1986 program levels at FY1985 levels. In this function, this means that all programs including the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and Department of Energy (DOE) general science programs are frozen at the FY1985 budget authority level. This will indefinitely defer construction of the new, manned space station and halt real growth in basic science and research programs.

FUNCTION 270: ENERGY

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals, 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	8.1	8.0	7.6	23.7
Outlay	7.4	7.4	7.0	21.8
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	7.9	7.7	7.2	22.8
Outlay	7.3	7.2	6.6	21.1
SBC 1st round:				
Budget authority	6.1	6.5	6.4	19.0
Outlay	6.1	6.0	5.9	18.0
SBC (Domenici) plan:				
Budget authority	5.5	5.5	5.0	16.0
Outlay	5.4	4.9	4.2	14.5
SBC vs. baseline:				
Budget authority	−2.6	−2.5	−2.6	−7.7
Outlay	−2.0	−2.5	−2.8	−7.3
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	5.3	5.3	4.6	15.2
Outlay	5.2	4.7	3.9	13.8
Republican leadership package vs. baseline				
Budget authority	−2.8	−2.7	−3.0	−8.5
Outlay	−2.2	−2.7	−3.1	−8.0

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PACKAGE

a. New cuts not in Domenici plan: None. No new programs cut.

b. Modification of policies in SBC/Domenici plan:

Phases out REA loan programs over eight years, raising interest rates to Treasury's cost of borrowing plus one and one-eighth percent. Senate Budget Committee (Domenici) mark cut loan programs by twenty-five percent consistent with levels acceptable to the Rural Electric Administration.

Energy conservation program appropriations to be offset by recoveries from petroleum pricing violations. (Administration estimates $3 billion in savings over 1986–88; CBO estimates $600 million in savings for the same period). Senate Budget Committee mark does not mention this proposal.

c. Same cuts as Domenici plan:

Terminates Strategic Petroleum Reserve saving $2 billion in 1986 budget authority ($5.5 billion FY86–88). Assumes indefinite deferral of construction funds for the Big Hill facility in Texas.

Reduces budget authority for energy research and conservation programs by $233 million.

Constrains spending to equal revenues in the uranium enrichment program (saves $80 million in budget authority in 1986; $314 million in 1986–88).

Reduces funding for naval petroleum and oil shale activities by $191 million in 1986.

Freezes acid rain research instead of providing the 35% increase requested by the Administration. This will postpone resolution of acid rain issues by several years.

FIRST ROUND SBC

Proposed by Senator Johnston and adopted 14–8.

Reduced budget authority for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve by $3.6 billion FY86–FY88, yet provided a credible oil purchase fill rate of 50,000 barrels per day in FY1986 and FY1987, rising to 75,000 barrels per day in FY1988. Assumed continued construction of the Big Hill facility in Texas, needed to achieve 750 million barrel level.

Provided 1985 funding levels for remaining energy programs.

FUNCTION 300: NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals, 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	13.4	13.7	14.0	41.1
Outlay	13.2	13.3	13.6	40.1
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	12.9	13.1	13.2	39.2
Outlay	13.0	12.9	13.0	38.9
SBC 1st round:				
Budget authority	13.0	13.1	13.3	39.4
Outlay	13.0	12.9	13.1	39.0
SBC (Domenici) plan:				
Budget authority	12.1	12.5	12.7	37.3
Outlay	12.4	12.2	12.3	36.9
SBC vs. baseline:				
Budget authority	−1.3	−1.2	−1.3	−3.8
Outlay	−.8	−1.1	−1.3	−3.2
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	12.1	12.5	12.7	37.3
Outlay	12.4	12.2	12.3	36.9
Republican leadership package vs. baseline:				
Budget authority	−1.3	−1.2	−1.3	−3.8
Outlay	−.8	−1.1	−1.3	−3.2

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PACKAGE

a. New cuts not in SBC/Domenici Package: None.

b. Modifications of policies in SBC/Domenici plan: None.

c. Same cuts as SBC/Domenici plan:

Reduces funding for discretionary public land purchases by $142 million in budget authority in 1986 ($424 million 1986–88). There currently exists a backlog of $500 million in authorized but not yet appropriated national parkland funds, totaling 370,000 acres.

Reduces soil and water conservation programs administered by the Department of Agriculture by $221 million (25 percent) in 1986 ($765 million 86–88). Current erosion rate average 7 tons per acre annually.

Initiates recreation user fees which may triple entrance fees (e.g. the entrance fee for Yosemite could rise from $3 to $9). Saves $82 million in 1986.

Reduces funding for National Park Service operations and construction account by $115 million in budget authority in 1986.

Freezes Superfund at 1985 spending levels ($620 million), providing funding levels 45 percent below the President's budget and less than one-half the amount provided in the Superfund reauthorization bill ($1.5 billion) recently reported by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee.

Reverses decision made last year to provide permanent appropriations and increased funding for the Dingell-Johnson fund which allocates grants to states to support sport fishery. Saves $51 million in 1986.

Reduces Corps of Engineers programs by $150 million in 1986.

FIRST ROUND SBC

Comprehensive freeze on the function proposed by Senator Hollings and adopted 13–9. Rejected President's and Senator Domenici's proposals to impose a moratorium on parkland purchases, reduce Bureau of Reclamation funding levels and phase out sewage treatment grants.

FUNCTION 350: AGRICULTURE

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals, 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	20.6	21.0	21.1	62.7
Outlay	17.8	20.0	20.4	58.2
CBO 1-yr freeze:				
Budget authority	20.4	20.7	20.8	61.9
Outlay	17.7	19.8	20.1	57.6
SBC 1st round:				
Budget authority	20.4	20.2	19.7	60.3
Outlay	17.6	19.1	18.9	55.6
SBC (Domenici) mark:				
Budget authority	20.4	20.2	19.7	60.3
Outlay	17.6	19.1	18.9	55.6
SBC vs. baseline:				
Budget authority	−.2	−.8	−1.4	−2.4
Outlay	−.2	−.9	−1.5	−2.6
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	16.5	16.4	13.6	46.5
Outlay	13.8	14.5	11.5	39.8
Republican leadership package vs. baseline:				
Budget authority	−4.1	−4.6	−7.5	−16.2
Outlay	−4.0	−5.5	−8.9	−18.4

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PACKAGE

a. New cuts not in SBC/Domenici plan:

Commodity Programs: Budget savings assume adjustments in target prices and loan rate mechanisms as well as modifications in acreage reduction and elimination of paid diversion programs. Other changes could include targeting of benefits and initiation of a conservation reserve.

Farm Credit:

Phases out all FmHA direct farm operating and ownership loans over a five-year period. Guaranteed farm operating and ownership loans would be increased to $3.0 billion in FY 86.

Eliminates emergency disaster loans in areas served by crop insurance programs, while retaining authority for property damage loans. 3,000 counties are currently covered by crop insurance.

Phases out federal crop insurance programs over 5-year period.

b. Modification of policies in Domenici plan:

Farm price support program changes far more severe than Senate Budget Committee (Domenici) mark but less stringent than original Administration Budget.

Agricultural credit reductions more moderate than Administration's original proposal, (e.g., instead of *terminating* FmHA direct loans, the Republican package would *phase out* loans). The Committee reported resolution contained no reductions in credit programs.

Crop insurance phase-out reflects Administration's original budget proposal, more stringent than Senate Budget Committee (Domenici) mark.

Freezes agriculture research.

c. Same cuts as Domenici plan: Some reductions could be achieved through the establishment of conservation reserve program also in the Domenici/Exon proposal.

FIRST ROUND SBC

Proposed by Senator Exon and agreed to 14–8. Rejected Administration's proposed deep cuts by a vote of 9–13 and a straight freeze proposal put forth by Senator Grassley by 6–16.

Freeze on 1986 spending and reductions of $2.4 billion in 1987–88.

Reductions to be achieved through the establishment of a 20–30 million acre conservation reserve and targeting of Federal agricultural benefits.

FUNCTION 370: COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT

[Dollars in billions and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	9.9	10.6	11.0	
Outlays	5.3	6.1	8.0	
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	9.6	10.2	10.5	
Outlays	5.1	5.8	7.6	
SBC first round:				
Budget authority	7.1	4.4	4.9	
Outlays	2.8	0.7	2.5	
SBC (Domenici) mark:				
Budget authority	6.0	4.5	5.0	
Outlays	2.8	0.6	2.5	
SBC versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−3.9	−6.1	−6.0	−16.0
Outlays	−2.5	−5.5	−5.5	−13.5
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	7.2	3.9	4.4	
Outlays	2.6	0.1	2.0	
Republican leadership package versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−2.7	−6.7	−6.7	−16.1
Outlays	−2.7	−6.0	−6.0	−14.7

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PACKAGE

a. New cuts not in Domenici plan: Terminates Small Business Administration and SBA direct loan and loan guarantees saving $1.1 billion in 1986 and $3.7 billion over 3 years. Proposal also assumes sale of SBA loan assests.

b. Modifications of policies in Domenici plan: Terminates all federal subsidies for preferred rate mailers except support for the blind. Outlay savings total $2.1 billion for 1988.

c. Same cuts as Domenici plan: Terminates all rural housing programs administered by the Farmer's Home Administration. Shifts responsibility for rural housing to HUD. Saves $11.2 billion in budget authority and $8.7 billion in outlays for 1988.

Freezes 202 housing for the elderly and handicapped at 1985 funding level.

Rejects increase in FHA loan origination fee and imposition of GNMA user fee.

FIRST ROUND SBC

Terminated all rural programs administered by Farmer's Home Administration. Shift responsibility to HUD effective in 1988.

Cut Small Business Administration by two-thirds.

Ended all Federal appropriations for postal subsidy including support for the blind and handicapped.

Held Section 202 housing for the elderly and handicapped at 1985 level.

Rejected GNMA user fee and increase in FHA origination fee.

FUNCTION 400: TRANSPORTATION

[Dollars in billions and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	30.2	31.1	32.1	
Outlays	28.2	29.8	30.8	
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	29.9	30.7	32.6	
Outlays	28.1	29.4	30.1	
SBC first round:				
Budget authority	28.7	30.2	30.7	
Outlays	26.7	28.2	27.4	
SBC (Domenici) plan:				
Budget authority	27.0	28.5	28.2	
Outlays	26.1	27.7	27.6	

FUNCTION 400: TRANSPORTATION—Continued

[Dollars in billions and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−3.2	−2.6	−3.9	−9.7
Outlays	−2.1	−2.1	−3.2	−7.4
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	26.6	27.1	26.3	
Outlays	25.6	27.0	26.5	
Republican leadership package versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−3.6	−4.0	−5.8	−13.4
Outlays	−2.6	−2.8	−4.3	−9.7

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PACKAGE

a. New cuts not in SBC/Domenici plan. Phases out urban mass transit operating funding over 5 years. Reduces transit capital grants to $1.7 billion by 1988.

Terminates Amtrak. Savings total $2.1 billion in outlays by 1988.

b. Modifications of policies in Domenici plan: Further reduces outlays for airway facilities and equipment. Savings total $316 million over three years compared to Domenici package of $149 million over same period.

c. Same cuts as Domenici plan: Reduces Federal-aid highway funding $2.7 billion in outlays over next three years, pursuant to Senate action on S. 391, the Senate passed Interstate Highway Funding Act of 1985. S. 391 lowers the 1986 highway obligation ceiling to $12.75 billion, a saving of $1.7 billion in obligations below the baseline.

Sell Conrail to private sector for $1.2 billion.

Assumes paybacks of ship construction-differential subsidy for 1986 total of $200 million.

Eliminates other railroad programs, including the local rail service program and the United Railway Association. Budget authority savings total $157 million by 1988.

FIRST ROUND SBC

Amtrak funding frozen at 1985 level.

Highway funding reductions assumed pursuant to S. 391.

Assumed President's request for aviation funding in 1986.

All other programs held at 1985 levels.

FUNCTION 450: COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	8.0	8.4	9.3	
Outlays	8.3	8.6	8.8	
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	7.9	8.2	8.6	
Outlays	8.3	8.2	8.6	
SBC first round:				
Budget authority	8.0	8.3	8.8	
Outlays	8.3	8.2	8.6	
SBC (Domenici) plan:				
Budget authority	5.8	6.2	6.6	
Outlays	7.7	6.9	6.4	
SBC versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−2.2	−2.2	−2.4	−6.8
Outlays	−0.6	−1.7	−2.4	−4.7
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	5.4	5.8	6.2	
Outlays	7.6	6.8	6.2	
Republican leadership package versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−2.6	−2.6	−3.1	−8.3
Outlays	−0.7	−1.8	−2.6	−5.1

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PACKAGE

a. New cuts not in SBC/Domenici plan: Terminates Urban Development Action Grants (UDAG).

b. Modifications of policies in Domenici plan: None.

c. Same cuts as Domenici plan:

Trims Community Development Block Grants (CDBGs) 10 percent.

Terminates economic development assistance and Appalachian programs.

Terminates CDBG loan guarantee program.

Terminates Section 312 rehabilitation program.

Reduces funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Terminates Tennessee Valley Authority development programs.

Terminates SBA disaster loan assistance programs.

Terminates rental development grants and imposes a 2-year moratorium on rental rehabilitation grants.

Cuts funding for national flood insurance program.

FIRST ROUND SBC

Held all programs at 1985 funding level.

FUNCTION 500: EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING AND SOCIAL SERVICES

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	32.3	33.5	34.4	
Outlays	31.3	32.4	33.4	
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	31.3	32.0	32.3	
Outlays	31.0	31.3	31.8	
SBC first round:				
Budget authority	31.9	32.5	33.4	
Outlays	31.2	31.9	32.8	
SBC (Domenici) plan:				
Budget authority	28.9	29.5	29.7	
Outlays	29.7	28.9	29.1	
SBC versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−3.4	−4.0	−4.7	−12.1
Outlays	−1.6	−3.5	−4.3	−9.4
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	28.4	29.1	29.5	
Outlays	29.7	28.5	28.7	
Republican leadership package versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−3.9	−4.4	−4.9	−13.2
Outlays	−1.6	−3.9	−4.7	−10.2

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN

General Note: Under the Republican plan, most of these cuts in education, job training and social services are reconciled to the Labor and Human Resources Committee, so a "frozen" program is not really protected, since it might be cut to avoid deep cuts in other areas.

a. New cuts not in SBC/Domenici plan.

Deeper student aid cuts in new package, now hits Pell Grants as well as guaranteed student loans. The three-year BA savings have more than quadrupled from $900 million to $3.8 billion. Most of the proposed cuts ($3.1 billion) are concentrated in the needs-based student aid programs such as Pell Grants. Under the new plan, the guaranteed student loan program and other student financial assistance would be modified in the following manner:

(1) Eligibility for low-interest guaranteed student loans would be capped at a family AGI of $60,000;

(2) In the calculation of eligibility for guaranteed student loans and federal grants, allowable educational expenses would be capped at $8,000;

(3) Students applying for independent student status would be required to meet criteria for two prior years instead of just previous year;

(4) Increased monitoring to reduce the over-payment rate on Pell Grants;

(5) Multiple disbursement of loans by lenders, with federal interest paid only on the disbursed amounts;

(6) Reduction in the special allowance to lenders to 3.2 percentage points over the three month treasury bill rate;

(7) Increases in the mandatory reinsurance rate on defaults charged to state guarantee agencies.

The new plan reverts to the President's original cuts in employment and training (−$1.1 billion in FY86 BA or a 29 percent reduction in Job Training Partnership Act programs). Job Corps is once again targeted for termination.

Funding for employment service is cut by 33%.

Modifications of policies in Domenici plan: Public Library Program is not terminated.

The increases in the higher education cuts are partly offset by smaller cuts in elementary and secondary education. Only impact aid, Part B, is still to be terminated. All other programs are assumed frozen at their FY85 appropriation levels.

c. Same cuts as in Domenici plan:

Eliminate the Work Incentive Program.

Reduce support for cultural activities through the elimination of the Institute of Museum Services and cutbacks in the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities.

Terminate the Community Service Block Grant.

Other discretionary programs are assumed frozen at the FY85 levels.

By a vote of 11 to 10, the committee voted to accept Senator Chiles' mark, which assumed savings of $3.8 billion in Budget Authority and $2.5 billion in outlays over three years. All discretionary programs would have been frozen in FY86 with the exception of those which are primarily targeted to low-income households. These programs received protection against inflation, thus preventing cutbacks in services and caseloads. Entitlement savings are assumed in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program.

Compensatory education for disadvantaged children: Assumes full inflation adjustment in all years to prevent cutbacks of services or participation level by over 200,000 children.

Student Financial Assistance: Rejects the President's proposals to implement a cap at $4,000 for subsidized grants and loans and to reduce or eliminate funding for grant programs. The mark assumes a full inflation adjustment for Pell Grants in FY86.

Job Training Partnership Act: Rejects the President's proposal to eliminate the Job Corps program and to reduce funding for other job training programs. Assumes partial inflation adjustment in FY86 for state block grants for training of disadvantaged workers.

Head Start: Assumes a full inflation adjustment to prevent cutbacks of services or participation level by about 20,000 children.

Administration on Aging: Assumes a full inflation adjustment to prevent cutbacks in supportive services or elderly nutrition programs.

Guaranteed Student Loan Program: Rejects the President's proposals to increase the costs of loans to students and to restrict eligibility. Accept, with some modifications, the President's proposals for administrative cost-savings.

FUNCTION 550: HEALTH

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	36.3	39.0	41.8	
Outlays	35.9	38.6	41.3	
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	35.9	38.4	41.0	
Outlay	35.7	38.1	40.6	
SBC first round:				
Budget authority	36.0	38.6	41.3	
Outlay	35.8	38.3	40.9	
SBC (Domenici)				
Budget authority	34.9	37.4	40.0	
Outlay	35.0	37.1	39.5	
SBC versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−1.4	−1.6	−1.8	−4.8
Outlay	−0.9	−1.5	−1.8	−4.2
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	34.9	37.1	39.2	
Outlay	35.0	36.7	38.7	
Republican leadership package versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−1.4	−1.9	−2.6	−5.9
Outlay	−0.9	−1.9	−2.6	−5.4

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PACKAGE

a. New cuts not in SBC/Domenici plan:

The new "compromise" package makes additional cuts in Medicaid. The President's proposal to permanently cap annual program growth to the medical care price index is assumed (−$0.3 billion in fiscal year 1986; −$2.0 billion over three years). The plan assumes some adjustments to take into account increased caseload among low-income mothers and children as a result of last year's Medicaid (CHAP) and AFDC legislation, but no specific proposals are made. Any state decision to expand eligibility to children beyond the minimal provisions enacted last year would not be recognized. Further, no recognition would be given to an increasing nursing home population, or to growth in the elderly population eligible for Medicaid in general. These additional savings replace the earlier Domenici assumption which would have cut Medicaid by $0.9 billion over the next three years.

b. Modifications to SBC/Domenici plan:

The original SBC/Domenici plan reconciled unspecified savings in the federal employee health benefits program of $0.1 billion in FY1986 and $0.4 billion over three years. The new plan retains the same savings, but specifically assumes that insurance carriers would be required to freeze physician fees for one year and institute a hospital payment schedule similar to the medicare prospective payment system.

c. Same cuts as SBC/Domenici plan:

Except for those programs listed below, most discretionary health programs would be frozen for one year at FY1985 levels, with an allowance for inflation of 3 percent in 1987 and 1988. These reductions would be included under a three-year binding cap instruction to the Appropriations Committee for all non-defense discretionary appropriations.

The plan assumes reconciliation instructions to authorizing committees to achieve further savings from:

Eliminating health profession training and education programs.

(−$0.2 billion in BA in FY1986; −$)—8 billion over three years).

Reducing new and competing NIH biomedical research awards from the currently appropriated level of $6,500 per year to $5,500 per year and allowing no inflation increases in individual grant awards in FY1986, 3 percent allowance in FY1987 and FY1988 (−$0.3 billion in BA in FY1986; (−$1.2 billion in BA in FY1986; −$1.2 billion over three years).

Freezing retired public health service officer COLAs for one year.

Cutting Indian health services and facilities by 15 percent (−$0.1 billion in BA in FY1986; −$0.4 billion over three years)

FIRST ROUND SBC

The committee initially adopted a Hollings motion, by a vote of 13 to 6, to achieve health savings of $0.4 billion in BA in FY1986, −$1.6 billion over three years, by freezing all discretionary health programs for one year and allowing three percent growth in 1987 and 1988. The Hollings motion would not have made any cuts in the Medicaid program, and would not have accepted any of the President's proposals to make deeper cuts or eliminate health programs.

FUNCTION 570: MEDICARE

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative Totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	82.3	91.6	95.4	
Outlays	71.7	79.9	89.9	
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	81.5	90.0	92.7	
Outlays	69.0	75.8	84.5	
SBC first round:				
Budget authority	81.6	90.3	93.2	
Outlays	69.0	75.6	84.0	
SBC (Domenici) plan:				
Budget authority	81.2	90.8	93.5	
Outlays	68.7	74.6	82.0	
SBC versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−1.1	−0.8	−1.9	−3.8
Outlays	−3.0	−5.3	−7.9	−16.2
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	81.6	90.5	93.3	
Outlays	68.0	74.1	81.6	
Republican leadership package versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−0.7	−1.1	−2.1	−3.9
Outlays	−3.7	−5.8	−8.3	−17.8

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN

Overall, the Republican Leadership Plan includes medicare cuts of $3.8 billion in FY1986, $18.1 billion over three years. Savings would come from a one year freeze on all provider payments (−$2.2 billion in FY1986, −$9.2 billion over three years); from additional reductions in hospital payments (−$0.6 billion in FY1986, −$3.0 billion over three years); from an increase in monthly premium amounts paid by medicare beneficiaries in the Part B program to an amount equal to 35 percent of program costs by 1990, increasing the Part B deductible paid by beneficiaries, and adding a new beneficiary co-payment for each home health visit after 20 visits in a year (−$0.4 billion in FY1986; −$3.9 billion over three years); from a one-month delay in initial medicare eligibility (−$0.2 billion in FY86; −$0.8 billion over three years); and from an extension of current law making medicare a secondary payor for all medicare beneficiaries covered by an employer's health plan (−$0.2 billion in FY1986; −$1.0 billion over three years.)

a. New cuts not in SBC/Domenici plan:

The new leadership plan added further increases in beneficiary out-of-pocket costs by including the President's proposals to: (1) index and increase the Part B deductible each year; and (2) delay initial Medicare eligibility by one month. (−$1.0 billion over three years).

b. Modifications To SBC/Domenici Plan:

Monthy premiums deducted from social security checks would increase, relative to current law, by $1.30 per month in 1986, reaching an increase of $14.20 per month by 1990. Today the annual premium charged beneficiaries is $186. Under the plan, it would be $416 by 1990. This is a more rapid increase than assumed in the original SBC/Domenici plan, with higher savings as a result of other modifications to the social security COLA freeze (−$0.4 billion in FY1986; −$3.4 billion over three years).

c. Same cuts as SBC/Domenici plan:

The leadership plan retained earlier agreed upon provisions for a new home health co-payment ($4.80 per visit after 20 visits a year in FY1986) and an extension of current law making medicare a secondary payor to an employer's health plan (−$0.2 billion in FY1986; −$1.0 billion over three years).

Also retained are provisions to freeze all provider payments for one year, including hospitals, physicians, laboratories and medical equipment suppliers (−$2.2 billion in FY1986, −$9.2 billion over three years). Only those physicians who do not agree to accept medicare as payment in full, however, would have payments frozen.

Additional reductions in hospital payments beyond a freeze would be made from a 50 percent cut in indirect teaching cost adjustments in FY1986 and from an assumption of no increase in total hospital payments above market basket in FY1987 and FY1988.

FIRST ROUND SBC

The Committtee initially accepted, by unanimous vote, a Chiles motion for medicare which would have achieved substantial savings by freezing payments to health care providers for one year but spared medicare beneficiaries from any legislated increases in out-of-pocket costs. The Chiles plan also would have rejected the President's proposal to cut payments to hospitals by $0.6 billion, in addition to a freeze, in fiscal year 1986 (−$3.0 billion over 3 years), instead assuming lesser, gradual reductions of $1.9 billion over 3 years. Total medicare savings in the Chiles plan would have been $2.6 billion in fiscal year 1986, and $11.7 billion over three years.

FUNCTION 600: INCOME SECURITY

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	159.4	168.6	177.0	
Outlays	123.2	129.3	135.4	
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	158.6	167.2	176.2	
Outlays	121.3	127.1	133.3	
SBC first round mark:				
Budget authority	159.3	168.3	177.3	
Outlays	122.5	128.7	135.0	
SBC (Domenici) plan:				
Budget authority	155.5	165.4	174.3	
Outlays	116.9	120.3	125.0	
SBC versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−3.9	−3.2	−2.7	−9.8
Outlays	−6.3	−9.0	−10.4	−25.7
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	156.3	166.5	174.7	
Outlays	118.1	121.9	125.6	

FUNCTION 600: INCOME SECURITY—Continued

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
Republican leadership package versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−3.1	−2.1	−2.3	−7.5
Outlays	−5.1	−7.4	−9.8	−22.3

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PACKAGE

a. New cuts not in SBC/Domenici plan

Funds from settlement of suits against petroleum companies (for overcharging customers) would be used to partially finance the low-income energy assistance program (in this function) and energy conservation programs (in function 270). The Majority staff estimates that this policy would save $3 billion in outlays over three years (in both functions). CBO estimates that it saves only $.6 billion over the same period.

b. Modifications of policies in SBC/Domenici plan

COLAs for all non-means-tested retirement and disability programs would be limited to 2 percent plus the excess of actual inflation over inflation as now projected by OMB; this limitation would apply in all years. The SBC/Domenici plan had imposed a one-year freeze for all non-means-tested COLAs and had held COLAs to "CPI/minus-two" in the out-years for civilian and military retirees.

The new plan would eliminate cash subsidies for meals provided through child nutrition programs to children from families with incomes greater than 185 percent of the poverty line. Assuming this increased cost is passed along to participating families, a household with two children would have to pay approximately $50 per year more than they do now. The SBC/Domenici plan would have eliminated both cash and commodity subsidies for all these meals. Both plans would require means-testing in the family day care portion of the child care food program.

The new plan would limit indexation of reimbursement for free and reduced price meals and commodity subsidies for paid meals in child nutrition programs to 2 percent or "inflation-minus-2 percent", whichever is greater; this limitation would apply in all years. The SBC/Domenici plan would have frozen reimbursements in FY86 but provided for full inflation in the out-years.

The new plan provides full funding for the Women, Infants and Children supplemental feeding program. The SBC/Domenici plan froze WIC funding in FY86.

The new plan does not switch the funding mechanism for future public housing construction from direct loans to tax-exempt financing. The SBC/Domenici plan had included such a switch in its dollar figures for function 600 (although it did not reconcile the savings).

The new plan does not include a new tax on coal mining companies and other changes that would support the Black Lung Trust Fund. The SBC/Domenici plan had included these policies but did not reconcile the savings. Both plans include a limitation on indexing of benefits for both the Black Lung and Special Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners programs. These benefits would be frozen in FY86 and increased in January in

each subsequent fiscal year, rather than in October.

c. Same cuts as SBC/Domenici plan

Does not freeze COLAs or reduce indexing for SSI or Food Stamps

Provides for an increase in SSI benefits of $10 a month for individuals and $15 a month for couples (this is in addition to a full COLA in January 1986) (Total cost of the benefit increase is $.3 billion in FY86 and $1.1 billion over three years).

Freezes all discretionary programs in FY86 (except WIC) (Saves $.1 billion in outlays in FY86 and $.4 billion over three years).

Increases premiums for Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. (Saves $.2 billion in outlays in FY86 and $.8 billion over 4 years from FY85-FY88.)

Transfers railroad workers from railroad unemployment insurance system to State Unemployment Insurance system (negligible outlay effect).

Makes major changes in Civil Service Retirement System in addition to COLA changes (saving $4.3 billion in outlays over three years and increasing contributions by $.4 billion in FY86 and by $3.1 billion over three years):

(a) Raises contribution rate for employees from 7 percent to 9 percent in FY87 and beyond (increase for Postal Service first occurs in FY86).

(b) Increases employer contribution rates significantly for Postal Service and District of Columbia.

(c) Conforms survivor, minimum, and student benefits to Social Security procedures.

(d) Makes other unspecified changes.

Eliminates mandatory retirement for some members of the armed forces (saves $.1 billion in outlays in FY86 and $.6 billion over three years).

Reduces funding for operating expenses of public housing projects, including a $.3 billion rescission in FY85 (saves $.4 billion in outlays in FY86 and $1.7 billion over three years).

Forgives amortization costs for HUD for previous public housing loans (this is offset in Function 900—net interest). In function 600, this change saves $1.1 billion in outlays in FY86 and $3.3 billion over three years.

Imposes mandatory workfare in Food Stamps, permanently caps nutrition assistance to Puerto Rico at FY85 level, and freezes State Food Stamp administrative costs at FY85 level in FY86 (and then provides for such costs as a block grant). (Saves $.1 billion in outlays in FY86 and $.5 billion over three years.)

First Round SBC:

Committee at first adopted (a vote of 14 to 6) a Chiles mark which would have provided:

Full COLAs or full inflation adjustment in all retirement and disability programs and SSI, Food Stamps, and Child Nutrition programs.

No cuts in Food Stamps or AFDC.

For all discretionary programs (except for Supplemental Feeding program for Women, Infants and Children—WIC) freeze BA in FY86 and increase BA by 3 percent in the out-years. WIC is maintained at full participation levels (CBO Baseline level of funding).

Premiums for single-employer pension plans for Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation would be increased from $2.50 to $7.50 per worker per year.

10 percent reduction in administrative overhead for Federal agencies.

FUNCTION 650: SOCIAL SECURITY

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	207.2	224.8	264.6	
Outlays	200.8	214.1	228.4	
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	206.4	222.0	259.2	
Outlays	197.1	209.5	223.8	
SBC first round:				
Budget authority				
Outlays				
SBC (Domenici) plan:				
Budget authority	211.6	226.0	226.7	
Outlays	194.9	206.0	220.2	
SBC vs. baseline:				
Budget authority	+4.4	+1.2	+2.1	+7.7
Outlays	−5.9	−8.1	−8.2	−22.2
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	207.6	225.3	266.2	
Outlays	197.7	206.5	216.1	
Republican leadership package vs. baseline:				
Budget authority	+0.4	+0.5	+1.6	+2.5
Outlays	−3.1	−7.6	−12.3	−23.0

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PACKAGE

a. New cuts not in SBC/Domenici plan: None.

b. Modifications of policies in SBC/Domenici plan: Limits Social Security COLA to 2% plus the excess of actual inflation over inflation as now projected by OMB; this limitation applies in all years. The SBC/Domenici plan would have frozen the COLA in FY86 but provided for full indexing in the out-years.

c. Same cuts as SBC/Domenici plan: Reduces staffing for Social Security Administration by 17,000 slots over six years. (Saves $.1 billion in outlays in FY86 and $.5 billion over three years.)

First Round SBC: No agreement reached by the Committee. All marks to freeze or protect COLAs rejected.

FUNCTION 700: VETERANS

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	27.7	28.2	28.7	
Outlays	27.1	27.8	28.4	
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	27.4	27.8	28.1	
Outlays	26.9	27.4	27.9	
SBC first round:				
Budget authority	27.4	27.9	28.4	
Outlays	26.9	27.5	28.1	
SBC (Domenici) mark:				
Budget authority	26.8	27.0	27.4	
Outlays	26.0	26.3	26.8	
SBC versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−0.9	−1.2	−1.3	−3.4
Outlays	−1.1	−1.5	−1.6	−4.2
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	26.9	26.9	26.9	
Outlays	26.3	26.3	26.4	
Republican leadership package versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−0.8	−1.3	−1.8	−3.9
Outlays	−0.8	−1.5	−2.0	−4.3

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN

a. New cuts not in SBC/Domenici plan:

The leadership plan provides for a partial 2 percent COLA in each of three years for both veterans pension and disability compensation programs. If actual inflation exceeds expected inflation in 1987 and 1988, the COLA could be higher than 2 percent, but it would still be below current law level. Low-income veterans would now also be subject to benefit reductions, and reductions for both programs would be over three years rather than the original one-year freeze provided for in the Domenici plan (−$0.2 billion in FY86; −$1.6 billion over three years).

b. Modifications of policies in SBC/Domenici plan:

The leadership plan assumes the same dollar cuts in veterans medical care (−$0.6 billion in FY1986; −$2.1 billion over three years) as the earlier SBC/Domenici plan, a larger cut than originally proposed by the President. The new package assumptions have changed, however, to specifically include the President's proposal to institute a means test for medical care for all non-service-disabled veterans with annual incomes above $11,000 (for a single veteran; $15,000 for a couple). CBO estimates that this proposal would eliminate between 200,000 and 250,000 of annual projected VA hospital admissions. Less than one-quarter of this group, about 50,000, would be eligible for Medicare. (Medicare expenditures would increase by about $0.2 billion in FY1986; +$1.1 billion over three years. This is not reflected in the compromise package for the Medicare function, however). Medical construction would also be cut below the CBO baseline, as in the original plan.

The leadership plan would phase in an increase in the VA housing loan origination fee from the current 1 percent to 3.8 percent over 3 years, with the fee increasing to 2 percent in 1986, 2.6 percent in 1987, and 3.8 percent in 1988 (−$0.2 billion in FY1986; −$0.7 billion over three years). The original SBC/Domenici plan would have increased the fee to 3.8 percent in 1986.

c. Same cuts as SBC/Domenici plan:

The leadership plan assumes enactment of legislation to require the VA to collect insurance payments from private health insurance policies held by veterans. The estimated savings of $1 billion over three years, however, are over twice as large as CBO estimates would be saved if such so-called "third party payor" legislation were enacted in conjunction with the proposed means test.

FIRST ROUND SBC

The Committee voted 13 to 6 to accept a first round mark offered by Senator Chiles, with savings of $0.3 billion in BA, and $0.1 billion outlays in FY1986. Three-year BA savings would have been $0.9 billion.

COLAs would have been granted for veterans pensions and disability compensation, protecting both low-income and disabled veterans. Some savings would have been achieved in veterans medical care by slowing down the rate of growth in construction of new hospitals and by increased collections from private health insurance policies held by veterans. Direct medical services would have been kept at current operating levels, without a freeze, in order to prevent a drop in services to veterans currently receiving VA medical care. No changes would have been made to the VA housing loan guaranty program.

FUNCTION 750: ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	6.8	7.0	7.1	
Outlays	6.7	6.9	7.1	
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	6.7	6.8	6.9	
Outlays	6.7	6.8	6.9	
SBC 1st round				
Budget authority	6.7	7.0	7.0	
Outlays	6.7	6.9	7.0	
SBC (Domenici) mark:				
Budget authority	6.8	6.9	7.0	
Outlays	6.7	6.9	7.0	
SBC versus baseline:				
Budget authority		−0.1	−0.1	−0.2
Outlays			−0.1	−0.1
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	6.8	6.9	7.0	
Outlays	6.7	6.9	7.0	
Republican leadership package versus baseline:				
Budget authority		−0.1	−0.1	−0.2
Outlays			−0.1	−0.1

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PACKAGE

a. New cuts not in Domenici plan: None.

b. Modifications of policies in Domenici plan: None.

c. Same cuts as Domenici plan:

The Republican leadership plan makes the same assumptions for this function as the Committee-passed resolution (Domenici plan). Accounts in this function would be frozen at the FY85 level in FY86; inflation factors would be added in the out-years. The plan assumes those costs associated with both the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984 and the Bankruptcy Amendments and Federal Judgeship Act of 1984, and also assumes that both the legal services corporation and the JJDP programs would be forzen in FY86.

FIRST ROUND SBC

The Committee adopted Senator Domenici's revised mark for Function 750. This mark freezes all justice and law enforcement programs in FY86; CBO inflation factors would be added to these programs in the out-years, FY87 and FY88. Although no specific programmatic assumptions were made by the Committee, adoption of this mark means that both the legal services and juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs would not be eliminated in FY86 as proposed by the President.

Senator Domenici revised his original mark at the table when he rejected his initial proposal to terminate the Legal Services Corporation and moved to a freeze in FY86 instead.

The mark was adopted by voice vote on March 7.

DOMENICI CUTS

The mark for Function 750 under the Domenici plan (as approved by the Committee March 13) assumes a freeze in justice and law enforcement programs in FY86. Further, the mark assumes that the Legal Services Corporation will be frozen—and not terminated—in FY86. The Domenici plan also assumes additional funds for the U.S. Attorneys and Marshals program and for judges' salaries pursuant to legislation passed last year.

FUNCTION 800: GENERAL GOVERNMENT

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	6.0	6.1	6.3	
Outlays	5.9	5.9	6.2	
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	5.9	5.9	6.1	
Outlays	5.8	5.8	6.0	
SBC first round:				
Budget authority	5.8	5.8	6.0	
Outlays	5.7	5.7	6.0	
SBC (Domenici) plan:				
Budget authority	5.2	5.3	5.4	
Outlays	5.2	5.1	5.4	
SBC versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−0.8	−0.8	−0.9	−2.5
Outlays	−0.7	−0.8	−0.8	−2.3
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	5.3	5.4	5.6	
Outlays	5.3	5.3	5.5	
Republican leadership package versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−0.7	−0.7	−0.7	−2.1
Outlays	−0.6	−0.7	−0.8	−2.1

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PACKAGE

a. New cuts not in Domenici plan: None.

b. Modifications of policies in Domenici plan: None.

c. Same cuts as Domenici plan:

The Republican leadership plan makes the same assumptions for this function as the Committee-passed resolution (Domenici plan). The leadership plan assumes that user fees will be levied on certain operations of the Customs Service (−$0.5 billion in FY86 outlays); and that fees will be charged to 5 government-sponsored credit agencies when borrowing or issuing pass-through securities from the Treasury Department. The plan also proposes a 10 percent cut in legislative branch operations and assumes the remainder of the discretionary programs in this function will be frozen in FY86.

FIRST ROUND SBC

The Committee at first adopted a Gorton-Sasser mark for F.800. This mark assumed a 5 percent cut in legislative branch programs and all executive agency administrative cost savings. The mark assumed a change in the calculation of Federal work force hours from 2,080 to 2,087 per year. The mark also assumed that funding for the Pacific Island Trust Territories would be kept in this function.

Unlike the President's and Senator Domenici's proposals, the mark made no assumption for the imposition of user fees on certain Customs Service operations or for the establishment of fees to be charged to 5 government-sponsored credit agencies when borrowing or issuing pass-through securities from the Treasury Department.

The Committee adopted this mark by a vote of 15 ayes to 6 nays on March 12.

DOMENICI CUTS

The Domenici proposal for this function assumes a one-year freeze in discretionary programs in this function. The mark also assumes a 10 percent cut in legislative branch activities in FY86 as well as the imposition of user fees on several Customs Service operations (−$0.5 billion in FY86 outlays). The mark also assumes implementation of a requirement that 5 government-sponsored credit agencies (Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Bank System, Student Loan Marketing Association and the Farm Credit Administration) pay a fee to the Treasury when borrowing or issuing pass-through securities (−$41 million in FY86 outlays). The mark also assumes that funds for the Pacific Island Trust Territories will be retained in F.800.

FUNCTION 850: GENERAL PURPOSE FISCAL ASSISTANCE

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	6.5	6.8	7.1	
Outlays	6.5	6.7	7.0	
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	6.5	6.8	7.1	
Outlays	6.5	6.7	7.0	
SBC first round:				
Budget authority	6.5	2.0	2.1	
Outlays	6.5	3.1	2.1	
SBC (Domenici) plan:				
Budget authority	4.2	4.3	2.1	
Outlays	4.8	4.3	2.6	
SBC vs. baseline:				
Budget authority	−2.3	−2.5	−5.0	−9.8
Outlays	−1.7	−2.4	−4.4	−8.4
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	6.5	2.0	2.1	
Outlays	6.5	3.2	2.1	
Republican leadership package vs. Baseline:				
Budget authority		−4.8	−5.0	−9.8
Outlays		−3.5	−4.9	−8.4

*Differences due to rounding.

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PACKAGE

a. New cuts not in Domenici plan: The leadership plan assumes that general revenue sharing will be funded at the full amount in FY86 and terminated once the authorization expires at the end of next year. This contrasts with the assumptions of the Committee-passed resolution (Domenici plan) which would have cut the program in half in 1986 (−$2.3 billion) and spent out the remaining half in FY87; the program would have then been terminated beginning in FY88.

b. Modifications of policies in Domenici plan: (See above.)

c. Same cuts as Domenici plan: The leadership plan assumes that all remaining programs in this function would increase based on projected rates of inflation.

First Round SBC: The Committee at first adopted Senator Exon's mark for Function 850 by a vote of 13 to 9 on March 12. The mark assumed that General Revenue Sharing is continued in FY86, but not reauthorized in FY87. The Committee's action rejected the President's proposal to terminate the program in FY86—one year before the current authorization is due to expire.

Domenici Cuts: The Domenici plan assumes that General Revenue Sharing will be phased out over a two-year period. The mark cuts the program 50 percent in FY86 (−$2.3 billion in budget authority) and 50 percent in FY87. The mark assumes no funding for general revenue sharing in FY88. The current authorization for the program expires at the end of fiscal year 1986; no authorization is in place at this time to begin in FY87.

FUNCTION 900: INTEREST

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	143.2	159.4	169.9	
Outlays	143.2	159.4	169.9	
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority				
Outlays				
SBC first round:				
Budget authority				
Outlays				
SBC (Domenici) plan:				
Budget authority	142.3	151.6	153.2	
Outlays	142.3	151.6	153.2	
SBC versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−0.9	−7.8	−16.7	−25.4
Outlays	−0.9	−7.8	−16.7	−25.4
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	142.3	153.0	155.2	
Outlays	142.3	153.0	155.2	
Republican leadership package versus baseline:				
Budget authority	−0.9	−6.4	−14.7	−22.0
Outlays	−0.9	−6.4	−14.7	−22.0

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PACKAGE

Reflects action taken in other functions.

FUNCTION 920: ALLOWANCES

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget Authority	1.2	2.8	4.6	
Outlays	1.2	3.0	4.9	
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget Authority	0	0.9	2.2	
Outlays	0	0.9	2.3	
SBC first round:				
Budget Authority	−0.9	−1.7	−1.6	
Outlays	−0.9	−1.8	−1.7	
SBC (Domenici) plan:				
Budget Authority	−2.2	−2.7	−1.9	
Outlays	−2.2	−2.7	−1.9	
SBC vs. baseline:				
Budget Authority	−3.4	−5.5	−6.6	−15.5
Outlays	−3.4	−5.7	−5.8	−15.9
Republican leadership package:				
Budget Authority	−1.4	−1.2	−0.2	
Outlays	−1.4	−1.2	−0.1	
Republican leadership package vs. baseline:				
Budget Authority	−2.6	−4.0	−4.8	−11.4
Outlays	−2.6	−4.2	−5.0	−11.8

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PACKAGE

a. New cuts not in SBC/Domenici plan: None.

b. Modifications of policies in SBC/Domenici plan: Although the same "management and workforce" reforms are included in both packages, the savings for the new package is now shown as $6 billion over three years, whereas before it was shown as $10.1 billion over the same period.

c. Same cuts as SBC/Domenici plan:

Freezes civilian workers' (non-DoD and DoD) pay in FY86 and provides for a 3.8 percent pay raise in January, 1987 and a 4.7 percent pay raise in January, 1988. (Saves $1.2 billion in outlays in FY86 and $5.9 billion over three years).

Institutes "management and workforces reforms" (saves $1.4 billion in outlays in FY86 and $6.0 billion over three years).

a. Reduces administrative overhead by 10 percent for Federal executive agencies

b. Reduces Federal workforce by 4 percent through voluntary attrition

c. Adds one year to minimum length of time Federal employees must wait for within-grade pay increases

d. Increases number of hours of work per year assumed in computation of Federal pay per pay period (reduces pay per pay period)

First Round SBC:

Freezes civilian workers' (non-DoD and DoD) pay in FY86 and allows for 3 percent pay raises in October, 1986 and October, 1987.

Requires 5 percent reduction in aggregate Federal workforce through attrition in each of the next two fiscal years (1986 and 1987).

FUNCTION 950: UNDISTRIBUTED OFFSETTING RECEIPTS

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative totals 1986–88
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	−35.5	−38.1	−41.1	
Outlays	−35.5	−38.1	−41.1	
CBO 1-year freeze:				
Budget authority	−34.7	−37.0	−39.5	
Outlays	−34.7	−37.0	−39.5	
SBC first round:				
Budget authority	−34–7	−36.8	−39.2	
Outlays	−34–7	−36.8	−39.2	
SBC (Domenici) plan:				
Budget authority	−35.0	−37.8	−41.1	
Outlays	−35.0	−37.8	−41.1	
SBC vs. Baseline:				
Budget authority	0.5	0.3	0	+0.8
Outlays	0.5	0.3	0	+0.8
Republican leadership package:				
Budget authority	−35.0	−37.8	−41.1	
Outlays	−35.0	−37.8	−41.1	
Republican Leadership Package vs. Baseline:				
Budget authority	+0.5	+0.3	0	+0.8
Outlays	+0.5	+0.3	0	+0.8

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PACKAGE

a. New cuts not in SBC/Domenici plan: None.

b. Modifications of policies in SBC/Domenici plan: None.

c. Same cuts as SBC/Domenici plan: Reflects offsets from decreased employer contributions to Federal retirement resulting from civilian and military pay changes in other functions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENS). Who yields time? If neither side yields time, time will be charged equally against both sides on this amendment.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I yield such time to the Senator from Illinois as he may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIXON. I thank my distinguished colleague from Florida, Mr. President.

REDUCE THE BUDGET DEFICIT—BUT FAIRLY

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I do not think there is anything this Congress can do that is more important than bringing Federal spending back under control. I have devoted myself to that effort, and I am willing to take the hard steps necessary to achieve that objective.

We now have before us the so-called Rose Garden proposal, a package that is designed to reduce Federal deficits by over $40 billion from the $215 billion we are expecting this year. I believe the objective of this package is achievable. I support and will work for a budget that results in deficit reductions of this magnitude or even larger.

However, my support for that objective does not mean I am indifferent to how it is achieved. I am not. How the cuts are structured—what programs are cut and what programs eliminated—is of real importance.

Necessary budget cuts must be fair. They must not do fundamental damage to the Nation's long-term interests. Unfortunately, the amendment before the Senate now fails on both counts.

It is fundamentally unfair, it puts a disproportionate burden of the sacrifices required on the elderly, on students, on cities, on farmers, and on those in the most need of help. It permits increases of over $20 billion in military spending while capping the cost of living adjustments of Social Security recipients. It mortgages our economic future by the way it treats education. For these reasons, and a number of others I will not take the time of the Senate to mention, I shall vote no on this amendment.

Mr. President, my own preference for the fairest way to proceed would be an across-the-board freeze on all spending, including the military. I supported proposals of this type last year, and will again this year.

I am confident we can reach a consensus on a budget that will be more equitable and less short-sighted than what is currently before us. The President has every right to make budget proposals to the Senate, but it should be remembered that the Senate has the constitutional duty and responsibility to work its will on the budget. The number of amendments being proposed provides eloquent testimony to the fact that the Senate wants an opportunity to consider alternatives to the current proposal. I think we should get about the task of considering those alternatives.

I thank my friend from Florida and I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? No time is yielded. Time will be charged equally to each manager.

For the information of the Senate, there are 15½ minutes on the side of the opposition and 59½ minutes on the side of the proponents of the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Charged against whose time?

Mr. CHILES. My understanding is that the quorum will be charged equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The quorum call will be charged against the Senator from Florida unless he

asks unanimous consent it be charged equally.

Mr. CHILES. I withdraw my request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn.

(Later the following occurred:)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state that the time in opposition has expired. The time remaining solely remains in the control of the proponents of the amendment.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished minority leader.

Does the leader yield himself time on the resolution?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; such time as I may require.

Mr. President, all time has expired on the amendment, as I understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time in opposition to the amendment has expired. The Chair would explain that the time of the proponents of 44 minutes remains under the control of the majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 38

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time and send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, an amendment is in order.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], for himself and Mr. DOMENICI, proposes an amendment numbered 38.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will for the time being.

Democrats oppose this budget for substantive reasons and we feel that we should take the time, whatever time is necessary, to discuss what bothers us about the Reagan budget cuts in Social Security and research and education. Those are things that deserve our attention and we will not be rushed into a final vote on the overall resolution.

The President had some harsh things to say about rushing votes earlier this week. It seems to depend on what he wants that he decides whether we should take the time to discuss it. We believe we should take the time to discuss the President's proposed cuts in the economic foundation of this country's future.

For the time being, I object to calling off the reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk will continue reading the amendment.

The legislative clerk continued reading the amendment.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I love my friend. I may make such a request myself in 10 or 15 minutes, but as of now, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The legislative clerk resumed reading the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. 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 text of the amendment follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 38—PERFECTING AMENDMENT TO AMENDMENT NO. 37

(Proposed by Mr. DOLE, for himself and Mr. DOMENICI.)

On page 2, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$736,200,000,000".

On page 2, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$793,600,000,000".

On page 2, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$866,300,000,000".

On page 2, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$955,900,000,000".

On page 2, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 2, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$900,000,000".

On page 2, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".

On page 2, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,400,000,000".

On page 2, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$44,800,000,000".

On page 2, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$51,000,000,000".

On page 2, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$56,100,000,000".

On page 2, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$61,300,000,000".

On page 3, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$186,200,000,000".

On page 3, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$200,700,000,000".

On page 3, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$216,900,000,000".

On page 3, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$248,300,000,000".

On page 3, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$1,055,600,000,000".

On page 3, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$1,076,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$1,139,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$1,216,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$949,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$969,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$1,013,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$1,055,700,000,000".

On page 3, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$212,900,000,000".

On page 3, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$175,400,000,000".

On page 4, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$146,800,000,000".

On page 4, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$99,800,000,000".

On page 4, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$1,849,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$2,088,000,000,000".

On page 4, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$2,316,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$2,529,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$25,500,000,000".

On page 4, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$238,700,000,000".

On page 4, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$228,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$213,100,000,000".

On page 4, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$52,900,000,000".

On page 4, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$69,200,000,000".

On page 4, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$30,000,000,000".

On page 5, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$74,500,000,000".

On page 5, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$27,400,000,000".

On page 5, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$74,400,000,000".

On page 5, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$25,600,000,000".

On page 5, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$79,000,000,000".

On page 5, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 6, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$292,600,000,000".

On page 6, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$252,000,000,000".

On page 6, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$312,800,000,000".

On page 6, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$276,100,000,000".

On page 6, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$334,900,000,000".

On page 6, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$298,400,000,000".

On page 7, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$359,600,000,000".

On page 7, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$321,400,000,000".

On page 7, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$25,300,000,000".

On page 7, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$18,000,000,000".

On page 7, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$11,500,000,000".

On page 7, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$10,300,000,000".
On page 7, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 8, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$21,000,000,000".
On page 8, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$17,800,000,000".
On page 8, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$8,200,000,000".
On page 8, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".
On page 8, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 8, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$20,200,000,000".
On page 8, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$17,100,000,000".
On page 8, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$7,800,000,000".
On page 8, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".
On page 8, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 8, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$20,500,000,000".
On page 8, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$16,600,000,000".
On page 8, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$7,900,000,000".
On page 8, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".
On page 9, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$9,100,000,000".
On page 9, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".
On page 9, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$8,800,000,000".
On page 9, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".
On page 9, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$9,000,000,000".
On page 9, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$8,800,000,000".
On page 9, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$9,300,000,000".
On page 10, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$9,000,000,000".
On page 10, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$1,600,000,000".
On page 10, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 10, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 10, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 10, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$5,200,000,000".
On page 10, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$5,100,000,000".
On page 10, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 11, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$4,100,000,000".
On page 11, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$5,200,000,000".
On page 11, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$4,600,000,000".
On page 11, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$1,400,000,000".
On page 11, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$4,900,000,000".
On page 11, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$4,200,000,000".
On page 11, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$1,000,000,000".
On page 11, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$12,700,000,000".
On page 12, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$13,100,000,000".
On page 12, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 12, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$12,100,000,000".
On page 12, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$12,400,000,000".
On page 12, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 12, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$12,500,000,000".
On page 12, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$12,200,000,000".
On page 12, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 12, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$12,700,000,000".
On page 13, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".
On page 13, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$24,800,000,000".
On page 13, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$21,000,000,000".
On page 13, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$13,800,000,000".
On page 13, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$5,700,000,000".
On page 13, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$16,500,000,000".
On page 13, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$13,800,000,000".
On page 13, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$11,700,000,000".
On page 13, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 14, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 14, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$16,400,000,000".
On page 14, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$14,500,000,000".
On page 14, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$10,200,000,000".
On page 14, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 14, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 14, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$13,600,000,000".
On page 14, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$11,500,000,000".
On page 14, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$9,100,000,000".
On page 14, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 14, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 14, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$12,600,000,000".
On page 14, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$5,600,000,000".
On page 15, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 15, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$27,000,000,000".
On page 15, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$7,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$2,600,000,000".
On page 15, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$2,500,000,000".
On page 15, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$25,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,900,000,000".
On page 15, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 15, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$2,500,000,000".
On page 15, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$26,700,000,000".
On page 15, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 16, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$4,300,000,000".
On page 16, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".
On page 16, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$2,700,000,000".
On page 16, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$28,400,000,000".
On page 16, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 16, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$29,600,000,000".
On page 16, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$26,100,000,000".
On page 16, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 16, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 16, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 16, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$26,600,000,000".
On page 16, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$25,600,000,000".
On page 16, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 16, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".

On page 17, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 17, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$27,100,000,000".
On page 17, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$27,000,000,000".
On page 17, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 17, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 17, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 17, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 17, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$26,500,000,000".
On page 17, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 17, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 17, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 17, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$8,400,000,000".
On page 17, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".
On page 18, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 18, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 18, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 18, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$5,400,000,000".
On page 18, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$7,600,000,000".
On page 18, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$800,000,000".
On page 18, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 18, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 18, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On page 18, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$6,800,000,000".
On page 18, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$700,000,000".
On page 18, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 18, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 19, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$6,200,000,000".
On page 19, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$6,200,000,000".
On page 19, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$800,000,000".
On page 19, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 19, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 19, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$31,600,000,000".
On page 19, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$30,300,000,000".
On page 19, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 19, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$8,600,000,000".
On page 19, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 19, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$28,600,000,000".
On page 19, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$29,800,000,000".
On page 19, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$8,900,000,000".
On page 20, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$29,400,000,000".
On page 20, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$28,700,000,000".
On page 20, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$9,200,000,000".
On page 20, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$29,800,000,000".
On page 20, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$29,000,000,000".
On page 20, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$9,400,000,000".
On page 20, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$33,600,000,000".
On page 21, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$33,500,000,000".
On page 21, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 21, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$34,900,000,000".
On page 21, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$35,000,000,000".
On page 21, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 21, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$37,100,000,000".
On page 21, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$36,700,000,000".
On page 21, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 21, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$39,200,000,000".
On page 21, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$38,700,000,000".
On page 22, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 22, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$71,800,000,000".
On page 22, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$65,200,000,000".
On page 22, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$81,600,000,000".
On page 22, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$68,000,000,000".
On page 22, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$90,500,000,000".
On page 22, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$74,100,000,000".
On page 23, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$93,300,000,000".
On page 23, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$81,600,000,000".
On page 23, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$162,800,000,000".
On page 23, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$128,600,000,000".
On page 23, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$14,300,000,000".
On page 23, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$156,300,000,000".
On page 24, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$118,100,000,000".
On page 24, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 24, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$166,500,000,000".
On page 24, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$121,900,000,000".
On page 24, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$2,300,000,000".
On page 24, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$174,700,000,000".
On page 24, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$125,600,000,000".
On page 24, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 25, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$195,500,000,000".
On page 25, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$189,300,000,000".
On page 25, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$207,600,000,000".
On page 25, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$197,700,000,000".
On page 25, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$225,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$206,500,000,000".
On page 26, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 26, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$266,200,000,000".
On page 26, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$216,100,000,000".
On page 26, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$27,200,000,000".
On page 26, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$1,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$16,800,000,000".
On page 27, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$1,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$15,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$1,200,000,000".
On page 27, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$17,400,000,000".
On page 27, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$26,400,000,000".
On page 27, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,200,000,000".
On page 28, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$20,100,000,000".
On page 28, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$6,600,000,000".
On page 28, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 28, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$6,800,000,000".
On page 28, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$6,700,000,000".
On page 28, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$6,900,000,000".
On page 28, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$6,900,000,000".
On page 28, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$7,000,000,000".
On page 29, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$7,000,000,000".
On page 29, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On page 29, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On page 29, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On page 29, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On page 29, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$5,400,000,000".
On page 30, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On page 30, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$5,600,000,000".
On page 30, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$5,500,000,000".
On page 30, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 30, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 30, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 31, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 31, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".
On page 31, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$3,200,000,000".
On page 31, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 31, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 31, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$129,700,000,000".
On page 32, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$129,700,000,000".
On page 32, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$142,300,000,000".
On page 32, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$142,300,000,000".
On page 32, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$153,000,000,000".
On page 33, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$153,000,000,000".
On page 33, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$155,200,000,000".
On page 33, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$155,200,000,000".
On page 33, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 33, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 33, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 5, strike the figure and insert "−$1,400,000,000".
On page 34, line 6, strike the figure and insert "−$1,400,000,000".
On page 34, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 14, strike the figure and insert "−$1,200,000,000".
On page 34, line 15, strike the figure and insert "−$1,200,000,000".
On page 34, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 23, strike the figure and insert "−$200,000,000".
On page 34, line 24, strike the figure and insert "−$100,000,000".
On page 34, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 8, strike the figure and insert "−$32,400,000,000".

On page 35, line 9, strike the figure and insert "−$32,400,000,000".
On page 35, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$35,000,000,000".
On page 35, line 18, strike the figure and insert "−$35,000,000,000".
On page 35, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 2, strike the figure and insert "−$37,800,000,000".
On page 36, line 3, strike the figure and insert "−$37,800,000,000".
On page 36, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 11, strike the figure and insert "−$41,100,000,000".
On page 36, line 12, strike the figure and insert "−$41,100,000,000".
On page 36, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 19, strike the date and insert "June 19, 1985".
On page 37, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$3,899,000,000".
On page 37, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$4,610,000,000".
On page 37, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$3,773,000,000".
On page 37, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$6,540,000,000".
On page 37, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$4,258,000,000".
On page 37, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$10,326,000,000".
On page 37, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$0".
On page 37, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$376,000,000".
On page 37, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 37, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$894,000,000".
On page 37, line 23, strike the first figure and insert "$0".
On page 37, line 23, strike the second figure and insert "$1,424,000,000".
On page 38, line 10, strike the first figure and insert "$10,122,000,000".
On page 38, line 10, strike the second figure and insert "$4,213,000,000".
On page 38, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$11,353,000,000".
On page 38, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$7,416,000,000".
On page 38, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$12,509,000,000".
On page 38, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$9,566,000,000".
On page 38, line 24, strike the first figure and insert "$2,622,000,000".
On page 38, line 24, strike the second figure and insert "$2,216,000,000".
On page 38, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,416,000,000".
On page 39, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$1,077,000,000".
On page 39, line 2, strike the first figure and insert "$1,633,000,000".
On page 39, line 2, strike the second figure and insert "$1,368,000,000".
On page 39, line 13, strike the first figure and insert "$2,962,000,000".
On page 39, line 13, strike the second figure and insert "$2,253,000,000".
On page 39, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$2,723,000,000".
On page 39, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$2,579,000,000".
On page 39, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$2,720,000,000".
On page 39, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$2,814,000,000".
On page 40, line 2, strike the first figure and insert "$719,000,000".
On page 40, line 2, strike the second figure and insert "$306,000,000".
On page 40, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$1,208,000,000".
On page 40, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$1,451,000,000".
On page 40, line 5, strike the first figure and insert "$1,720,000,000".
On page 40, line 5, strike the second figure and insert "$2,112,000,000".
On page 40, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 40, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$8,117,000,000".
On page 40, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$0".
On page 40, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$18,934,000,000".
On page 40, line 18, strike the first figure and insert "$0".
On page 40, line 18, strike the second figure and insert "$28,137,000,000".
On page 41, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".
On page 41, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$47,000,000".
On page 41, line 5, strike the first figure and insert "$275,000,000".
On page 41, line 5, strike the second figure and insert "$109,000,000".
On page 41, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$282,000,000".
On page 41, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$140,000,000".
On page 41, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$375,000,000".
On page 41, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$0".
On page 41, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,101,000,000".
On page 41, line 18, strike the first figure and insert "$1,325,000,000".
On page 41, line 18, strike the second figure and insert "$0".
On page 41, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$7,332,000,000".
On page 41, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$1,370,000,000".
On page 41, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$0".
On page 41, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$9,097,000,000".
On page 42, line 6, strike the first figure and insert "$3,404,000,000".
On page 42, line 6, strike the second figure and insert "$1,299,000,000".
On page 42, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$3,826,000,000".
On page 42, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$3,446,000,000".
On page 42, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$4,291,000,000".
On page 42, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$4,231,000,000".
On page 42, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$882,000,000".
On page 42, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$1,258,000,000".
On page 42, line 21, strike the first figure and insert "$2,034,000,000".
On page 42, line 21, strike the second figure and insert "$2,101,000,000".
On page 42, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$2,594,000,000".
On page 42, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$2,275,000,000".
On page 43, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$858,000,000".
On page 43, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$791,000,000".
On page 43, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$1,332,000,000".
On page 43, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$1,496,000,000".
On page 43, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$1,725,43,000,000".
On page 43, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$1,987,000,000".
On page 43, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".
On page 43, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$87,000,000".
On page 43, line 22, strike the first figure and insert "$201,000,000".
On page 43, line 22, strike the second figure and insert "$151,000,000".
On page 43, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$211,000,000".
On page 43, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$181,000,000".
On page 44, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$3,899,000,000".
On page 44, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$4,610,000,000".
On page 44, line 12, strike the first figure and insert "$3,773,000,000".
On page 44, line 12, strike the second figure and insert "$6,540,000,000".
On page 44, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$4,258,000,000".
On page 44, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$10,326,000,000".
On page 44, line 19, strike the first figure and insert "$0".
On page 44, line 19, strike the second figure and insert "$376,000,000".
On page 44, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 44, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$894,000,000".
On page 44, line 22, strike the first figure and insert "$0".
On page 44, line 22, strike the second figure and insert "$1,424,000,000".
On page 45, line 8, strike the first figure and insert "$9,159,000,000".
On page 45, line 8, strike the second figure and insert "$4,028,000,000".
On page 45, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$9,730,000,000".
On page 45, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$6,870,000,000".
On page 45, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$10,379,000,000".
On page 45, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$8,550,000,000".
On page 45, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$2,838,000,000".
On page 45, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$1,316,000,000".
On page 45, line 23, strike the first figure and insert "$3,183,000,000".
On page 45, line 23, strike the second figure and insert "$3,202,000,000".
On page 45, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$3,549,000,000".
On page 45, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$3,865,000,000".
On page 46, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$5,188,000,000".

On page 46, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$8,187,000,000".

On page 46, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$3,871,000,000".

On page 46, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$10,159,000,000".

On page 46, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$3,958,000,000".

On page 46, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$13,539,000,000".

On page 46, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".

On page 46, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$47,000,000".

On page 46, line 25, strike the first figure and insert "$275,000,000".

On page 46, line 25, strike the second figure and insert "$109,000,000".

On page 47, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$282,000,000".

On page 47, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$140,000,000".

On page 47, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 12, strike the first figure and insert "$64,000,000".

On page 47, line 12, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$3,699,000,000".

On page 47, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$5,203,000,000".

On page 47, line 25, strike the first figure and insert "$540,000,000".

On page 47, line 25, strike the second figure and insert "$292,000,000".

On page 48, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$559,000,000".

On page 48, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$402,000,000".

On page 48, line 3, strike the first figure and insert "$634,000,000".

On page 48, line 3, strike the second figure and insert "$526,000,000".

On page 48, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$401,000,000".

On page 48, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$379,000,000".

On page 48, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$293,000,000".

On page 48, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$352,000,000".

On page 48, line 17, strike the first figure and insert "$394,000,000".

On page 48, line 17, strike the second figure and insert "$450,000,000".

On page 49, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$375,000,000".

On page 49, line 3, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 3, strike the second figure and insert "$3,037,000,000".

On page 49, line 4, strike the first figure and insert "$1,325,000,000".

On page 49, line 4, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$7,183,000,000".

On page 49, line 6, strike the first figure and insert "$1,370,000,000".

On page 49, line 6, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$8,850,000,000".

On page 49, line 17, strike the first figure and insert "$1,895,000,000".

On page 49, line 17, strike the second figure and insert "$469,000,000".

On page 49, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$3,091,000,000".

On page 49, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$1,950,000,000".

On page 49, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$4,170,000,000".

On page 49, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$3,161,000,000".

On page 50, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$882,000,000".

On page 50, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$1,258,000,000".

On page 50, line 7, strike the first figure and insert "$2,034,000,000".

On page 50, line 7, strike the second figure and insert "$2,101,000,000".

On page 50, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$2,594,000,000".

On page 50, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$2,275,000,000".

On page 50, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$858,000,000".

On page 50, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$791,000,000".

On page 50, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$1,332,000,000".

On page 50, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$1,496,000,000".

On page 50, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$1,725,000,000".

On page 50, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$1,987,000,000".

On page 51, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 51, line 7, strike the first figure and insert "$7,600,000,000".

On page 51, line 7, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 51, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$14,456,000,000".

On page 51, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 51, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$21,809,000,000".

On page 51, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$313,500,000,000".

On page 51, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$335,600,000,000".

On page 51, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$360,400,000,000".

On page 52, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$136,700,000,000".

On page 52, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$138,200,000,000".

On page 52, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$143,100,000,000".

On page 54, line 20, strike the figure and insert "8".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require from the time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to make a proposal to the distinguished majority leader to the effect that he call up his amendment which he really wants to get a vote on, which is "F," and that we take 30 minutes or 20 minutes equally divided—I would say 30 minutes equally divided—and then vote up or down on that amendment without any preceding quorum call.

Mr. DOLE. No motion to recommit?

Mr. BYRD. I do not have in mind offering any motion to recommit.

As I suggested, it will be an up-or-down vote on amendment F.

That will save the Senate a good bit of time. I do not know whether we have the votes to defeat the distinguished majority leader. I do not know whether he knows he has the votes to carry. Maybe he has.

But let us just have the vote and have done with that part of it.

That would not end the ball game by any means. There are still many hours remaining and many opportunities to offer amendments.

But rather than stay here and chew up another half-dozen hours, I am happy to offer the distinguished majority leader that proposal. I will be glad to yield to him if he wishes so he may make a response.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator was yielding to me, is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. I will be glad to yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair makes the observation that the minority leader had the floor.

Who yields time?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield myself time off the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized for time off the resolution.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, that sounds like a pretty good deal to me, but I have not fully mastered all these things and I just need a few minutes to make certain that it is a good deal. It is not that I do not have complete faith in the distinguished minority leader, but I am not sure how we got from where we are to option F.

Mr. BYRD. That is a detour.

As I say, there are no tricks in this offer, no tricks. It simply saves the Senate a lot of time.

I do not want to be here at midnight tonight voting on this amendment. Let us just have a vote now.

The Senator may win. If he wins, as I said, the ball game is not over. If he loses, the ball game is not over.

Mr. DOLE. I say to the distinguished minority leader I appreciate the gesture and I share the view that if we can work this out it would save some time and obviously the ball game is barely started whatever happens. I am not certain there is anyone on base yet, but there are a lot of batters up.

So if we can just have a bit of time to discuss this with the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee we will let the time run on the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Let it run. It will be charged equally to both sides for the time being.

Mr. President, the time running will be equally divided if nobody yields time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished minority leader is correct. The Chair is making that assumption without the announcement. It was previously announced.

(Later the following occurred:)

Mr. BYRD. Well? [Laughter.]

I see the distinguished Vice President is in the chair, and we are happy for that. We appreciate his attendance this evening. He appears to be a little nervous. [Laughter.] I understand he is keeping someone waiting.

I do not guess offers such as I have just made are made very often, and when they are made perhaps it causes the offerees to wonder if there is something behind them that they do not see. But there are no tricks in this. [Laughter.] And for the Vice President's sake, I wish we would get on with the voting.

Well? [Laughter.]

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, what is the time situation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the opponents has expired, and the proponents have 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time and send an amendment to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished majority leader will let the minority leader know what he is doing. We never entered a consent order. I merely made a proposal.

Mr. DOLE. I am just filling out the tree. I am just doing the normal process.

Mr. BYRD. The majority leader is going to have to get the yeas and nays to get unanimous consent. I do not mind giving it to him.

Mr. DOLE. Not on this. I am just offering the third part of the tree, and then they will read the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does not take unanimous consent to yield back the time and offer an amendment.

Mr. BYRD. I know that, but I offered to let the distinguished majority leader fill out the entire trunk of this tree and then vote on the amendment that will be in the "F" position. I thought the majority leader was proceeding to fill out the entire tree. I now understand the distinguished majority leader is not quite ready to do that as yet, and so he is proceeding to offer the next amendment in the arrangement, so he does not need consent to do that.

AMENDMENT NO. 39

(Purpose: A substitute for the perfecting amendment to the substitute).

Mr. DOLE. I send an amendment to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], for himself and Mr. DOMENICI, proposes an amendment numbered 39:

The legislative clerk continued to read the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading——

Mr. HELMS. I object.

Mr. BYRD. Will the distinguished Senator from North Carolina let me finish my sentence?

I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. HELMS. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

The legislative clerk continued to read the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. STEVENS]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The text of the amendment follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 39

(A substitute for the perfecting amendment to the substitute.)

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

On page 2, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$736,200,000,000".

On page 2, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$793,600,000,000".

On page 2, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$866,300,000,000".

On page 2, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$955,900,000,000".

On page 2, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 2, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$900,000,000".

On page 2, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".

On page 2, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,400,000,000".

On page 2, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$44,800,000,000".

On page 2, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$51,000,000,000".

On page 2, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$56,100,000,000".

On page 2, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$61,300,000,000".

On page 3, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$186,200,000,000".

On page 3, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$200,700,000,000".

On page 3, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$216,900,000,000".

On page 3, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$248,300,000,000".

On page 3, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$1,055,600,000,000".

On page 3, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$1,076,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$1,139,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$1,216,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$949,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$969,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$1,013,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$1,055,700,000,000".

On page 3, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$212,900,000,000".

On page 3, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$175,400,000,000".

On page 4, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$146,800,000,000".

On page 4, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$99,800,000,000".

On page 4, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$1,849,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$2,088,000,000".

On page 4, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$2,316,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$2,529,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$25,500,000,000".

On page 4, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$238,700,000,000".

On page 4, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$228,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$213,100,000,000".

On page 4, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$52,900,000,000".

On page 4, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$69,200,000,000".

On page 4, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$30,000,000,000".

On page 5, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$74,500,000,000".

On page 5, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$27,400,000,000".

On page 5, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$74,400,000,000".

On page 5, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$25,600,000,000".

On page 5, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$79,000,000,000".

On page 5, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 6, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$292,600,000,000".

On page 6, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$252,000,000,000".

On page 6, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$312,800,000,000".

On page 6, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$276,100,000,000".

On page 6, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$334,900,000,000".

On page 6, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$298,400,000,000".

On page 7, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$359,600,000,000".

On page 7, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$321,400,000,000".
On page 7, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 7, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 7, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 7, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$25,300,000,000".
On page 7, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$18,000,000,000".
On page 7, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$11,500,000,000".
On page 7, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$10,300,000,000".
On page 7, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 8, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$21,000,000,000".
On page 8, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$17,800,000,000".
On page 8, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$8,200,000,000".
On page 8, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".
On page 8, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 8, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$20,200,000,000".
On page 8, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$17,100,000,000".
On page 8, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$7,800,000,000".
On page 8, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".
On page 8, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 8, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$20,500,000,000".
On page 8, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$16,600,000,000".
On page 8, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$7,900,000,000".
On page 8, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".
On page 9, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$9,100,000,000".
On page 9, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".
On page 9, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 9, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".
On page 9, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$9,000,000,000".
On page 9, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$8,800,000,000".
On page 9, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$9,300,000,000".
On page 10, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$9,000,000,000".
On page 10, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 8, strike the figure and insert '$0".
On page 10, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$1,600,000,000".
On page 10, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 10, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 10, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 10, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$5,200,000,000".
On page 10, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$5,100,000,000".
On page 10, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 11, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$4,100,000,000".
On page 11, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$5,200,000,000".
On page 11, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$4,600,000,000".
On page 11, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$1,400,000,000".
On page 11, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$4,900,000,000".
On page 11, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$4,200,000,000".
On page 11, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$1,000,000,000".
On page 11, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$12,700,000,000".
On page 12, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$13,100,000,000".
On page 12, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 12, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$12,100,000,000".
On page 12, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$12,400,000,000".
On page 12, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 12, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$12,500,000,000".
On page 12, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$12,200,000,000".
On page 12, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 12, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$12,700,000,000".
On page 13, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".
On page 13, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$24,800,000,000".
On page 13, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$21,000,000,000".
On page 13, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$13,800,000,000".
On page 13, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$5,700,000,000".
On page 13, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$16,500,000".
On page 13, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$13,800,000,000".
On page 13, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$11,700,000,000".
On page 13, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 14, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 14, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$16,400,000,000".
On page 14, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$14,500,000,000".
On page 14, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$10,200,000,000".
On page 14, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 14, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 14, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$13,600,000,000".
On page 14, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$11,500,000,000".
On page 14, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$9,100,000,000".
On page 14, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 14, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 14, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$12,600,000,000".
On page 14, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$5,600,000,000".
On page 15, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 15, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$27,000,000,000".
On page 15, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$7,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$2,600,000,000".
On page 15, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$2,500,000,000".
On page 15, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$25,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,900,000,000".
On page 15, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 15, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$2,500,000,000".
On page 15, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$26,700,000,000".
On page 15, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 16, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$4,300,000,000".
On page 16, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".
On page 16, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$2,700,000,000".
On page 16, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$28,400,000,000".
On page 16, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 16, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$29,600,000,000".
On page 16, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$26,100,000,000".

On page 16, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 16, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 16, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 16, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$26,600,000,000".
On page 16, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$25,600,000,000".
On page 16, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 16, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 17, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 17, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$27,100,000,000".
On page 17, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$27,000,000,000".
On page 17, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 17, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 17, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 17, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 17, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$26,500,000,000".
On page 17, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 17, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 17, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 17, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$8,400,000,000".
On page 17, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".
On page 18, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 18, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 18, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 18, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$5,400,000,000".
On page 18, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$7,600,000,000".
On page 18, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$800,000,000".
On page 18, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 18, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 18, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On page 18, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$6,800,000,000".
On page 18, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$700,000,000".
On page 18, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 18, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 19, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$6,200,000,000".
On page 19, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$6,200,000,000".
On page 19, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$800,000,000".
On page 19, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 19, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 19, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$31,600,000,000".
On page 19, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$30,300,000,000".
On page 19, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 19, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$8,600,000,000".
On page 19, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 19, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$28,600,000,000".
On page 19, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$29,800,000,000".
On page 19, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$8,900,000,000".
On page 20, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$29,400,000,000".
On page 20, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$28,700,000,000".
On page 20, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$9,200,000,000".
On page 20, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$29,800,000,000".
On page 20, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$29,000,000,000".
On page 20, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$9,400,000,000".
On page 20, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$33,600,000,000".
On page 21, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$33,500,000,000".
On page 21, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 21, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$34,900,000,000".
On page 21, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$35,000,000,000".
On page 21, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 21, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$37,100,000,000".
On page 21, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$36,700,000,000".
On page 21, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 21, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$39,200,000,000".
On page 21, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$38,700,000,000".
On page 22, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 22, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$71,800,000,000".
On page 22, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$65,200,000,000".
On page 22, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$81,600,000,000".
On page 22, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$68,000,000,000".
On page 22, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$90,500,000,000".
On page 22, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$74,100,000,000".
On page 23, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$93,300,000,000".
On page 23, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$81,600,000,000".
On page 23, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$162,800,000,000".
On page 23, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$128,600,000,000".
On page 23, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$14,300,000,000".
On page 23, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$156,300,000,000".
On page 24, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$118,100,000,000".
On page 24, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 24, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$166,500,000,000".
On page 24, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$121,900,000,000".
On page 24, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$2,300,000,000".
On page 24, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$174,700,000,000".
On page 24, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$125,600,000,000".
On page 24, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 25, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$195,500,000,000".
On page 25, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$189,300,000,000".
On page 25, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$207,600,000,000".
On page 25, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$197,700,000,000".
On page 25, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".

51-059 O-86-32 (Pt. 7)

On page 25, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$225,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$206,500,000,000".
On page 26, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$266,200,000,000".
On page 26, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$216,100,000,000".
On page 26, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$27,200,000,000".
On page 26, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$1,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$16,800,000,000".
On page 27, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$1,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$15,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$1,200,000,000".
On page 27, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$17,400,000,000".
On page 27, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$26,400,000,000".
On page 27, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,200,000,000".
On page 28, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$20,100,000,000".
On page 28, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$6,600,000,000".
On page 28, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 28, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$6,800,000,000".
On page 28, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$6,700,000,000".
On page 28, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$6,900,000,000".
On page 28, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$6,900,000,000".
On page 28, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$7,000,000,000".
On page 29, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$7,000,000,000".
On page 29, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On page 29, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On page 29, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On page 29, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On page 29, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$5,400,000,000".
On page 30, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On page 30, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$5,600,000,000".
On page 30, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$5,500,000,000".
On page 30, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 30, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 30, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 31, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 31, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".
On page 31, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$3,200,000,000".
On page 31, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 31, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 31, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$129,700,000,000".
On page 32, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$129,700,000,000".
On page 32, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$142,300,000,000".
On page 32, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$142,300,000,000".
On page 32, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$153,000,000,000".
On page 33, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$153,000,000,000".
On page 33, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$155,200,000,000".
On page 33, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$155,200,000,000".
On page 33, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 33, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 33, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 5, strike the figure and insert "−$1,400,000,000".
On page 34, line 6, strike the figure and insert "−$1,400,000,000".
On page 34, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 14, strike the figure and insert "−$1,200,000,000".
On page 34, line 15, strike the figure and insert "−$1,200,000,000".
On page 34, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 34, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 34, line 23, strike the figure and insert "−$200,000,000".

On page 34, line 24, strike the figure and insert "−$100,000,000".

On page 34, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 35, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 35, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 35, line 8, strike the figure and insert "−$32,400,000,000".

On page 35, line 9, strike the figure and insert "−$32,400,000,000".

On page 35, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 35, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 35, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 35, line 17, strike the figure and insert "−$35,000,000,000".

On page 35, line 18, strike the figure and insert "−$35,000,000,000".

On page 35, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 35, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 35, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 36, line 2, strike the figure and insert "−$37,800,000,000".

On page 36, line 3, strike the figure and insert "−$37,800,000,000".

On page 36, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 36, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 36, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 36, line 11, strike the figure and insert "−$41,100,000,000".

On page 36, line 12, strike the figure and insert "−$41,100,000,000".

On page 36, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 36, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 36, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 36, line 19, strike the date and insert "June 30, 1985".

On page 37, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$3,899,000,000".

On page 37, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$4,610,000,000".

On page 37, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$3,773,000,000".

On page 37, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$6,540,000,000".

On page 37, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$4,258,000,000".

On page 37, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$10,326,000,000".

On page 37, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 37, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$376,000,000".

On page 37, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 37, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$894,000,000".

On page 37, line 23, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 37, line 23, strike the second figure and insert "$1,424,000,000".

On page 38, line 10, strike the first figure and insert "$10,122,000,000".

On page 38, line 10, strike the second figure and insert "$4,213,000,000".

On page 38, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$11,353,000,000".

On page 38, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$7,416,000,000".

On page 38, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$12,509,000,000".

On page 38, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$9,566,000,000".

On page 38, line 24, strike the first figure and insert "$2,622,000,000".

On page 38, line 24, strike the second figure and insert "$2,216,000,000".

On page 38, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,416,000,000".

On page 39, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$1,077,000,000".

On page 39, line 2, strike the first figure and insert "$1,633,000,000".

On page 39, line 2, strike the second figure and insert "$1,368,000,000".

On page 39, line 13, strike the first figure and insert "$2,962,000,000".

On page 39, line 13, strike the second figure and insert "$2,253,000,000".

On page 39, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$2,723,000,000".

On page 39, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$2,579,000,000".

On page 39, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$2,720,000,000".

On page 39, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$2,814,000,000".

On page 40, line 2, strike the first figure and insert "$719,000,000".

On page 40, line 2, strike the second figure and insert "$306,000,000".

On page 40, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$1,208,000,000".

On page 40, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$1,451,000,000".

On page 40, line 5, strike the first figure and insert "$1,720,000,000".

On page 40, line 5, strike the second figure and insert "$2,112,000,000".

On page 40, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 40, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$8,117,000,000".

On page 40, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 40, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$18,934,000,000".

On page 40, line 18, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 40, line 18, strike the second figure and insert "$28,137,000,000".

On page 41, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".

On page 41, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$47,000,000".

On page 41, line 5, strike the first figure and insert "$275,000,000".

On page 41, line 5, strike the second figure and insert "$109,000,000".

On page 41, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$282,000,000".

On page 41, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$140,000,000".

On page 41, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$375,000,000".

On page 41, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 41, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,101,000,000".

On page 41, line 18, strike the first figure and insert "$1,325,000,000".

On page 41, line 18, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 41, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$7,332,000,000".

On page 41, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$1,370,000,000".

On page 41, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 41, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$9,097,000,000".

On page 42, line 6, strike the first figure and insert "$3,404,000,000".

On page 42, line 6, strike the second figure and insert "$1,299,000,000".

On page 42, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$3,826,000,000".

On page 42, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$3,446,000,000".

On page 42, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$4,291,000,000".

On page 42, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$4,231,000,000".

On page 42, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$882,000,000".

On page 42, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$1,258,000,000".

On page 42, line 21, strike the first figure and insert "$2,034,000,000".

On page 42, line 21, strike the second figure and insert "$2,101,000,000".

On page 42, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$2,594,000,000".

On page 42, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$2,275,000,000".

On page 43, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$858,000,000".

On page 43, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$791,000,000".

On page 43, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$1,332,000,000".

On page 43, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$1,496,000,000".

On page 43, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$1,725,000,000".

On page 43, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$1,987,000,000".

On page 43, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".

On page 43, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$87,000,000".

On page 43, line 22, strike the first figure and insert "$201,000,000".

On page 43, line 22, strike the second figure and insert "$151,000,000".

On page 43, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$211,000,000".

On page 43, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$181,000,000".

On page 44, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$3,899,000,000".

On page 44, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$4,610,000,000".

On page 44, line 12, strike the first figure and insert "$3,773,000,000".

On page 44, line 12, strike the second figure and insert "$6,540,000,000".

On page 44, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$4,258,000,000".

On page 44, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$10,326,000,000".

On page 44, line 19, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 44, line 19, strike the second figure and insert "$376,000,000".

On page 44, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 44, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$894,000,000".

On page 44, line 22, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 44, line 22, strike the second figure and insert "$1,424,000,000".

On page 45, line 8, strike the first figure and insert "$9,159,000,000".

On page 45, line 8, strike the second figure and insert "$4,028,000,000".

On page 45, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$9,730,000,000".

On page 45, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$6,870,000,000".

On page 45, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$10,379,000,000".

On page 45, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$8,550,000,000".

On page 45, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$2,838,000,000".

On page 45, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$1,316,000,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike the first figure and insert "$3,183,000,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike the second figure and insert "$3,202,000,000".

On page 45, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$3,549,000,000".

On page 45, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$3,865,000,000".

On page 46, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$5,188,000,000".

On page 46, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$8,187,000,000".

On page 46, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$3,871,000,000".

On page 46, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$10,159,000,000".

On page 46, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$3,958,000,000".

On page 46, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$13,539,000,000".

On page 46, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".

On page 46, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$47,000,000".

On page 46, line 25, strike the first figure and insert "$275,000,000".

On page 46, line 25, strike the second figure and insert "$109,000,000".

On page 47, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$282,000,000".

On page 47, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$140,000,000".

On page 47, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 12, strike the first figure and insert "$64,000,000".

On page 47, line 12, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$3,699,000,000".

On page 47, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$5,203,000,000".

On page 47, line 25, strike the first figure and insert "$540,000,000".

On page 47, line 25, strike the second figure and insert "$292,000,000".

On page 48, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$559,000,000".

On page 48, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$402,000,000".

On page 48, line 3, strike the first figure and insert "$634,000,000".

On page 48, line 3, strike the second figure and insert "$526,000,000".

On page 48, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$401,000,000".

On page 48, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$379,000,000".

On page 48, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$293,000,000".

On page 48, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$352,000,000".

On page 48, line 17, strike the first figure and insert "$394,000,000".

On page 48, line 17, strike the second figure and insert "$450,000,000".

On page 49, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$375,000,000".

On page 49, line 3, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 3, strike the second figure and insert "$3,037,000,000".

On page 49, line 4, strike the first figure and insert "$1,325,000,000".

On page 49, line 4, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$7,183,000,000".

On page 49, line 6, strike the first figure and insert "$1,370,000,000".

On page 49, line 6, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$8,850,000,000".

On page 49, line 17, strike the first figure and insert "$1,895,000,000".

On page 49, line 17, strike the second figure and insert "$469,000,000".

On page 49, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$3,091,000,000".

On page 49, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$1,950,000,000".

On page 49, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$4,170,000,000".

On page 49, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$3,161,000,000".

On page 50, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$882,000,000".

On page 50, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$1,258,000,000".

On page 50, line 7, strike the first figure and insert "$2,034,000,000".

On page 50, line 7, strike the second figure and insert "$2,101,000,000".

On page 50, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$2,594,000,000".

On page 50, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$2,275,000,000".

On page 50, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$858,000,000".

On page 50, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$791,000,000".

On page 50, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$1,332,000,000".

On page 50, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$1,496,000,000".

On page 50, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$1,725,000,000".

On page 50, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$1,987,000,000".

On page 51, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 51, line 7, strike the first figure and insert "$7,600,000,000".

On page 51, line 7, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 51, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$14,456,000,000".

On page 51, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 51, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$21,809,000,000".

On page 51, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$313,500,000,000".

On page 51, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$335,600,000,000".

On page 51, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$360,400,000,000".

On page 52, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$136,700,000,000".

On page 52, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$138,200,000,000".

On page 52, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$143,100,000,000".

On page 54, line 20, strike the figure and insert "8".

MOTION TO RECESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the distinguished majority leader will withhold that motion momentarily, I wish to inquire of him what the schedule will be if he goes in recess until tomorrow.

Mr. DOLE. We will be back on the budget resolution. I hope to finish the tree tomorrow, and try to find a couple of people in the tree when I get finished.

But there is a possibility we may not be in too late tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the distinguished majority leader will yield, I regret that we will not be able to have this showdown here tonight. I kind of like these OK Corral shootouts.

Mr. DOMENICI. Another tree trimming.

Mr. BYRD. I was willing to offer the distinguished majority leader the proposals that I announced. I guess I will have to think overnight as to whether or not I would want to renew the proposals on tomorrow.

I understand that the distinguished majority leader is having a little problem with a couple of votes. I guess while he is looking for the beef we will just have to think it over again tonight as to whether or not we will proceed. I believe the majority leader would have won. He may win yet and may win on tomorrow.

I believe he would have won tonight. But I am not sure about that. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOLE. I am not either.

Mr. BYRD. So I thank the distinguished majority leader for yielding.

What would be his plan on tomorrow? Would he go over into Saturday or would he go over until Monday?

Mr. DOLE. Is the time being charged on the amendment or on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the amendment.

Mr. DOLE. To whom?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators who are speaking as they speak.

Mr. DOLE. I yield myself time from the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized on the resolution.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I would just say to the distinguished minority leader that in my view this is a very, very critical vote. And whether we win or lose, we still have a lot of work to do. But you always feel better about it if you win. That is something I picked up along the way, having lost a lot.

But, in any event, it would be my hope we would come in tomorrow, finish the tree, or if that offer to move to option F might still be available, maybe see how the minority leader feels tomorrow about that. And I will see how everybody else feels.

But this is going to be a very close vote. I do not think there is any question about that. It could be by one vote one way or the other. And, unfortunately, one of our colleagues is hospitalized and not able to be here, which makes it even a bit more difficult.

But I would be prepared, I would hope, by noon tomorrow to advise the minority leader if, in fact, we will be in late and if, in fact, there will be votes

tomorrow. We will not be in session on Saturday. I have indicated that.

It is my understanding that we may need to discuss tomorrow a mutual problem that may arise on Monday. So I would be happy to discuss that with the minority leader tomorrow morning.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I really hate to see the majority leader recess until tomorrow. We want to stay in and work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires if the minority leader is speaking on the resolution?

Mr. BYRD. I speak on the resolution. I would hate to see the majority leader go out. I hope we can vote this evening. We called several Senators to come in. We had one Senator who canceled his trip to Hawaii. But the distinguished Senator from Florida and I asked him to stay, and he is here. So I think we ought to have a rollcall vote on the motion to recess because we do not want to go out without voting on the amendment.

Mr. DOLE. We are very pleased to have a rollcall. I think I can win that one. I would not want to bet on it. [Laughter.]

I would just say to my colleagues we would be happy to provide a trip. [Laughter.] Maybe work out a family plan.

But these things are close sometimes, and I am new at the job. I keep trying to learn, and Howard Baker will not return my phone calls. But if you would like, we can have a vote, a voice vote, or rollcall.

Mr. BYRD. Now, the distinguished Senator mentioned a trip. Does he mean by Amtrak? [Laughter.] We would like to keep Amtrak. Amtrak is going to be a part of my package. I am developing a package—Amtrak, Social Security COLA's, veterans' COLA's.

Mr. DOLE. Sounds very appealing. I wish I would have thought of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRD. I will let the Senator think of it now.

Mr. DOLE. I would just say to my friend from West Virginia that we certainly will have an opportunity to discuss many of those areas. And Amtrak is something I know a little about. I learned a lot about it at home.

But, in any event, it just seems to me that for the good of all of us and the proceedings it might be best if we do stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. If the yeas and nays are ordered, we could vote on that.

Mr. BYRD. We will vote.

Mr. DOLE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE ON MOTION TO RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas to recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow morning. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. EAST], is absent due to illness.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. EAGLETON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 32 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Abdnor	Danforth	Gorton
Andrews	Denton	Gramm
Armstrong	Dole	Grassley
Boschwitz	Domenici	Hatch
Chafee	Durenberger	Hatfield
Cochran	Evans	Hawkins
Cohen	Garn	Hecht
D'Amato	Goldwater	Heinz
Helms	Murkowski	Stevens
Humphrey	Nickles	Symms
Kassebaum	Packwood	Thurmond
Kasten	Pressler	Trible
Laxalt	Quayle	Wallop
Lugar	Roth	Warner
Mathias	Rudman	Weicker
Mattingly	Simpson	Wilson
McClure	Specter	
McConnell	Stafford	

NAYS—44

Baucus	Ford	Melcher
Bentsen	Glenn	Metzenbaum
Biden	Gore	Mitchell
Bingaman	Harkin	Moynihan
Boren	Hart	Nunn
Bradley	Heflin	Pell
Bumpers	Hollings	Proxmire
Burdick	Johnston	Pryor
Byrd	Kennedy	Riegle
Chiles	Kerry	Rockefeller
Cranston	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
DeConcini	Leahy	Sasser
Dixon	Levin	Simon
Dodd	Long	Zorinsky
Exon	Matsunaga	

NOT VOTING—4

Eagleton	Inouye
East	Stennis

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. ON FRIDAY, APRIL 26, 1985

The motion was agreed to and, at 8:13 p.m., the Senate recessed until Friday, April 26, 1985, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 25, 1985:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Abraham D. Sofaer, of New York, to be legal adviser of the Department of State, vice Davis Rowland Robinson, resigned.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 25, 1985:

The nomination of John D. Ward, of Colorado, to be Director of the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, vice James R. Harris, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, which was sent to the Senate of January 3, 1985.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WILLIAM E. BURNETT RETIRES FROM THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is all too infrequent that we stop to appreciate the outstanding job done by the people of the Government Printing Office in putting together the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. When you stop to think about it, it is truly remarkable that what we say here today, will be printed in the RECORD which will be delivered to our offices early tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to honor today a man who has been an important part of the process of assembling the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. William E. Burnett will be retiring on April 26, 1985, after 23 years of service at the U.S. Government Printing Office.

Bill Burnett, also known as Mr. Record, has been associated with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for nearly 20 years. He started as a linotype operator and in August 1970 was promoted to copy preparer in charge, a position he held until a further promotion to assistant foreman in June 1977. The good working knowledge that Bill possesses with regard to parliamentary procedure has been most beneficial in his job on the RECORD. In addition to his official duties, Bill was a member of the Printing Office choir for many years. It should be noted as well that Bill Burnett is a veteran, who flew combat missions in the South Pacific during World War II as a Navy radioman/gunner.

Although Bill is retiring, it is unlikely that he will be taking to his easy chair, for he is a man of many interests, hobbies, and talents. Bill resides in Hyattsville, MD, with his wife, Mildred. They have two grown children who also live in the area. An ordained minister, Bill has his own congregation. He preaches on Sundays and administers the sacraments.

An avid reader, Bill owns a valuable collection of fine books. He also is very interested in music, and has a large collection ranging from classical to big band to country. He also enjoys photography and collecting stamps.

With so many interests, Bill Burnett is certain to have an active, enjoyable retirement. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that all of us here in the House wish Bill and Mildred Burnett health and happiness in the coming years. I am sure you will all join me as well in giving our thanks to Bill for 23 years of outstanding work at the Government Printing Office.●

THAT PLACE (BITBURG CEMETERY), MR. PRESIDENT, IS NOT YOUR PLACE

HON. BEN ERDREICH

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, as I sat in the Capitol rotunda last week to observe the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the German death camps, I was again overcome with the emotion of an event that was so evil, so inhumane that it was and still is almost too incomprehensible for us to conceive. Andd yet, Mr. Speaker, looking around that room into the tear-filled anguished eyes of many survivors of those heinous crimes, we are reminded only too well that such a horror took place and that such a horror must never, never be forgotten.

As I watched six candles being lit for the 6 million Jews who died in the concentration camps and listened to the moving words of author and survivor, Elie Wiesel, I could not help but think of the current plan of our President to lay a wreath at the cemetery in Bitburg, West Germany, where SS troops, those elite Nazi soldiers who committed unspeakable crimes against humanity, are buried. I believe all Americans support President Reagan's effort to make a gesture of reconciliation toward our ally, West Germany, but such a gesture as the one proposed is in my view, not the correct one.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the President that it is not too late. It is not too late to visit another site in West Germany as a gesture of reconciliation without desecrating the memories of the 6 million Jews and 5 million others who died at the hands of the SS. An let us not forget, Mr. President, our own American soldiers who were murdered at the hands of the SS in the Battle of the Bulge and the prisoner of war camps at Malmedy.

This week in a speech to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee Policy Conference, my senior Senator from Alabama, HOWELL HEFLIN, eloquently summed up my feelings and, I believe those across America, about this planned visit, when he said:

All Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike, applaud President Reagan's desire for reconciliation with modern Germany and especially with the German people.

But, Mr. President, as the leader of the Free World, your visit to Bitburg Cemetery does not advance the cause of reconciliation. It only serves to open old wounds.

Surely another location can be found to serve the process of reconciliation without offending the sensitivities of so many.

Last week, when Elie Wiesel received the Congressional Gold Medal at the White House, he made a moving personal appeal to President Reagan to alter his plans. I insert a copy of his remarks, and urge the President, as Wiesel said, to "* * * do something else, to find a way, to find another way, another site * * *. That place (Bitburg Cemetery), Mr. President, is not your place."

WIESEL'S REMARKS

Mr. President, speaking of the conciliation, I was very pleased that we met before, so a stage of the conciliation has been set in motion between us. But then, we were never on two sides. We were on the same side. We were always on the side of justice, always on the side of memory, against the SS and against what they represent.

It was good talking to you, and I am grateful to you for the medal. But this medal is not mine alone. It belongs to all those who remember what SS killers have done to their victims.

It was given to me by the American people for my writings, teaching and for my testimony. When I write, I feel my invisible teachers standing over my shoulders, reading my words and judging their veracity. And while I feel responsible for the living, I feel equally responsible to the dead. Their memory dwells in my memory.

ALONE IN AN ORPHANED WORLD

Forty years ago, a young man awoke and he found himself an orphan in an orphaned world. What have I learned in the last 40 years? Small things. I learned the perils of language and those of silence. I learned that in extreme situations when human lives and dignity are at stake, neutrality is a sin. It helps the killers, not the victims. I learned the meaning of solitude, Mr. President. We were alone, desperately alone.

Today is April 19, and April 19, 1943, the Warsaw Ghetto rose in arms against the onslaught of the Nazis. They were so few and so young and so helpless. And nobody came to their help. And they had to fight what was then the mightiest legion in Europe. Every underground received help except the Jewish underground. And yet they managed to fight and resist and push back those Nazis and their accomplices for six weeks. And yet the leaders of the free world, Mr. President, knew everything and did so little, or nothing, or at least nothing specifically to save Jewish children from death. You spoke of Jewish children, Mr. President. One million Jewish children perished. If I spent my entire life reciting their names, I would die before finishing the task.

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

FRAGILITY OF HUMAN CONDITION

Mr. President, I have seen children, I have seen them being thrown in the flames alive. Words, they die on my lips. So I have learned, I have learned, I have learned the fragility of the human condition.

And I am reminded of a great moral essayist. The gentle and forceful Abe Rosenthal, having visited Auschwitz, once wrote an extraordinary reportage about the persecution of Jews, and he called it, "Forgive them not, Father, for they know what they did."

I have learned that the Holocaust was a unique and uniquely Jewish event, albeit with universal implications. Not all victims were Jews. But all Jews were victims. I have learned the danger of indifference, the crime of indifference. For the opposite of love, I have learned, is not hate, but indifference. Jews were killed by the enemy but betrayed by their so-called allies, who found political reasons to justify their indifference or passivity.

But I have also learned that suffering confers no privileges. It all depends what one does with it. And this is why survivors, of whom you spoke, Mr. President, have tried to teach their contemporaries how to build on ruins, how to invent hope in a world that offers none, how to proclaim faith to a generation that has seen it shamed and mutilated. And I believe, we believe, that memory is the answer, perhaps the only answer.

A few days ago, on the anniversary of the liberation of Buchenwald, all of us, Americans, watched with dismay and anger as the Soviet Union and East Germany distorted both past and present history.

Mr. President, I was there. I was there when American liberators arrived. And they gave us back our lives. And what I felt for them then nourishes me to the end of my days and will do so. If you only knew what we tried to do with them then. We who were so weak that we couldn't carry our own lives, we tried to carry them in triumph.

Mr. President, we are grateful to the American Army for liberating us. We are grateful to this country, the greatest democracy in the world, the freest nation in the world, the moral nation, the authority in the world. And we are grateful, especially, to this country for having offered us haven and refuge, and grateful to its leadership for being so friendly to Israel.

And, Mr. President, do you know that the Ambassador of Israel, who sits next to you, is my friend, and has been for so many years, is himself a survivor? And if you knew all the causes we fought together for the last 30 years, you should be proud of him. And we are proud of him.

SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL

And we are grateful, of course, to Israel. We are eternally grateful to Israel for existing. We needed Israel in 1948 as we need it now. And we are grateful to Congress for its continuous philosophy of humanism and compassion for the underprivileged.

And as for yourself, Mr. President, we are so grateful to you for being a friend of the Jewish people, for trying to help the oppressed Jews in the Soviet Union. And to do whatever we can to save Shcharansky and Abe Stolar and Iosif Begun and Sakharov and all the dissidents who need freedom. And of course, we thank you for your support of the Jewish state of Israel.

But, Mr. President, I wouldn't be the person I am, and you wouldn't respect me for what I am, if I were not to tell you also of the sadness that is in my heart for what happened during the last week. And I am sure that you, too, are sad for the same reasons.

What can I do? I belong to a traumatized generation. And to us, as to you, symbols are important. And furthermore, following our ancient tradition, and we are speaking about Jewish heritage, our tradition commands us "to speak truth to power."

So may I speak to you, Mr. President, with respect and admiration, of the events that happened?

We have met four or five times. And each time I came away enriched, for I know of your commitment to humanity.

And therefore I am convinced, as you have told us earlier when we spoke, that you were not aware of the presence of SS graves in the Bitburg cemetery. Of course you didn't know. But now we all are aware.

YOUR PLACE IS WITH THE VICTIMS

May I, Mr. President, if it's possible at all, implore you to do something else, to find a way, to find another way, another site? That place, Mr. President, is not your place. Your place is with the victims of the SS.

Oh, we know there are political and strategic reasons, but this issue, as all issues related to that awesome event, trancends politics and diplomacy.

The issue here is not politics, but good and evil. And we must never confuse them.

For I have seen the SS at work. And I have seen their victims. They were my friends. They were my parents.

Mr. President, there was a degree of suffering and loneliness in the concentration camps that defies imagination. Cut off from the world with no refuge anywhere, sons watched helplessly their fathers being beating to death. Mothers watched their children die of hunger. And then there were Mengele and his selections. Terror, fear, isolation, torture, gas chambers, flames, flames rising to the heavens.

But Mr. President, I know and I understand, we all do, that you seek reconciliation. And so do I, so do we. And I too wish to attain true reconciliation with the German people. I do not believe in collective guilt, nor in collective responsibility. Only the killers were guilty. Their sons and daughters are not.

And I believe, Mr. President, that we can and we must work together with them and with all people. And we must work to bring peace and understanding to a tormented world that, as you know, is still awaiting redemption.

I thank you, Mr. President.●

J. PAUL RUSSELL

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform my colleagues about an outstanding public servant, and a very good friend of mine, from my hometown of Lexington, MO.

I would like to express my personal and my community's thanks and gratitude to J. Paul Russell, who has served for 13 years as the president of the Lafayette Regional Health Center City Board of Trustees, and who has been a board member for 36 years. Although Paul is resigning from his current post as president, he has been appointed as a director emeritus of the Lafayette County Health Center.

In a letter accepting his resignation, the city trustee board stated that Mr. Russell was honored for the strength of his leadership, and his dedication to public service. Prompt, efficient and complete health care are the goals which Paul Russell has, and will continue, to strive for. In his term as board president, Paul has presided ably over dramatic change in the health care industry, both nationally and in Lexington.

A letter of appreciation to Paul, from the mayor of Lexington, said "Your untiring devotion to the improvement to the hospital is an example to city appointees who will follow you."

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I share with you and the entire House, some of the accomplishments of my fellow Missourian from Lafayette County, Paul Russell.●

UNITED STATES CIVILIAN SPACE PROGRAMS—POSTURING OURSELVES FOR FUTURE GROWTH

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the United States has seen tremendous advances in science and technology in the past quarter century. These advances have profoundly touched the lives of, I dare say, every U.S. citizen, be it in the manner of medical breakthroughs, food production research, or development of energy conservation methods.

As dramatic as any advances we have seen in this period are those in the space arena. In 1958, the United States saw the formation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, created by law, in part, to respond to the space activities of the Soviet Union. Since that time, we have seen the success of major endeavors. We have set our goals high at times, and we have achieved those goals.

But what does the future hold? We are seeing in space exploration and development the dawn of an era of commercial growth. We are seeing advances in technology to view distant stars and to map the topography of our own oceans and seas. We envision expansion in the space launch industry and even the establishment of factories in space to manufacture remarkably pure pharmaceuticals.

We are standing on a scientific plateau, poised to leap to new heights. As wise men and women will do, many participants in space activities have recognized the need to plan, to establish long-range goals to maximize the use of our national resources, those re-

sources being not only fiscal but physical and intellectual.

The House adopted, in last year's NASA authorization bill (Public Law 98-364), language calling for the establishment of a National Commission on Space, comprised of high-level individuals from the private sector, academia, and the Government. The Commission will study and report to Congress on long-range goals for maximizing the potential of the U.S. civilian space program and identify means to achieve these goals.

On March 29, 1985, the President announced the membership of the National Commission on Space and it is with great enthusiasm that I congratulate the appointed Commissioners:

Chairman: Thomas O. Paine, chairman, Thomas Paine Associates, former NASA Administrator (1968-70).

Vice Chairman: Laurel L. Wilkening, vice provost, University of Arizona.

Members:

Luis W. Alvarez, physicist, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory;

Neil A. Armstrong, chairman of the board, Computer Technology Aviation, Inc., former astronaut.

Paul Jerome Coleman, president, Universities Space Research Association and Assistant Director, Los Alamos National Lab.

George Brooks Field, senior physicist, Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory and Chairman, Space Telescope Advisory Committee, Space Telescope Science Institute.

Lt. Gen. William H. Fitch, USMC-Ret. former Deputy Chief of Staff, Aviation, U.S. Marine Corps Headquarters.

Charles M. Herzfeld, vice president and director of research, ITT Corp.

J.L. Kerrebrock, department head, Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, former U.S Ambassador to the United Nations.

Gerard K. O'Neil, president, chairman, CEO, Geostar Corp.

Kathryn D. Sullivan, astronaut, Johnson Space Center, NASA.

David C. Webb, chairman and founding member, National Coordinating Committee for Space.

Brig. Gen. Charles E. Yeager, USAF-Ret., consultant and former test pilot.

In the fiscal year 1986 NASA authorization bill which passed on the House floor on April 3 (H.R. 1714), the Committee on Science and Technology adopted, and the House approved, language lengthening the life of the National Commission on Space by 6 months, allowing the newly named members additional time, until April 1986, to complete their review and report to Congress.

As a congressional adviser to the Commission, I am honored to be in assocation with this distinguished forum and look forward to its recommendations on how the United States must posture itself to enter a new era in space.●

TWO FOR THE PRICE OF ONE

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, if the administration has its way, the United States will be the only developed nation in the world without a national passenger rail service. Despite increasing ridership and decreasing reliance on Federal subsidies, Amtrak is slated for extinction under the proposed budget for fiscal year 1986.

A review of Amtrak's recent record and the effect of its elimination reveal the administration's plan to be penny-wise and pound-foolish. Over the last 14 years, the Federal Government has spent $5.2 billion in upgrading the system's infrastructure and improving the service in the Northeast corridor between Boston and Washington. This investment is now beginning to pay off, with Amtrak transporting over 20 million passengers in 1984, an 18-percent increase over 1983 ridership, with its best ever on-time performance. This has come while the Federal Government's share of operating expenses has decreased, dropping from $896 million in fiscal year 1981 to $684 million in fiscal year 1985.

And what will it cost to dismantle the system? As the Boston Globe points out in the following editorial, 25,000 Amtrak employees, including over 700 in Massachusetts, would be laid off, costing the Federal Government an estimated $2.1 billion in labor protection benefits.

SAVING AMTRAK

The Amtrak rail passenger system was one of the achievements of the Nixon Administration. Under the leadership of former Massachusetts. Gov. John Volpe, who was then Secretary of Transportation, the federal government took over passenger service from the railroads, which had found it a money loser.

The arrangement has worked well. After a difficult transition. Amtrak's employees and managers have cooperated admirably to hold down costs and improve service. Last year the system carried 20 million passengers.

The Reagan Administration proposes to shut down Amtrak to "save" $684 million in annual subsidies. There would be no savings for some years, since the government would have to pay more than $2 billion in severance to the 25,000 employees who would lose their jobs, and it would have to write off more than $3 billion in equipment and other assets.

It is misleading for the Administration to assert that Amtrak competes unfairly with unsubsidized rival forms of transportation. All modes of transportation are subsidized, directly or indirectly. Buses do not pay for the full cost of the highways and streets that they travel. The government subsidizes airlines by providing air traffic control.

Because air service is so much faster than rail service, Amtrak does not compete with the airlines for business passengers except on very short trips. The much higher price of air travel shows that business travelers would rather save time than money. The ordinary weekday fare between Boston and New York is $25 for a five-hour trip on Amtrak compared to $65 for a 30-minute flight on the Eastern shuttle.

Amtrak, however, does compete with airlines for the business of low-income travelers of families with small children. It also competes with bus companies, which charge slightly less for a slightly faster trip. If it were to be put out of business, the bus lines would be free to raise their fares substantially, and low-income travelers would have no choice.

W. Graham Claytor Jr., the chairman of Amtrak, points out that it is the only form of transportation that could move large numbers of people in a national emergency, and that in many small communities, it is the only transportation. If it were abolished, the United States would be the only industrial nation without a rail passenger system. Claytor has promised to wage a battle to save Amtrak. He deserves public and congressional support.●

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE STROM THURMOND HIGH SCHOOL MOCK TRIAL TEAM

HON. BUTLER DERRICK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join with me in honoring a group of young people in my home county, Edgefield, SC, which has distinguished itself in interscholastic competition.

For the second year in a row, the Strom Thurmond High School Mock Trial Team has brought home the State's top trophy.

Coached by the Honorable Greg Anderson, an Edgefield attorney, and faculty members Mrs. Vickie McAlister and Ms. Denise Jackson, team attorneys included Tyra Bush, Michael Medlock, April Abel, Laurie Rhoden, Kathryn Wooten, and Cassandra Lott. Other particpants were Will Luquire, Lori Black, Trieneke Kylstra, Zena Calhoun, Errol Gordon, Sonny Reel, and Leonard Knight.

These students and their coaches have worked diligently to bring honor to their school and to carry on the tradition of Edgefield County which has always been known for its outstanding attorneys and judges.

Debates are a tradition in our county, dating back a century and a half. Such emphasis on oratorical skills accounts for Edgefield County having produced 10 governors, 5 lieutenant governors and many other statesmen. These young people have been grooming themselves for key roles in the U.S. citizenry and I commend them for their winning efforts.●

BUFFALO SCHOOLS' PUBLICATION MARKS BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of Black History Month, the Buffalo Public Schools, Department of School Integration and Minority Business Utilization, published a booklet featuring the accomplishments of black Americans, entitled Black History Celebration: 1985, the project was spearheaded by Director James R. Heck III, and staff members. It was an individual and group effort intended to stimulate interest and research in black history as an integral part of the curriculum and to promote a better understanding on the part of teachers as well as the students.

The publication covers topics such as black Catholicism in Buffalo, NY, American's first black astronaut, and an anthology of poems by black writers.

This publication is most interesting and informative and I would like to extend my congratulations to Mr. Heck and the staff members of the Department of School Integration for their creativity and effort. I would like to share with my colleagues an article on the publication that appeared in the March 6, 1985 issue of the "Buffalo Challenger:"

LOCAL BLACK HISTORY PUBLICATION RELEASED

James R. Heck III, Director of School Integration and Minority Business Utilization for the Buffalo Public School system has announced the release of a publication entitled, Black History Celebration: 1985.

The booklet was prepared by staff members of the Department of School Integration and has a broad range of application for school children from kindergarten through the secondary level.

"This project is both an individual and group effort by staff members and is intended to stimulate interest and research in Black History as an integral part of the curriculum. My main concern for the inclusion of Black History in the school curricula is to promote better understanding on the part of teachers as well as students in the continuum of the learning process," states Mr. Heck in the foreward of the booklet.

The publication contains a documented pictorial review Black Catholicism in Buffalo, New York and Pictorial Review of the Old YMCA, by Lum Smith.

Western New York area Black Catholics from the 1840s to the late 1940s are highlighted. The impact of Catholicism on the educational, social and spiritual development of the Black community is depicted. Many local Black leaders and well-known Black personalities can be found in the photographs.

A background study entitled America's First Black Astronaut by Teacher Assigned Bertron Carter recounts the determination of Lieutenant Colonel Guion S. Bluford Jr., to become an astronaut.

The struggle of a determined Black sculptress against the barriers of racism and poverty is presented in a biography entitled Determination: You Can Make It If You Try—Augusta Savage—The Sculptress by Home-School Coordinator Glendell Johnson. A study guide is also included in the report.

Contemporary Black Americans, their accomplishments and the difficulties they encountered as they strove to reach their goals are presented in a story and visual image coloring book entitled Contemporary Black Americans and Their Success Stories by Home-School Coordinators Thelma G. Lanier and Judy Pistrin. Some of the persons presented are Rev. Jesse Jackson, Mrs. Rosa Parks, Gary Coleman, Michael Jackson, and Carl Lewis.

The Female in the Political Process: Shirley Chisholm, by Home-School Coordinator Marguerite L. Bell, is a biographic outlook about the life and political career of Shirley Chisholm. Mrs. Chisholm was the first Black woman to be selected to Congress and the first woman to run for President of the United States.

Career preparation and goal setting are outlined in an essay entitled Yes You Can by Home-School Coordinator Betty L. Collins. The study guide may be used by teachers and counselors to motivate young people to set long and short-range plans for themselves and to succeed in achieving career goals.

An Anthology of Poems by Black Writers for Secondary Students by Home-School Coordinator Joseph S., Sperrazza includes biographical sketches of various Black poets and examples of their work. Writers such as Langston Hughes, Nikki Giovanni, Dudley Randall, Marie Evans and others are presented as they express their dreams about Black culture and the Black experience.

These materials have been distributed to every Early Childhood Center, Elementary and Secondary School principal in the Buffalo Public School system, with permission to duplicate for classroom use.

Mr. Heck's letter to school administrators states, "I hope that this publication will not only enlighten the reader, but will also serve as a catalyst and result in the production of other projects of a similar nature."●

EUROPEAN COAL CONFERENCE

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at The Hague in The Netherlands the Second U.S.-European Coal Conference got underway. This meeting of some of the most prominent European coal buyers and their suppliers is especially important to producers of U.S. coal as the nations of Europe are their best export market.

Last year, European nations purchased 32.8 million tons of U.S. coal out of the total U.S. coal export figure of 81.5 million tons. Italy alone accounted for almost 8 million tons of U.S. coal followed by The Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg and France as the top ranking European buyers.

At this time, I submit for the RECORD an excerpt from the keynote address delivered at the conference by the president of the National Coal Association, Mr. Carl Bagge, on April 23, 1985.

No longer is coal sold with a smile, a firm handshake and a goodbye. The industry today must be prepared to help the buyer make the most efficient use of those precious British Thermal Units.

The American coal industry knows this. We look upon every advance in the clean, more efficient use of coal as a marketing tool. And we are working to create a multitude of new tools.

We are now prepared to participate in turnkey projects; these package deals would deliver technology along with American coal and the commitment to get the projects to peak efficiency. We are looking for joint ventures with all of you that are in accord with the western tradition of commerce; that are founded on the concept of mutual benefit, which is our tradition.

Coal is plentiful, particularly in the United States, and it is cheap. This is the kind of energy that is mandatory if any economic growth is to be real and sustain itself. This energy is less subject to political whim and turbulence than any energy on the face of the earth, or under it.

The American coal industry believes that, when all the advantages of American coal are matched against the coals of Poland, South Africa, Australia and Colombia, we are the clear winner.

This new marketing approach is symbolized by the study on coal-use systems under the recent U.S.-Italy Joint Research and Development Agreement.

Gerald Blackmore, the CEO of Old Ben Coal Company, whom we imported from Wales, gave us a report in detail on this exciting new concept. But remember the idea behind it is that you get cheaper electricity as it leaves the plant by using high-quality, cleaned U.S. coal in generation. You will have lower maintenance costs, less slagging in the boiler and reduced ash disposal expenses. You will move more Btus for your transportation dollar. The U.S.-Italian study will look at every step from the working face in the mine through combustion. It even contemplates coal-fired colliers.

You see, we really want your business. It will be good for you. This coal still is in an early stage of its development—virtually a raw resource. We are now pushing out to find better ways to move, handle and use it. The advantages of using coal will only grow. And selling it will be good for us, and you.

Furthermore, the exchanges of coal will help the trans-Atlantic community avoid the possibility of political friction like that which is cropping up between us and the Asians at this very moment.

In addition, the American coal industry defends its customers. We have entered many controversies to keep the trading channels open and to protect our customers' investments. We have done this even when it was not to our immediate advantage to do so. We have done it because we believe the world needs what we have to offer, and we believe in trade.

Furthermore, our coal loading terminals are more modern and efficient now than when your colliers last called on them in volume, and we sent 100 million tons a year to meet a crisis in Europe. And there are more of them today.

In addition, we are struggling with powerful interests in Congress to bring about deepening of our harbors. Meantime, Ameri-

can entrepreneurs have made it possible for deep-draft colliers to top off in the Gulf of Mexico; and there is another struggle against the environmentalists to provide the same service on the East Coast in Delaware Bay.

And minemouth prices for coal in the United States have dropped about 20 percent for met coal and steam coal in the recent past. We producers have shared our productivity increases with our export customers.

Morever, we have been nose-to-nose in dispute with the American railroad industry over coal freight rates since it became clear the Staggers Act was going to deliver to us, and you, the Twain consequences of good intentions. The Act was meant to help the railroads become profitable. But its implementation threatened to make them profiteers. We have opposed distortions of the intent of the Act.

The signal accomplishment in this wide-ranging war of words and lawyers has been to legally prohibit any inclination by the railroads to throw away the rate book on coal destined for export.

We challenged the export rate exemption in court, and the court held that the coal export rate exemption granted by the United States Interstate Commerce Commission is illegal and improper. We expect this verdict to be sustained by the United States Supreme Court where we are defending the lower court decision on your behalf.

Meantime, export-coal rail rates have not gone up. The railroads have gratefully been restrained, and we would like to think we in coal have had something to do with their circumspection. Moreover, domestic shippers are having success in negotiating transportation contracts that are favorable to them and the railroads. The contracts offer coal rates better than the old ones.

The Staggers Act has led to productivity increases for the railroads. However, these increases have not led to export-coal rate reductions. The railroads have not shared their productivity increases with export buyers as coal producers have done. But the railroads have shared these increases with domestic coal consumers.

We know from our prior exertions on the Staggers Act, in defense of our export customers, that such reductions are possible for export coal. We hired some very good, very expensive transportation cost experts to look at export rail rates. We call their work the Section 229 study, and it led to our lawsuit in the Section 229 case. This case challenges the present level of coal export rail rates to all our ports as unreasonable and illegal.

The conclusion of this study and our lawsuit, which is based upon it, is that export rail rates have a sufficient margin to permit rate reductions and still afford a reasonable return to the railroads.

Therefore I now plead with my colleagues who represent the American rail industry: Join us in serving a market that needs what we have; do it by dropping your export-coal rates to match our drop in prices based on our own productivity gains to gain the newly emerging coal markets in Europe.

Find ways to voluntarily strike for coal export the kinds of contracts and rates you have been recently negotiating for coal in our domestic market. The margin is there. Let's find it and provide our European friends with the kind of dependable, cheap energy they need to keep their economies growing.

And let me give an assurance to our European customers: If the railroads do not act voluntarily, as I hope they will, we will not surrender in our fight to serve you; if it is essential to our competitive survival, we have every intention of pursuing our legal rights under the Staggers Act to reduce these rates under the Section 229 study and the legal proceedings we initiated before the coal export rate exemption was initiated by the railroads.

In summary, we will defend the finding that the export rate exemption is illegal and improper. And if rates are not voluntarily reduced, we plan to press the court case that can ultimately reduce them.

Our mines are ready. Our ports are ready. We have already reduced our prices at the mine and the railroads are already in the process of reducing their coal rates. In short, the American coal industry is ready to do business to our mutual benefit.

America has not turned its face to the Pacific and its back on Europe! We Americans are what we are because of Europe, because of the Industrial Revolution, and because of coal.

We give and take, buy and sell, all to mutual benefit. This is our shared tradition. We have weathered the fears, anxieties and near desperation of 1973 and 1979, and we have done it together.

No, America will not turn away. Rather we turn to you and offer the embrace of good friends and kinsmen. The next 40 years can be what the Barzinis of distant times will call the beginning of a Golden Age. We can do it by making the best use of what we have. And Coal and a tested and proved willingness to work together is what we do have.

And we can start right here today in The Hague, the genesis of much of this century's cooperation between us. Coal can provide the vehicle for setting us forth, once again, as it has in the past, towards a Golden Age between America and Europe. Let us begin here and now at this historic gathering of producers, transporters and buyers of the Atlantic community.●

REGULATORY OVERSIGHT AND CONTROL ACT

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing H.R. 1339, the Regulatory Oversight and Control Act of 1985, with an additional 22 cosponsors, bringing to 73 the total number of cosponsors on this measure.

I originally introduced the bill in this Congress on February 28, with 47 Members who had cosponsored an identical measure in the 98th Congress, H.R. 3939. The bill was introduced in response to the Supreme Court decision in INS against Chadha, and subsequent decisions, holding the one- and two-House legislative vetoes over executive actions unconstitutional.

Under my legislation, all Federal regulations subject to informal rulemaking under the Administrative Procedure Act would be submitted to Congress for up to 90 days before they could take effect. Major regulations, those which an agency estimates could cost the economy $100 million or more in any year, would have to be approved by the enactment of a joint resolution. Nonmajor regulations could be disapproved by the same means.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the new legislative veto device provided in my bill, title I contains a regulatory reform package that is essentially the same as a compromise worked out between various parties inside and outside the House in the 97th Congress. The main feature is the requirement that agencies perform regulatory analyses on proposed major regulations and their alternatives before they make a final decision, and that they choose the most cost-effective alternative unless another is mandated by law.

Moreover, both existing and new major regulations would be subject to 10-year sunset dates, meaning they would have to be resubmitted in the same or amended form every 10 years, both through the rulemaking process, and the congressional review process which requires approval by joint resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee, of which I am a member, conducted extensive hearings in the last Congress on the effect of the Chadha decision on the Congress and on what steps we might take to rectify the loss of the traditional legislative veto. It is my hope the committee will complete its work in this Congress and make an affirmative recommendation on my proposal to establish a uniform congressional review process for all regulations. Rulemaking is lawmaking, after all, and the Congress must retain ultimate control over this important constitutional prerogative. It is too important an activity to abdicate to the unelected regulatory bureaucrats.

At this point in the RECORD, I include a summary of the bill and a complete list of cosponsors. The items follow:

COSPONSORS OF REGULATORY OVERSIGHT AND CONTROL ACT (H.R. 1339)

Mr. Archer, Mr. Badham, Mr. Barton, Mr. Bereuter, Mr. Blaz, Mr. Bliley, Mr. Breaux, Mr. Broomfield, Mr. Broyhill, Mr. Campbell.

Mr. Coats, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Crane, Mr. Daniel, Mr. Dannemeyer, Mr. Daub, Mr. DeLay, Mr. DeWine, Mr. Dreier, Mr. Duncan.

Mr. Edwards of Ok., Mr. Emerson, Mr. Evans, of Iowa, Mr. Fields, Mr. Fish, Mr. Gallo, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Henry, Mr. Gingrich, Mr. Hartnett.

Mr. Hiler, Mrs. Holt, Mr. Hyde, Mr. Kemp, Mr. Kindness, Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. Latta, Mr. Lewis of Calif., Mr. Livingston, Mrs. Lloyd.

Mr. Loeffler, Mr. Lowery of Calif., Mr. Lujan, Mr. McCain, Mr. McCandless, Mr. McGrath, Mr. Martin of N.Y., Mrs. Martin of Ill., Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Moore.

Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Morrison of Wash., Mr. Oxley, Mr. Parris, Mr. Quillen, Mr.

Rudd, Mr. Siljander, Mr. Shumway, Mr. Smith of Oregon, Mr. Stangeland.

Mr. Strang, Mr. Stump, Mr. Swindall, Mr. Tauke, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Thomas of Calif., Mr. Vander Jagt, Mr. Walker, Mr. Watkins, Mr. Whitehurst.

Mr. Whittaker, Mr. Wolf, and Mr. Wylie.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF LOTT "REGULATORY OVERSIGHT AND CONTROL ACT OF 1985"

(H.R. 1339, Introduced Feb. 28, 1985)

TITLE I—AGENCY RULEMAKING IMPROVEMENTS (AMENDMENTS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT)

Regulatory Analysis of Major Rules.—Agencies would be required to perform regulatory analyses of major rules and alternatives. Major rules are those which the agency or President determine would have an annual impact on the economy of $100 million or more or would otherwise have a substantial impact. The agency would be required to choose the most cost-effective alternative unless another alternative is mandated by the underlying statute. The President (or the Vice President or other Executive Officer confirmed by the Senate) would establish guidelines for compliance and would review and monitor compliance. The Comptroller General may also monitor compliance.

Regulatory Agenda.—Each agency shall publish in the Federal Register in April and October of each year a regulatory agenda listing all rules the agency tends to propose, promulgate, modify, repeal or otherwise consider in the next 12-months. Certain information is required to be included with each rule listed on the agenda.

Agency Review of Existing Rules.—Not later than nine months after the effective date, each agency shall publish in the Federal Register a schedule for the review of existing major rules over the next ten years. A final schedule would be published not later than six months later, after publish comment. The President could add rules to this review schedule. The reviews would be subject to the same comment analysis requirements as new major rules.

Sunset for Major Rules.—All newly proposed and existing major rules scheduled for review shall include a date on which they shall cease to be effective, not later than 10 years after they are initially effective, in the case of new rules, and according to their sunset review schedule for existing rules.

Informal Rulemaking Process.—The informal rulemaking process is amended to provide greater notice, information, and opportunity for oral and written public comment.

Judicial Review (modified "Bumpers Amendment").—When agency actions are challenged in the courts, the courts shall independently decide all relevant questions without according any presumption in favor or against the actions.

Appeals of Agency Orders ("race to courthouse" problem).—When agency actions are challenged in two or more courts of appeals within ten days of their issuance, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts shall, by random selection, designate one court in which the record shall be filed.

Intervenor Funding.—Federal funds could not be used for public participation in agency rulemaking proceedings unless specifically authorized by law.

TITLE II—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULES (AMENDMENTS TO ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT)

Submission and Review of Agency Rules.—Agencies would be required to submit most rules of general applicability to Congress for a 90-day review period. The rules would be referred to one committee of primary jurisdiction in each House or to an ad hoc committee if more than one committee has primary jurisdiction.

Congressional Action on Rules.—Major rules could not take effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted within 90-days of continuous session of Congress; other rules could take effect unless a joint resolution of disapproval is enacted within the 90-day period, and could take effect sooner if neither House has acted on a resolution within 60-days or if either House has rejected a resolution.

Committee Consideration of Resolutions.—In the case of major rules, resolutions of approval must be introduced by the chairman (or his designee) of the committee to which the rule is referred within one day after the rule is received, and the committee would be required to report the resolution not later than 45-days after receipt of the rule, or would thereafter be discharged of the resolution. Other rules would be subject to joint resolutions of disapproval which the committee could report at its own discretion or would be required to report if a "motion for consideration" is filed within 25-days after the rule is received and is signed by one-fourth of the membership of the House involved not later than 30-days after the rule is received. If the committee has not reported such a resolution within 45-days after receipt of the rule, the resolution would be discharged.

Floor Consideration of Resolutions.—Resolutions reported or discharged would be referred to the appropriate calendar of the House involved, a motion to proceed to their consideration would be privileged and, if adopted, debate on major rules resolutions would be for two-hours, and for other rules resolutions, one-hour. If one House receives a resolution from the other House and has not reported or been discharged of its own resolution within 75-days after the rule is received, the resolution of the other House would be placed on the appropriate calendar.

TITLE III—REGULATORY OVERSIGHT AND CONTROL AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE RULES (AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF THE HOUSE)

House Regulatory Review Calendar.—A Regulatory Review Calendar would be established in the House to which all joint resolutions of approval and disapproval would be referred once reported or discharged from committee. The Calendar would be called on the first and third Monday and second and fourth Tuesday of each month after the approval of the Journal. Priority consideration would be given to resolutions for rules whose review period would expire before the next calling of the Calendar. Motions to proceed to the consideration of a resolution would be nondebatable except for resolutions discharged pursuant to a "motion for consideration" signed by one-fourth of the membership, in which case the motion would be debated for twenty minutes.

Regulatory Appropriations Riders.—The present House rule restricting the offering of limitation amendments to appropriations bills would be amended. At present such limitation amendments can only be offered after other amendments are disposed of and only if the House votes down a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise. Under the proposed rule change, limitation amendments could be considered during the initial amendment process with respect to regulations for which a resolution of disapproval has not been considered by the House, or has been passed but not enacted, during the specified review period.

Oversight Improvements.—Committees would be required to formally adopt oversight plans at the beginning of a Congress and their funding resolutions could not be considered until the plans have been submitted to the Government Operations Committee. Committees would also be required in their final oversight reports to relate their actual oversight activities and accomplishments to their original plans. The Speaker could create special ad hoc oversight committees, subject to House approval.●

INTRODUCTION OF THE FISHERMEN'S TAX REFORM ACT OF 1985 AND A BILL TO REDUCE THE TARIFF ON IMPORTED FISH NETS

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, today, along with Representatives LENT, YOUNG of Alaska, and MCKERNAN of Maine and several other colleagues, I am introducing two pieces of legislation to help the American fishermen.

The first bill, the Fishermen's Tax Reform Act, seeks to correct an inequitable situation created for fishermen under certain provisions of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act [FUTA].

As you know, Mr. Speaker, New England commercial fishermen have long considered themselves to be self-employed. Independent by nature, New England fishermen seek to make a living from the sea on their own terms and conditions. Instead of receiving an hourly wage or annual salary as they work among the various fishing boats, they receive a share of the catch. By sharing in the profits, and, unfortunately, the losses on some fishing trips, the crews of our fishing fleet retain their independence.

As you may recall, the Internal Revenue Service has not always agreed with our fishermen, preferring to treat them instead as employees of a fishing vessel. In 1976 we addressed this situation in the Tax Reform Act, providing that owners of fishing vessels manned by a share paid crew of 10 or less were to be exempt from withholding Federal income taxes and Social Security taxes on their crewmembers. The amendments made by that act simplified matters for our fishermen and permitted them to retain their freedom to work on different fishing boats as self-employed fishermen. Overall, this system has worked very well for both the vessel owner and the fishermen.

Mr. Speaker, I was recently alerted by some of my Cape Cod fishermen to

a problem not dissimilar to the one they faced in 1976. The current unemployment laws exempt owners of vessels under 10 net tons from paying unemployment taxes on their crew share. Over the pass several years, however, our fishermen have found it necessary to increase the size of their vessels both for safety reasons and because they have found it necessary to travel further offshore to take a full day's catch. Many of the vessels in my area now exceed 10 net tons, although the crew size has remained about the same. As you can see, these vessel owners may now be forced to pay into the Federal unemployment fund even though their crew is considered to be self-employed for purposes of Social Security and Federal withholding taxes.

The bill I am introducing today provides that owners of fishing vessels exceeding 10 net tons that are manned by a share paid crew of 10 or less, will be permanently exempted from paying Federal unemployment taxes. By treating Social Security, Federal withholding, and unemployment taxes exactly the same for this class of fishermen, I believe we will be greatly simplifying the administrative burdens placed on them as well as making sound public policy.

The second bill that I am introducing today as intended to help American fishermen compete with their foreign counterparts and thereby help alleviate a fisheries trade deficit that now exceeds $4 billion. My bill would accelerate an already scheduled tariff reduction on imported synthetic fiber fish nets and netting, providing almost immediate relief for our domestic fishing industry.

Since 1963, our fishermen have been burdened with an import tariff on synthetic fish nets and netting which now stands at 24.8 percent ad valorem plus 12 cents per pound. As a result of multilateral trade negotiations in 1979, the United States plans to gradually reduce this tariff to 17 percent ad valorem in 1989. My bill simply accelerates this process.

Because the United States does not manufacture the quality and variety of nets required by the industry, our commercial fishermen depend on a wide variety of imported fish nets. Consequently, they are forced to buy an imported product and pay an excessive duty. The irony in our present tariff structure is that while our fishermen are expected to compete with foreign fishermen heavily subsidized by their own government—and whose catch generally enters this country duty free—they are also expected to pay a high tariff on the nets they use. This situation has made it virtually impossible for many of our fishermen to hold their own against foreign competition.

This legislation does not propose to provide any new tariff relief for foreign net suppliers; it only seeks to accelerate already approved reductions in existing tariffs. Its goals and purposes are in keeping with the administration's trade policy which has sought to open world markets by reducing the number of barriers to international trade.

Reducing this tariff will help all segments of our fishing industry, including salmon gilnetters in the Pacific Northwest, tuna purse seiners in the Pacific, Great Lakes gilnetters, Gulf shrimpers, and North Atlantic trawlers.●

WORKER HEALTH AND SAFETY NO SEXY ISSUE, BUT 6,000 WORKPLACE DEATHS ANNUALLY AREN'T CHEAP

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, last week a most comprehensive study of workplace deaths and injuries and the impact of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA] on worker health and safety was released by the Office of Technology Assessment.

Simply stated, the OTA study noted that workplace deaths and injuries had decreased between 1979 and 1983, a decrease also noted by the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS], but, unlike BLS which gave credit to OSHA for the decline, OTA said the decrease was due to a far greater extent on the economic recession which gripped the country at that time.

I, for one, applaud the efforts by OTA. The agency has gathered together an impressive array of facts and figures which strengthen the views of those of us who have been concerned for a number of years about the failure of OSHA to do its job.

I must admit to being somewhat perplexed by the media's reaction to the OTA study. I know the New York Times and the Washington Post devoted space in their newspapers for the story and I assume other newspapers around the country also provided space.

What I want to know is where are the reporters from these newspapers when other questions of worker health and safety are discussed? In fact, Mr. Speaker, where are the other Members of Congress?

It takes no mental giant to realize that worker safety and health is not a sexy issue. After all, when the Committee on Education and Labor reorganized several weeks ago, I wasn't exactly overwhelmed by a crush of members wanting to serve on the Subcommittee on Health and Safety. And, from what I have learned, the minority faced the same problem during its reorganization.

But to those of us in this body and in other places throughout the country who have been involved in worker health and safety, the OTA report substantiates the comments we have been making for years.

Mr. Speaker, I have served on the Subcommittee on Health and Safety since I first came to the Congress in 1968. I was a member of the subcommittee when the Occupational Safety and Health Act was passed in 1970.

I have been chairman of the subcommittee for nearly 10 years. I clearly recall numerous attempts during those years by many so-called friends of American working men and women who offered proposals to gut or repeal OSHA.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I consider myself no Johnny-come-lately in the field of worker health and safety. I am very much aware of what has been going on at OSHA through the current administration and I have said so on many occasions, here on the floor of the House, in committee and subcommittee meetings and in speeches around the country.

On April 2, just a few short weeks ago, Robert Rowland, Assistant Secretary of Labor for OSHA, appeared before the Subcommittee on Health and Safety to inform us of his goals and directions for the agency.

After Mr. Rowland completed his testimony and responded to questions, I made it very clear that I was concerned about the efforts of OSHA to provide direction in the area of worker health and safety.

In my closing remarks at that hearing, I said:

> I must tell you that I am not in total agreement with your (Rowland's) views on the way the agency should function, especially with regard to plant and health inspections and the development of standards.
>
> I believe that there is too much reliance on record checks instead of full inspections. I believe there is too much reliance on industry's willingness to make the commitment to employee safety and health without more careful oversight by OSHA.
>
> And, while I recognize the time involved in developing standards that cover exposures to toxic and hazardous substances, I feel there is too often a willingness to write off more comprehensive protective measures by saying those protections will cost too much. Cost too much in what terms? In terms of corporate expenses or in terms of lives?

In my opening remarks at a subcommittee hearing on February 19, I said about OSHA's delay in implementing the hazard communication standard:

> • • • We on this committee are greatly concerned about the promulgation and implementation of rules and regulations with regard to hazard communication. It was dis-

tressing news when we learned at our earlier hearing (December 12, 1984) that OSHA standards would not be going into even partial effect until November of this year and not fully so until May of next year. I must tell you that my primary concern is not with the chemical industry insofar as compliance with or leadership in meeting OSHA standards, it is with small companies that use toxic materials in their manufacturing processes.

I am concerned that some of those smaller companies, especially those where toxic and hazardous materials make up only a modest part of the manufacturing process, will be considerable slower in responding and conforming to the standards.

I am concerned because I would not want to see repeated deaths and injuries in the work force due to a lack of awareness on the part of employees when dealing with hazardous and toxic materials.

As a case in point, Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of the House to Maywood, IL, where, a couple of weeks ago, a trial of four former corporate officials charged with murder in the 1983 cyanide poisoning death of a chemical worker began.

The firm recovered the silver on exposed photographic film through a process using a cyanide-based substance. According to reports, the barrels containing the cyanide-based chemical were labeled as to the dangers of the substance. The labels were in English but, unfortunately, few of the plant workers read or spoke English well enough to understand the hazards they faced.

And that is just one of thousands of similar cases in this country where workers are using hazardous and toxic materials without adequate protection or information.

Here is just a partial list of some other major accidents that have occurred since 1980:

An explosion at a chemical plant in Delaware in 1980 killed six workers, injured dozens of others, and forced the evacuation of about 1,000 residents.

A series of explosions in a chemical plant in Indian Trail, NC, in 1980, injured some 50 persons.

An explosion at a paint and resin plant in Chicago Heights, IL, in 1981, killed 1 person and injured 22 others.

An ammonia leak from a storage terminal in Bernesville, MN, in 1981, blinded, choked and burned at least 30 people.

An explosion and fire at a tank farm in Taft, LA, in December 1982, forced the evacuation of some 17,000 people.

Last October, leaking insecticide from a plant in Linden, NJ, hospitalized 161 persons.

In November, in Middleport, NY, a 30-gallon spill of methyl isocyanate, affected some 30 schoolchildren and a teacher.

And, of course, last December, as we all know, a runaway reaction at Union Carbide's MIC plant in Bhopal, India, killed some 2,000.

A complete list of known tragedies would be endless. We could include the cost in human life from the grain elevator explosions. We could include the storage tank explosion in Newark, NJ, in January 1983, which resulted in the death of 1 employee and injuries to 22 others.

The OTA study tells us that about 25 American working men and women are killed on the job every day and between 10,000 and 45,000 are injured seriously enough to require medical care or time off. In total, the OTA study estimates that some 6,000 workers are killed annually on the job.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates annual workplace fatalities between 3,000 and 5,000, but the National Safety Council estimates some 11,000 to 12,000 worker fatalities per year.

Frankly, to me it doesn't make much difference who is right. When any worker gets killed on the job or suffers a permanent disability because of his occupation, I am concerned.

I am concerned because I know there is a family somewhere that isn't going to be provided for properly, even with the insurance and other benefits available.

I am concerned because I know that too many of those workplace deaths and injuries could have been prevented—prevented by the use of equipment, prevented through better training programs so that workers on the job would be more aware of the potential hazards, and prevented by companies making some adjustments in the way they operate.

I wish we could eliminate all workplace deaths and injuries, but I know that is an unattainable goal. But that doesn't mean he shouldn't be striving toward it.

It is up to us to insure that every precaution is taken to protect our workers—and, in the process, the community at large.

It is up to OSHA to set workplace health and safety standards that are meaningful and to enforce those standards. It is not enough to say that certain workplace changes will be too costly. We have to make the cost a worthwhile expense for business and industry.

Believe me, I understand the need for companies to show profits. I believe in our economic system and I believe a reasonable return on investment is the only way companies will be able to get additional investors so they can expand and grow.

Still, it may be necessary for some firms to provide fewer dollars for their board members and senior officers and investors and put more of those dollars into making their plants, offices and other facilities safer for the workers.

OSHA, too, has a responsibility. Its role is to see that hazardous conditions in the workplace are reduced and eventually eliminated. It cannot do this by just satisfying itself that everything is OK because the records say so.

It can't just depend on the lost work day rate as a test.

Inspections of targeted industries should not be terminated just because, after a check of corporate records, it is found that a plant has a lost work day rate lower than that of the industry involved.

OSHA inspections must be more comprehensive. We must find ways to encourage industry to improve facilities before an accident which results in serious injury or death occurs.

We cannot afford to wait until someone or enough people die on a job before enforcing standards already in existence, even though standards may be outdated.

We must be more attentive to what is happening in the manufacture, use and distribution of hazardous and toxic substances. According to fairly good estimates, there are between 30,000 and 60,000 different kinds of substances and combinations of substances being manufactured and used in American factories, businesses, hospitals and other facilities. No industry is immune. Those substances are used in construction, manufacturing, service and other industries.

It is estimated that every day in this country there are more than 180,000 shipments by truck or rail of everything from nail polish remover to nuclear weapons.

It is evident that our knowledge of the effects, both short term and long term, of those substances on American workers is woefully limited.

The hazard communication standard promulgated by OSHA lists some 2,000 substances on which material safety data sheets will be required.

The National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health [NIOSH] has a far more extensive list, but even it is in no way complete. Still, it might be better if OSHA used the NIOSH registry of toxic or chemical substances as the basis for the hazard communication standard than its present list of 2,000 substances.

We need considerably more research on the toxicity of substances used in the workplaces. We need to know what the maximum acceptable exposures should be. We need to know what kinds of special protective equipment is needed by the workers.

Industry must understand that we are committed to improved safety and health in the workplace and must be prepared to use its resources, including, as I mentioned, some of its profits, to make the necessary improvements to increase the health and safety of its workers.

I am often asked what kinds of incentives can be used to encourage in-

dustry to improve safety and health conditions in the workplace.

It's not hard to come up with answers. OSHA can provide some incentive by restructuring its fine scales. It seems clear enough to me that a company cited for serious violations would be willing to invest the money it would pay in fines into improving safety conditions if it knew those fines would be large enough to have an impact.

OSHA may have to reorganize the way the fining process works by providing for the remission of fines if the violations are corrected within a specified period of time.

Another incentive could come from the insurance industry. Perhaps America's health insurance firms and those that handle worker compensation might consider special premium abatements for companies that truly reduce workplace injuries.

I truly believe we can substantially reduce workplace deaths and injuries if we are willing to make the the necessary commitment. It will require considerable effort. It will require the joint effort of industry, labor, and others, such as the insurance industry to make a difference.

The OTA study provides many important numbers to strengthen the views that those of us aware of and concerned about workplace deaths and injuries have held. We know much must be done.

I encourage my colleagues in this body to participate in the activities of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety. I encourage the media to cover our hearings.

Worker health and safety may not be a sexy issue, but it surely affects every American.●

STATUE OF LIBERTY 100TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATED BY JUNIOR SERVICE LEAGUE OF HUDSON COUNTY

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, As you know, Americans all and people throughout the world are looking forward to the 100th anniversary of the Statue of Liberty.

In the 14th District of New Jersey, which I am pleased to represent, we have a special endearment to the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island because of the proximity to our shores.

From New Jersey's Liberty State Park, located in Jersey City, we are but 1,000 yards away from Liberty Island where our fair lady stands 305 feet tall.

With the leadership of Lee A. Iacocca, chairman of the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Centennial Commission, more than $230 million is being raised in order to pay for the repairs and renovation to our national shrines, with work well underway at the present time at the Statue of Liberty.

Many individuals and groups, from schoolchildren to some of America's largest industries, are making monetary contributions toward the renovation fund.

Just 2 weeks ago I was pleased to participate in a ceremony where the National Disabled American Veterans organization, working with people from New Jersey, made a donation of $1 million toward the $2.7 million needed to help make the shrines barrierfree.

On May 10, 1985, the Junior Service League of Hudson County is sponsoring a fundraising celebration in Jersey City's Liberty State Park at the historic, beautifully renovated central railroad terminal.

The funds raised will be donated to the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Centennial Commission, through the Jersey Journal, which is sponsoring a countywide "Save Our Statue" fund.

Joan Z. Shields is chairperson of the junior service league gala committee, and she is aided by the following members of the junior service leagues: President Lynn Kegelman, Vice President Rita Tomkins, Secretary Maureen Connors, Treasurer Mary Kegelman, Statue of Liberty Gala Committee Co-chairperson Maureen McLaughlin, Planning Board Catherine Carnevale, Rita Tomkins, Jacqualine Connors, and Sharon Schrier, publicity Jan Onieal and Susan Flynn, Journal Lynette D'Klia and Catherine Kegelman, ticket reservations, Liz Kitzpatrick and Mary Ellen McLaughlin, and reception Aida Scirocco, Adrianne Scalfane, and Joanne Carroll.

The junior service league has appointed an honorary committee, hosted by New Jersey Governor Thomas H. Kean and his wife, Deborah Kean. Members of this committee are: Kenneth Albers, chief executive officer of Provident Bank; Paul Amico, mayor of Secaucus; Alan Bardack, president, Bardack Realty Co.; Rabbi Samuel Berman, Temple Beth-El; Bill Bradley, U.S. Senator from New Jersey; Gerald F. Callahan, Jr., community relations manager, New Jersey Bell; Raymond P. Catlaw, Esq., vice president and trust officer, Trust Company of New Jersey; Joseph Charles, New Jersey State Assemblyman; Elba Cinciarelli, bilingual teacher; John Collins, chairman, Commercial Trust Company; Joseph Cory, Joseph Cory Warehouse Corp., Thomas Cowan, New Jersey State Senator; Lloyd Currier, president of Christ Hospital; Anthony De Fino, mayor of West New York; Joseph Doria, New Jersey State Assemblyman;

Michael Fistel, managing editor of the Dispatch; Joseph Funfey, vice president area development of First Jersey National Bank; Archbishop Peter L. Gerety of the Archdiocese of Newark; Rev. Edward Glynn, S.J., president of St. Peter's College; Raymond Graham, mayor of East Newark; Frank J. Guarini, U.S. House of Representatives; Bernard M. Hartnett, general counsel, vice president of Bell Atlantic; Henry Hill, mayor of Kearny;

Christopher Jackman, New Jersey State Senator; William "Tex" Jackson, Thomas A. Deming, Co., Inc.; Frank Lautenberg, U.S. Senator from New Jersey; Roy Lenahan, vice president of Patrick J. McGlynn, Inc., Insurance; Gerald McCann, mayor of Jersey City;

Rosemary T. McFadden, president, New York Merchantile Exchange; Eleanor McGlynn, president of Patrick J. McGlynn, Inc.; Mark Munley, Jersey City Economic Development Corporation; Peter Murphy, Sr., vice president, First Fidelity Bank; Edward O'Conner, New Jersey State Senator; Morris Pesin, director of City Spirit; Daryl Rand—Harrison-Appleman-Rand;

Robert A. Ranieri, New Jersey State Assemblyman; PETER W. RODINO, U.S. House of Representatives; Dr. Kenneth Rogers, president of Stevens Institute of Technology; Harold J. Ruvoldt, Sr., Esq., past president of New Jersey Bar Association; Raymond A. Schnyder, mayor of Guttenberg; Frederick J. Tomkins, business administrator, city of Jersey City; Anthony Vanieri, New Jersey State Assemblyman; Joanne Van Dorn, project development officer, Jersey City Economic Development Corporation; Rev. Ercel Webb, Monumental Baptist Church; Arthur Wichert, mayor of Union City; and Audrey Zapp, commissioner of Liberty State Park.

During the reception 100 outstanding men and women of Hudson County are scheduled to be honored for contributions they have made to the quality of life in Hudson County because of personal successes. The honorees announced by the Junior Service League are as follows:

Kenneth F.X. Albers, Barbara Amato, Sister M. Ambrosina, Robert Argyelan, Adrian Arpel Jim Bishop, Dr. Joseph F. Boyle, Phillip Bosco, Francis X. Burke, Arthur Burns, Dr. Vincent Butler, Theordore Conrad, Jacques D'Amboise, Edward G. Davin III, Harry A. Devlin, Sam Di Peo, Sr., Nina Dobkin, Joan Doherty, Nino S. Domingo, Rose Donski, Diane Dragone, David Dworkin, Dr. Lena Edwards, Gloria Esposito, Francis Fitzpatrick, Lloyd Currier.

Thomas Fleming, Stanley Fryczynski, Marie Garibaldi, Bishop Robert Garner, Dr. Janet Geraghty-Deutsch, Steve Gregg, the late J. Owen Grundy, Donna Hagemann, Bernard Hartnett, Margaret Hayes, Jerry Herman, Wesley J. Howe, Arthur Im-

peratore, Dennis James, Sister Pat Jelly, Lucille Joel, Sister Ellen Joyce, Madaline Kaufman, Mary Pat Kennedy, Kool and the Gang, Frank Longella, Harry Leber, LeRoy J. Lenahan, William Martin, Sister Alice McCoy.

Rosemary T. McFadden, Sister Margaret, Thomas McGovern, L. Deckle McLean, John McMullen, Matthew F. McNulty, Dr. John P. McTague, John Meagher, David A. Messier, Edward N. Moriarty, Ward Mount, the late Samuel I. Newhouse, Phyllis Newman, Dr. Stephen Obstbaum, Pat O'Donnell, Mike O'Koren, Nicholas Oresko, Lillian Pearce, Morris Pesin, E. Curtis Plant, John Quigley, Jr., Richard Reeves, Jerome Robbins, Horace K. Roberson, Dr. Kenneth C. Rogers, Luis Rojes, Harold Runoldt, Sr.

Cynthia Sanford, Sidney Schlesinger, Francis Albert Sinatra, Harry Siperstein, Dr. May Som, Thomas Stanton, Virginia Statile, Edward John Stevens, Sister Grace Francis Strauber, Mark Sullivan, Mrs. Ellis Taube "Josie," Thomas Taylor, Anthony Terracciano, Dr. Utah Tsao, Rev, Ercel Webb, the late Dr. Thomas White, Carol Wilson, Flip Wilson, Rev. Victor Yanitelli, S.J., Rev. Betty Jane Young, and Audrey Zapp.

I wish to commend all of the members of the Junior Service League who have been working for Hudson County for more than 50 years. Some of their accomplishments are the Women's Exchange in 1932; a survey of Jersey City in 1936, which resulted in the establishment of a council of social service agencies.

During the World War II years this group did excellent work maintaining club rooms at the Fairmount Motel for members of the armed services.

In 1944 they focused on a family service-child welfare program, and in 1946 established its volunteer bureau.

During the forties this ambitious group undertook the redecoration of dormitories and the construction of a sun porch at the Salvation Army Door of Hope. They also assisted in the renovation of the Whittier House Boy's Club, where they helped develop recreation programs for girls at the club.

During the fifties, the league raised funds resulting in the purchase of equipment for Girl Scout and Boy Scout camps.

They also donated six hospital beds to the American Cancer Society, Hudson County Chapter in 1955 and 1957, and provided a hospitality cart in 1957 for Greenville Hospital which was put to good use.

The group has also worked in the area of low-income families and particularly in the formation of a teenage girls' club at the A. Harry Moore housing project, in addition to decorating and furnishing the teenage lounge at the Y.W.C.A.

It was in the sixties, however, that the league branched out into many new areas, including homemaker service, a Spanish-American center, clinic for hearing and speech afflicted persons; Good Will Industries; Catholic Youth Organization; St. Joseph's Home for the Blind; Lutheran Welfare Association and the Occupational Center of Hudson County.

When Seton Hall had its medical college in Jersey City, the Junior Service League staffed the Clinic Research Center with volunteers and purchased equipment for the entertainment and hobby programs for the patients.

Throughout these years summer scholarships were donated to Boy Scout and Girl Scout camps.

In 1968 the Junior Service league also helped in the educational area by donation of nursing scholarships at St. Francis Hospital and Christ Hospital.

They also donated funds toward the construction of a new vestibule in the radiology department of Christ Hospital in 1969, and supplied a cauterizing machine at St. Francis Hospital.

The league also focused on the saving and restoration of the historic Hudson County Court House and worked with city and county committees organized to celebrate America's 200th birthday.

This fine group also aided the New Jersey State Council of the Arts by conducting a survey of cultural organizations within the county which was published and distributed to the public.

During the seventies the league donated thousands of dollars to charitable organizations within the county, providing renovations at the newly purchased Academy House, a community center sponsored by the Hudson County Mental Health Association.

Almost $10,000 was given to the Association for Brain Injured Children, while respirators were donated to Bayonne Hospital and Greenville Hospital, and other equipment donated to Bayonne Mental Health Center, Jersey City Salvation Army Community Center, and Henrietta Benstead Senior Citizen Center in Kearny.

A donation was also made to the North Hudson Hospital for the purchase of a fetal monitor.

The following year funds were donated to St. Joseph's Home for the Blind to purchase a minibus.

Currently, the Junior Service League is working at the core of many social service programs, including the newly formed Hudson County Hospice, an organization working with the terminally ill and the Bayonne Community Day Nursery.

Funds also have been raised by the group for the rehabilitation and renovation of both Y's in Hudson County.

In 1981, during the International Year of the Handicapped, this fine group committed proceeds from its annual luncheon to several organizations including Young Wheels Can Fly, Hudson County Association for Brain-Injured Children and S.C.A.T.E. (Special Children's Athletic Training Experience).

The Junior Service League of Hudson County deserves the accolades of the area they have served. Indeed, they have shown a spirit of service above self. I feel certain that this gala celebration on May 10 will result in perhaps one of the largest donations to be raised by any such group in the entire State of New Jersey.

I am certain my colleagues here in the House of Representatives are deeply appreciative of their efforts and wish to join me in a salute to this fine group.●

PRESIDENT'S POLICIES DAMAGE PROSPECTS FOR PEACE IN CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. TIMOTHY WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, as we debate the vital issue of whether or not America should provide further aid to the Nicaraguan Contras, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to a letter to all of us from American Rhodes scholars now studying in Oxford, England.

These students, among the best and brightest that America has to offer, have seen the fallacy of further military aid to the Contras. They correctly argue that aid to the Contras obstructs the possibility of reasoned diplomacy to resolve peacefully the growing conflict in Nicaragua.

Opposition to aid to the Contras is not, as the students point out, predicated on the belief that the Sandinistas are necessarily the best governors for Nicaragua: "Of course, we each have our own views of the present Nicaraguan Government. But we are of one mind in believing that President Reagan's policies damage the prospects for democracy in Nicaragua. And we are of one voice when we say that the President's policies damage the prospects for peace in Central America."

Mr. Speaker, this effort, led by Mr. Wade Buchanan of Boulder, CO, highlights the urgent need to resort to negotiation before Nicaragua, and other Central American nations, are trapped in an endless cycle of violence. I commend this letter to my colleagues, and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD:

MARCH 24, 1985.

We, the undersigned American Rhodes Scholars currently studying in Oxford, England, wish to register our strong opposition to any renewal of United States aid—covert

or otherwise—to the contra forces fighting the Nicaraguan government.

An objective of the Rhodes Scholarship is to foster peace and understanding among nations. In this spirit, we feel the Administration's current policy toward Nicaragua is dangerous and counter-productive. Of course, we each have our own views of the present Nicaraguan government. But we are of one mind in believing that President Reagan's policies damage the prospects for democracy in Nicaragua. And we are of one voice when we say that the President's policies damage the prospects for peace in Central America.

As United States citizens, we urge you, in the strongest possible terms, to oppose any renewal of aid to the contra forces. We urge you to work toward a more constructive foreign policy in Central America.

We do not speak for all Rhodes Scholars who are citizens of the United States. Nor do we speak for the Rhodes Trust as an institution. We speak as 46 individual Americans who are profoundly concerned that our nation's support for the contra war is harmful to US national interests as well as to the interests of Central Americans.

Please send all responses c/o Wade Buchanan, Magdalen College, Oxford OX1 4AU, England, or 2808 S. Lakeridge Trail, Boulder, Colorado, 80302.

Sincerely yours,

Wade B. Buchanan, Boulder, Colorado; Claudena M. Skran, Saginaw, Michigan; David Vitter, New Orleans, Louisiana; Brenda Buttner, Watsonville, California; Barbara J. Toman, Crown Point, Indiana; Maureen E. Freed, Salt Lake City, Utah; Christopher Hedrick, Olympia, Washington; Jerri-Lynn Scofield, Newton, New Jersey; John W. Fanestil, La Jolla, California; Daniel Porterfield, Towson, Maryland; Carlton Long, Gary, Indiana; Heather A. Wilson, Keene, New Hampshire; Lois Quam, Marshall, Minnesota; David Noever, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Catherine J. Kissee-Sandoval, Montebello, California; Kelley H. Kirklin, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Charles R. Conn III, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Elizabeth H. Kirkland, Charleston, South Carolina; Lawrence J. Vale, Chicago, Illinois; William H. Bender, Rutland, Vermont; Hunter Monroe, Chapel Hill, North Carolina; David Duncombe, Boulder City, Nevada; Brian R. Greene, New York City, New York; Katherine R. Richards, Missoula, Montana; Jean McCollister, Iowa City, Iowa; Raymond Paretzky, New York City, New York; Christopher L. Eisgruber, Corvallis, Oregon; Elizabeth Kiss, Alexandria, Virginia; Marvin Krislov, New Haven, Connecticut; Sarah B. Sewall, Medomak, Maine.

George R. Stephanopoulos, Cleveland, Ohio; Kevin L. Thurm, Merrick, New York; Lawrence Ellis, Skillman, New Jersey; Michael E. Hasselmo, Golden Valley, Minnesota; Kathrin Day Lassila, Ames, Iowa; Richard Klingler, Cincinnati, Ohio; Craig G. Kennedy, Clearwater, Florida; Donald W. Hawthorne, Lakewood, Ohio; John M. MacLeod, North Sutton, New Hampshire; Richard Sommer, Morgantown, West Virginia; Patricia E. Connelly, Belleville, New Jersey; Terrence Tehranian, Honolulu, Hawaii; Daniel Bloomfield, New York City, New York; Judith Stoddart, East Lansing, Michigan.●

DAMNED IF YOU DON'T

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, less than 24 hours ago this House retreated from leadership in foreign policy to what can best be described as isolationism revisited. Fearing to act in defense of developing democracy in Central America, our colleagues defeated two proposals which would have allowed the House to be on record in favor of this promising and yet fragile trend by rejecting proposals made by President Reagan and one authored by Republican leader MICHEL, our good colleague from Illinois.

It seemed to this Member as if those who voted against the President and the Michel amendment were hobgoblinized into believing that there would be a horrendous price to pay for defending U.S. support for the democratic resistance in Nicaragua. Part of this fear was based on misinformation and disinformation which intentionally distorted both the meaning of the Michel amendment and the context of that amendment as it relates both to current law and firm assurance from the President of the United States. By shirking our responsibility to defend democracy by denying modest amounts of nonlethal assistance to the resistance, this House cleared the way for the comandantes in charge of Nicaragua to consolidate their revolution and to externalize it throughout the region.

The most that a bare plurality of our colleagues support was a declaration of perpetual neutrality and disarmament.

Given the choice between the Hamilton amendment and nothing, most of our colleagues took the position I did—back to square one. The Wall Street Journal of this date accurately portrays the confusion and flight from foreign involvement which characterized this House these past few days. I commend it to all in the hopes we can recover our sense of history and learn from our gratuitous errors.

THE POLITICS OF INACTION

After emotional and confused debate, the House wrote its own foreign policy Tuesday night, washing its hands of any military aid to Nicaragua's anti-communist contras. Of course, this was not really a policy; it was a non-policy. And while we believe in representative democracy, we know from experience that you can't hold 248 people—208 Democrats and 40 Republicans—politically accountable individually for the consequences of their inaction. We learned that lesson anew in the sellout of Saigon a decade ago.

It's true as well that the further two votes taken yesterday, while insuring that the issue will at least go to a conference committee with the Senate, will serve only to further confuse anyone trying to understand U.S. policy. It was for reasons like these that the Constitution wisely put foreign policy in the hands of the president.

But at least we now know more about the current condition of the American political process. It has become, more than ever before, internationalized. And some of the players have no high regard either for democracy or the future well-being of the U.S.

For example, Danny Ortega, the Nicaraguan president, was able to predict on Monday that the U.S. House would hand him a victory over his contra foes. In a show of religious devotion not evident in the policies of his government, he even went to a church to pray for that victory. But on the chance that the Almighty might not be listening, he had previously enlisted two freshman U.S. senators, Kerry of Massachusetts and Harkin of Iowa, as his ambassadors to Ronald Reagan, assigned to tell the president that Mr. Ortega was offering what Sen. Kerry called a "wonderful opportunity" for peace. Mr. Ortega had also offered concessions—relaxed press censorship and the right for Nicaraguan workers to strike—before a House vote on contra aid last summer, then reneged after Congress gave him what he wanted.

Even if the senators didn't know that, they should know that bait-and-switch tactics are an old game for authoritarians trying to consolidate power. Hitler constantly made promises he didn't intend to keep during the early '30s. Mr. Ortega whispers to the gullible that he is fundamentally a democrat, but if he were, his communist colleagues and their big brothers in Havana and Moscow would have thrown him in the lake years ago.

However, most of the congressional 248 could not have been naive about or even mildly sympathetic to international communism. Any American who strays that direction usually is brought back to reality when the Russians commit some new brutality, such as the shooting of a U.S. Army major.

Some may have fallen victim to the moral equivalence argument: "Our Nicaraguans are just as bad as their Nicaraguans." The answer to that is that war is a "bad" business. But "our" Nicaraguans are willing to engage in it, to kill or be killed, because they don't want communism. That, we are quite sure, is also the prevailing view in the U.S.

A still unresolved issue is the nature of the threat, Mr. Reagan's strong rhetoric notwithstanding. The Sandinistas don't plan to launch their 75 tanks and 12 helicopter gunships against Houston. But they, the Cubans and the other foot soldiers in Moscow's imperial crusade are going to continue doing some other things. They will continue to dabble in U.S. politics, partly by subterfuge and deception. They will continue building the drug trade, which nets them huge piles of dollars, spreads degeneracy and undermines law enforcement in the U.S. They will continue to train terrorists who, partly through the net-works developed in the drug trade, will sow further disorder and try to destabilize democratic regimes in this hemisphere. It is a bitter irony that Colombia, one of the intermediaries in the Contadora process some Americans think will bring peace to Central America, is under intense pressure from the drug terrorists.

Finally, some congressmen probably represent what the polls suggest is a common view among Americans generally, that $14 million in aid to the contras doesn't look like we are very serious about beating the

communists. Do we intend to win or don't we? If not, poll respondents seem to be saying, don't get us bogged down in any more losing struggles.

It is to that final misgiving, especially, that the administration must find an answer. The opportunity will present itself, because this problem, and indeed the larger problem of Soviet imperialism, is not going to go away just because the House tried to wish it away Tuesday night.●

THE HOMELESS MENTALLY ILL

HON. JIM MOODY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, today I and my colleague, Mr. WEISS, will introduce a bill to benefit the homeless mentally ill.

As my colleagues know, deinstitutionalization, a movement that began in the 1960's, is a major contributor to the homeless situation in the United States. Because of advances in medical science and a desire to protect patients' rights, thousands of people were released with the best of intentions. Sadly, however, the result of deinstitutionalization was that many of the mentally ill were released into communities without proper social counseling or followup procedures.

This legislation urges States to use a portion of the amounts received under two block grant programs in order to develop and to implement housing counseling services for individuals before their release from facilities for the mentally ill.

An important provision of the bill would call for the Secretary of HUD and the Secretary of HHS to submit reports to Congress regarding the housing counseling programs which are to be developed by the States using these block grants.

There is a real need to end the suffering of these Americans who have been left to fend for themselves on the streets. Many, dehumanized by the system, do not wish to live in doorways and alleys; they simply have no where else to go. This legislation is designed to help these individuals.

We hope you will join us in this effort.

I would also like to commend to my colleagues attention the following Washington Post article that clearly illustrates the problems experienced by the homeless mentally ill.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1985]

D.C.'s HOMELESS SCHIZOPHRENICS GET LITTLE HELP, REPORT FINDS

(By Margaret Engel)

Last month, a 42-year-old North Carolina schizophrenia patient was discharged abruptly from St. Elizabeths Hospital while wearing a cotton dress, sneakers, a thin sweater and no underclothes.

She was told to go to a public shelter, but after walking the streets for six hours was readmitted. A day later, she was given a week's supply of medicine, bus fare, a list of shelters and was turned out again. Her discharge summary read; "destination unknown."

The woman's case was cited in a study released yesterday by three doctors at the Health Research Group to illustrate how the 1,200 homeless believed to be schizophrenic came to live in the streets, grates and public shelters in the District. The study found that nearly 40 percent of the city's homeless suffer from schizophrenia and that little is being done to aid them.

Federal officials said the figure is consistent with surveys nationwide that have found one-third to one-half of the homeless are mentally ill.

The study was based on interviews in January and February with the staff of 12 homeless shelters in the District. The staff members told researchers that schizophrenia was the main reason that 33 percent, or 441 of the 1,316 men in the shelters, were homeless. Alcoholism was the reason that another 40 percent, or 532 of the men, were homeless.

Officials at St. Elizabeths said the case of the woman cited in the study is under review and would not comment on it. "If the case is true, that's not good," said Dr. Shervert Frazier, director of the National Institute of Mental Health, which manages the hospital.

"* * * Homelessness is primarily the result of inappropriate deinstitutionalization," said the report's main author, Dr. E. Fuller Torrey, a former psychiatrist at St. Elizabeths Hospital, which is in the process of being transferred from federal to city control.

"This is the most psychiatrically rich city in the nation and the world," said Dr. Sidney E. Wolfe, director of the Health Research Group, and a coauthor of the report along with Dr. Eve Bargmann. "There are 1,300 psychiatrists, yet only two work in the shelters. There's only 25 hours a week available for all the needs of the homeless."

As a result of so many untreated mentally ill persons in the city's shelters, the facilities resemble "psychiatric wards of the 1930s" before medicines to help schizophrenics were created, the study found.

The report urges the city to require every psychiatrist to donate two hours a week as a condition of holding a license. It also asks that 15 psychiatrists at St. Elizabeths and 15 at the National Institute of Mental Health with administrative-only duties be asked to work in shelters part time.

"Given psychiatric manpower and monetary resources available in Washington, the existing mental health services for the city's mentally ill homeless are a desgrace * * *," the report states.

Dr. Frazier said, "Most of our psychiatrists are heavily responsible for heavy expenditures of research money and are running the review committees." Forcing them to see patients "is not the way to solve the problem."

According to a 1984 National Institute of Mental Health study, the District spends at least twice as much as every state in the nation for mental health. According to figures supplied by the states for fiscal 1981, the District spent $151 per person for mental health, which was more than six times the average state spending of $24 per person.

"* * * If throwing money at a problem would solve it, then Washington would already be a model for public mental health services," the report said. It urged that money for St. Elizabeths be given to the District to follow the "mass exodus" of patients who left the federal hospital.

Mental illness was a larger problem for women, the study found, as 58 percent, or 210 or the 359 in shelters at the time, were schizophrenic. Alcoholism was the primary reason for homelessness among 14 percent of the women, or 50 cases.

The report was critical of the community mental health centers, which it said "have established records for unparalleled mediocrity."

Charles Siegel, a spokesman for the Department of Human Resources, which runs the city's community mental health centers, noted, "We have been improving out mental health system for some time, especially our Crisis Resolution Unit."●

U.S. CIVILIAN SPACE PROGRAMS—POSTURING OURSELVES FOR FUTURE GROWTH

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the United States has seen tremendous advances in science and technology in the past quarter century. These advances have profoundly touched the lives of, I dare say, every U.S. citizen, be it in the manner of medical breakthroughs, food production research, or development of energy conservation methods.

As dramatic as any advances we have seen in this period are those in the space arena. In 1958, the United States saw the formation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, created by law, in part, to respond to the space activities of the Soviet Union. Since that time, we have seen the success of major endeavors. We have set our goals high at times, and we have achieved those goals.

But what does the future hold? We are seeing in space exploration and development the dawn of an era of commercial growth. We are seeing advances in technology to view distant stars and to map the topography of our own oceans and seas. We envision expansion in the space launch industry and even the establishment of factories in space to manufacture remarkably pure pharmaceuticals.

We are standing on a scientific plateau, poised to leap to new heights. As wise men and women will do, many participants in space activities have recognized the need to plan, to establish long-range goals to maximize the use of our national resources, those resources being not only fiscal but physical and intellectual.

The House adopted in last year's NASA authorization bill—Public Law 98-364—language calling for the establishment of a National Commission on Space, comprised of high-level individ-

uals from the private sector, academia, and the Government. The Commission will study and report to Congress on long-range goals for maximizing the potential of the U.S. civilian space program and identify means to achieve these goals.

On March 29, 1985, the President announced the membership of the National Commission on Space and it is with great enthusiasm that I congratulate the appointed Commissioners:

Chairman: Thomas O. Paine, Chairman, Thomas Paine Associates, Former NASA Administrator (1968-1970).

Vice Chairman: Laurel L. Wilkening, Vice Provost, University of Arizona.

Members: Luis W. Alvarez, Physicist, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory; Neil A. Armstrong, Chairman of the Board; Computer Technology Aviation, Inc., Former Astronaut; Paul Jerome Coleman, President, Universities Space Research Association and Assistant Director, Los Alamos National Lab; George Brooks Field, Senior Physicist, Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory and Chairman, Space Telescope Advisory Committee, Space Telescope Science Institute; Lt. Gen. William H. Fitch, USMC-Ret., Former Deputy Chief of Staff, Aviation, U.S. Marine Corps Headquarters; Charles M. Herzfeld, Vice President and Director of Research, ITT Corporation; J.L. Kerrebrock, Department Head, Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, Former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations; Gerard K. O'Neill, President, Chairman, CEO, Geostar Corporation; Kathryn D. Sullivan, Astronaut, Johnson Space Center, NASA; David C. Webb, Chairman and Founding Member, National Coordinating Committee for Space; Brig. Gen. Charles E. Yeager, USAF-Ret., Consultant and Former Test Pilot.

In the fiscal year 1986 NASA authorization bill which passed on the House floor on April 3 (H.R. 1714), the Committee on Science and Technology adopted, and the House approved, language lengthening the life of the National Commission on Space by 6 months, allowing the newly named members additional time, until April 1986, to complete their review and report to Congress.

As a congressional adviser to the Commission, I am honored to be in association with this distinguished forum and look forward to its recommendations on how the United States must posture itself to enter a new era in space.●

ADJUSTMENTS NEEDED IN SUPERFUND LEGISLATION

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently, I introduced H.R. 1881 to remove the petroleum exclusion from Superfund and set aside a certain portion of the fund to deal with leaking underground gasoline storage tanks. In the discussions that have ensued about H.R. 1881, it has become apparent that several changes are needed in the legislation. I am therefore, introducing new legislation that incorporates these changes. This new bill will supercede H.R. 1881. The text of this new bill is as follows:

H.R. —

A bill to provide that the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 will apply to certain petroleum and to establish a separate account in the Superfund for leaking underground storage tanks

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Superfund Amendments of 1985".

SEC. 2. PETROLEUM EXCLUSION.

Section 101(14) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 is amended by striking out ", and the term does not include natural gas, natural gas liquids," and substituting ", except that the term 'hazardous substance' shall include (in addition to the substances specifically listed or designated under subparagraphs (A) through (F)) any petroleum (including crude oil or any fraction thereof) which is released from an underground storage tank (as defined in subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act); the term 'hazardous substance' does not include natural gas, natural gas liquids, propane,".

SEC. 3. SET-ASIDE FOR UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS.

(a) SEPARATE ACCOUNT.—Section 221 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF SEPARATE ACCOUNT FOR LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS, ETC.—

"(1) CREATION OF ACCOUNT.—There is established in the Response Trust Fund a separate account to be known as the 'Leaking Underground Storage Tank Account' (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the 'Account') consisting of such amounts as may be transferred to the Account as provided in paragraph (2).

"(2) TRANSFERS TO ACCOUNT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Account on an annual basis from the Response Trust Fund amounts equivalent to 8.5 percent of the amounts appropriated to that Trust Fund under this section in each year.

"(3) EXPENDITURES FROM ACCOUNT.—Amounts in the Account shall be available for expenditures which may be made under subsection (c) and section 111 with respect to releases and threatened releases of petroleum which is defined as a hazardous substance in section 101(14). Any expenditure which may be made from the Account may not be made from other funds in the Response Trust Fund.

"(4) REPAYABLE ADVANCES.—

"(A) AUTHORIZATION OF TRANSFERS.—The Secretary may transfer, as repayable advances, to the Account from other amounts in the Response Trust Fund such sums as may, from time to time, be necessary to make the expenditures described in paragraph (3).

"(B) REPAYMENT OF ADVANCES.—Advances made to the Account pursuant to this paragraph shall be repaid, and interest on such advances shall be paid, to the Response Trust Fund, when the Secretary of the Treasury determines that moneys are available for such purposes in the Account (or when required pursuant to subparagraph (D)).

"(C) RATE OF INTEREST.—The interest on advances made pursuant to this paragraph shall be at rates determined under the rules of section 223(b)(2) and shall be compounded annually.

"(D) LIMITATIONS ON ADVANCES.—Rules similar to the rules of section 223(c)(2) shall apply for purposes of this paragraph.".

"(b) EXPENDITURES.—(1) Section 221(c)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 is amended by inserting the following at the end thereof:

"In the case of the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Account, amounts in such account shall be available only for expenditures described in section 111 which are incurred with respect to releases or threatened releases of petroleum which is a hazardous substance as defined in section 101(14).".

(2) Section 221(c)(2)of such Act is amended by inserting "(other than amounts in the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Account)" after "Fund".

(3) Section 111 of such Act is amended by adding the following at the end of subsection (a): "In the case of costs incurred with respect to petroleum which is a hazardous substance as defined in section 101(14), only funds from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Account established under section 221(d) may be used.".●

URBAN-FARM COALITION

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, since the crisis in American agriculture affects all of us either as consumers or growers, I would like to call attention to the positive approach to the farm crisis which is now underway among Michigan residents.

Two weeks ago, a group of Detroit community leaders traveled across the State to Eaton Rapids, MI, to personally observe the plight of the small farmer, and to express their support through an urban-rural coalition for the benefit of all citizens.

On May 4, a group of farmers will visit Detroit and meet with community leaders to hear about the urban condition. They will also take a tour of the large farmers market to observe the prices of food paid by the urban consumer. This people to people outreach will open new doors for the establishment of economic justice and mutual cooperation. I am including the article by James A. Mallory which appeared in the Detroit News on April 6, 1985:

CITY-RURAL COALITION SOUGHT

(By James A. Mallory)

EATON RAPIDS.—U.S. Rep. John Conyers, D-Detroit, is campaigning to strengthen an urban-rural coalition created when mid-Michigan farmers brought tons of food to Detroit during the 1982 recession.

During a weekend visit to this farming community about 15 miles south of Lansing, Conyers and a group of Detroit community leaders discussed with farmers the financial crisis plaguing rural communities. The city visitors also toured dairy and hog farms in the area.

It was nearly three years ago when some of the farmers, who are now experiencing financial stress, delivered more than 55 tons of food to Detroit for hungry and unemployed workers who had exhausted their unemployment benefits.

Conyers said it is important that Detroit residents understand what is happening on the farm since some 23 million jobs in America are related to agriculture and famers buy much of the machinery made in urban factories. Another consideration, said host farmer Neil Rogers, is that people forced off the farm will have to turn to the city to find jobs.

In a few weeks, Rogers and other farmers will visit Detroit to continue the dialog about the farming crisis and how it relates to urban residents.

"We're in the process of getting them to come and tell the people what it is all about," Conyers said. "There is a great cultural gap between the rural and urban people and we're trying to mix it up."

According to Conyers, many farmers have only 30 days left to get financing for spring planting this year. He is attempting to put together a bipartisan effort to obtain emergency credit relief for farmers.

"I didn't realize the magnitude of the problem," he said. "If they are not in trouble, they are on the borderline."

In the long run, farmers need a federal crop-pricing policy that ensures farmers will get a reasonable return, Conyers said. But Conyers rejected the Reagan administration's call for a market-oriented pricing structure.

"If you wanted to fold up the biggest industry in the country, you pull the subsidies out," he said. "What is a fair and decent pricing policy is arguable. That's where we are now."

Farmers need a national policy geared to saving the family farm and guaranteeing him a fair return for his labor, Conyers added. Such a policy is needed because family farms provide a type of employment that corporate farms could not provide.

"If the small farmers are driven off the land, they'll be sent to the city where there is already an exorbitant unemployment rate," he said.

In addition, the loss of the family farm would mean the control of the nation's food supply would be in fewer hands. This will lead to higher prices, he said.

"Many supermarkets are . . . setting prices that are driving my constituents up the wall," he said. "They (people in Detroit) assume the farmer is sharing in the price increases. He is not. The profit is falling to the middleman."

Rogers, who is president of the Michigan Chapter of the American Agriculture Movement, said farmers are beginning to change their attitudes and recognize the need to work with city residents.

In a report last month, a state Senate committee said about 18 percent of Michigan's 30,000 full-time farmers are in financial difficulty. Rogers said he met Conyers when farmers brought the food to Detroit in 1982. Since that time he has had several meetings with Conyers while lobbying in Washington, D.C.●

A NEED FOR AMTRAK

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, the administration has proposed the elimination of all funding for Amtrak, our Nation's rail passenger system. The result would be the complete cessation of all Amtrak service on October 1. A recent article in the Philadelphia Inquirer accurately describes the disastrous effects that would be felt throughout the Nation if Amtrak were eliminated. In Philadelphia, for instance, the city's already jammed airport would have to add 50 flights each day to handle some of the 10,000 Amtrak passengers who now pass through the city daily.

There are 161 towns, mostly in the South and West, reached by Amtrak that have no bus or air service and would be stranded if the railroad were eliminated. Furthermore, Amtrak carries more passengers—20 million a year—than all but the four largest airlines and the Greyhound bus system.

The article notes that nearly half the travelers on Amtrak's long-distance routes outside of the Northeast have family incomes less than $20,000 annually. Additionally, slightly more than one-third of all long-distance travelers are over 55, thus debunking the administration's claims that Amtrak is a service for the "well-heeled."

Finally, as the Inquirer points out, Amtrak could cost more to eliminate than to run. Labor benefits of some $2.1 billion over 6 years will have to be paid. Amtrak's rolling stock, valued at $3 billion, will have to be sold for scrap since there would be no market value for passenger locomotives and cars. The $2 billion investment in the Northeast corridor would also go to waste since no State commuter authority could take over the maintenance of the rail.

I believe the administration's proposed elimination of Amtrak makes no sense in either economic or human terms. I urge my colleagues to support Amtrak and commend this excellent article to them.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Apr. 14, 1985]

THE AX HANGS OVER AMTRAK; EFFECTS WOULDN'T STOP THERE

(By Dale Mezzacappa)

WASHINGTON.—It could happen: Philadelphians could wake up on Oct. 1 and find the 30th Street Station nearly empty. No more long-distance trains. Amtrak out of business.

The repercussions would be felt immediately. SEPTA and other local commuter operations would suddenly become responsible for all upkeep of tracks and equipment that they share with Amtrak. SEPTA fares would go up; its trains would become more crowded.

Philadelphia International Airport would have to add 50 flights each day to handle some of the 10,000 Amtrak passengers who now pass through the city daily. Traffic to and from the airport, already slowed by repairs to the Schuylkill Expressway, would become clogged.

Would it be a disaster, or merely an inconvenience?

"The Baltimore-Philadelphia-Trenton area will have more people adversely affected if Amtrak shuts down than any [other] place in the country," said W. Graham Claytor, president of the federally subsidized rail-passenger corporation.

"If Amtrak folds, Philadelphians will find another way to get around," said Edwin Dale, spokesman for the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB), which has led the assault on Amtrak.

Either way, the railroad's demise is more than just a remote possibility. The Reagan administration is firm in wanting to end the government's current subsidy of $684 million and has eliminated all funding for Amtrak in its fiscal 1986 budget.

Officials, led by Budget Director David A. Stockman, call government aid to Amtrak an unjustified subsidy that benefits only a small portion of the traveling public. Train travel, in the eyes of Stockman and some members of Congress, is a nostalgic luxury the nation can no longer afford.

"Intercity passenger trains are in trouble today for the same reason stagecoach lines would be in trouble if earlier Congresses had subsidized them in perpetuity: Time and technology have passed them by," said Sen. William L. Armstrong (R., Colo.).

How likely is it that Amtrak will be shut down?

Although there is still strong support in Congress to continue the service, key House backers fear that there is an even chance it will be lost in the Reagan administration's massive efforts to drastically reduce the federal budget and realign the nation's spending priorities.

The threat to Amtrak "is real, not hypothetical," said Rep. James J. Florio (D., N.J.). chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Commerce, Transportation and Tourism and one of the railroad's key backers.

"In a $52 billion package [of cuts], the administration will use it as a bargaining chip," Florio said. "If it gets dealt with in one big budget reconciliation vote, instead of separately through the committee process, the odds are 50-50 Amtrak will die."

Ever since Congress created Amtrak in 1971 from private railroads seeking to get out of the unprofitable passenger business, every administration has tried to cut or eliminate it. But the Reagan efforts are the most relentless yet.

In the first tests, Senate Republican leaders in their budget compromise with the White House agreed to end the program, after the Budget Committee had voted a cut of 30 percent—an amount that Amtrak officials said would be enough to kill the system.

For Stockman, Amtrak is a pet peeve. He has pushed to end its subsidy, even against

the advice of the administration's transportation officials.

As recently as 1982, the transportation secretary, then Drew Lewis, a Pennsylvanian, said, "The Reagan administration realizes Amtrak plays an important role in our transportation system." Lewis said it would continue "so long as the cost of providing rail passenger service remains reasonable."

Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Dole actually asked for an increase in Amtrak's subsidy for fiscal 1986, but she was overruled.

Stockman, however, facing a $200 billion federal deficit, sees Amtrak as a key example of misguided government spending.

The OMB director cites favorite statistics: Less than 1 percent of all intercity travelers use trains (the overwhelming majority, 87 percent, drive); 44 percent of the 513 Amtrak stations serve fewer than 10 passengers a day, and two-thirds serve fewer than 25 passengers a day; the average subsidy for every rider on an Amtrak train is $35—enough on some routes to buy a discount airplane ticket and have some money left over.

But there is another side to those numbers, contends Claytor, a gruff, no-nonsense 73-year-old railroad man and former Navy secretary, who three years ago was tapped to head the national rail corporation.

NEEDS AND STATISTICS

"Ten [passengers] a day is quite a number for very small towns that do not have any other means of transportation," he said. "It's 300 a month. For those towns, the train is pretty important. They [Amtrak opponents] are disregarding human needs and changing them to statistics."

There are 161 towns reached by Amtrak that have no air or bus service, mostly in the West and South, he said. Amtrak carries more passengers—about 20 million a year—than all but the four largest airlines and the Greyhound bus system.

And while more than half the passengers on the busy Northeast Corridor are on business trips and meet Stockman's conception of Amtrak passengers as "well-heeled," nearly half the travelers on long-distance routes elsewhere have family incomes of less than $20,000 annually, Claytor's figures show.

Since 1979, there have been route eliminations, labor concessions, changes in schedules to promote efficiency and an annual reduction in subsidy. Amtrak, Claytor said, has done everything Congress asked it to except run at a profit—an accomplishment that has not been achieved by any passenger rail system in the world.

(In Great Britain, where 8 percent of intercity travelers go by train, the national rail system receives a $1 billion annual subsidy. In France, the government assistance is $3 billion; Germany, $4 billion, and Japan, $2 billion. In all these countries, rail passengers represent about 20 percent of all travelers.)

"Those who want to kill Amtrak are ideologues who absolutely believe, like some people believe in passages of the Bible, that nothing should be done by government in the way of transportation or services that private enterprise cannot make a profit on," Claytor said, "In today's world, that is a false philosophy and a false economy."

The Northeast Corridor is the nexus of the Amtrak system and carries half its passengers. More people take the train between Washington and New York each day than fly—17,500 vs. 12,000 a day. Of these, about 9,300 passengers a day get on or off at 30th Street Station.

Though the proportion of train travelers in the nation as a whole is less than 1 percent, in cities such as Philadelphia, New York and Washington the percentage is more like that in Europe and Japan—15 percent to 20 percent.

"What are you going to do with those people?" Claytor asks. "Build a new airport in New York? Put them on the highways?"

Claytor said that he didn't have the option, as some have suggested, to shut down the more inefficient long-distance routes and preserve the Northeast Corridor, where a better case can be made for rail travel, and where the government has already sunk $2 billion in capital improvements. (An additional $1 billion has gone to improvements in the rest of the system.)

Labor-protection agreements require full pay for laid-off employees for up to six years and would eat up most of the operating budget if large numbers of workers lost their jobs because of route cutbacks.

That protection was mandated by Congress under pressure from the unions during Amtrak's chancy creation in 1971 from the bankrupt private carriers. Claytor regards the protection agreements as a mistake but says there is little he can do about them.

He told a Senate subcommittee last month that even a 30 percent cut in funding, leaving him with $480 million in operating money, would force him to shut down the system.

Eliminating all the off-corridor trains would save $362 million in operating costs but trigger $330 million in payments to laid-off workers in the first year. There would be $30 million in shut-down costs, leaving $120 million to operate the Northeast Corridor trains—less than half of what is necessary.

Such a cutback "would inevitably result in [Amtrak's] immediate insolvency, and the only responsible thing to do would be to shut down on Oct. 1, 1985," Claytor told the Senate subcommittee.

He said the minimum amount Amtrak would need to operate—still shutting down all the off-corridor trains—would be $607 million, about a 10 percent cut.

The unions, which in the past have accepted work-rule changes and wages 12 percent less than paid to equivalent workers on freight railroads, say they would be crazy to offer changes in the labor-protection arrangement at just the time jobs are threatened.

"We feel we've made all the sacrifices we can," said Richard Kilroy, president of the Brotherhood of Railway and Airline Clerks, Amtrak's largest union.

The Reagan administration contends that Amtrak's assets are $3.5 billion and could be sold to pay the $2.1 billion that the labor protection agreement would cost over the next six years. But Claytor told Congress he believed that because locomotives and dining cars were of no value to anything but a passenger railroad, they would only be worth their scrap value—$300 million to $500 million.

As a result, he said, Amtrak could cost more to liquidate than to run over the next few years. The government would be saddled with paying the labor protection or, at the very least, face lengthy lawsuits.

Stockman says that if the need for passenger service was so great in the Northeast, private enterprise, the states and such commuter operations as SEPTA should be willing to step in and operate Amtrak.

But William Dempsey, president of the Association of American Railroads, wrote Florio that "it is hard for me to believe that any freight railroad would be interested in getting back into that service." Though the Northeast Corridor trains cover their operating costs, they still do not make a profit, because of capital expenses.

As for the states, they say they cannot afford to take over the service. SEPTA and New Jersey Transit testified before Florio's subcommittee last month that their service would be crippled.

The Amtrak subsidy is hidden assistance for SEPTA and NJT because Amtrak owns and operates the Northeast Corridor tracks—paying for track maintenance, signals, bridges, stations, dispatching and tower operations.

Right now SEPTA has 50,000 passengers a day traveling over Amtrak lines; NJT has 83,000 commuters who use Amtrak lines into New York.

"Should Amtrak no longer operate service on the track used for commuter services, SEPTA would be required to bear the burden for the entire cost of approximately 330 miles of track and catenary," SEPTA government relations manager Jeanne E. Neese told Florio's subcommittee on March 14.

Amtrak estimates that SEPTA would have to pay an additional $27 million and NJT $47 million to keep operating their current routes. Contributing to keeping Amtrak's service alive is out of the question, SEPTA's Neese said.

The Reagan administration also is proposing to eliminate aid to urban mass transit, which would have an additional effect on the commuter operations.

Claytor, like Florio, hopes that Amtrak does not get lumped together with all the other items as the budget battle shapes up.

"A zero budget for Amtrak is quite different from most other proposed cuts in that it takes an organization with a $3 billion investment that has taken 14 years to build, a going concern with 25,000 employees, and permanently wipes it out," he told Congress.

"This is an irreversible decision—we would never be able to bring passenger service back again."●

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF JOHN JAMES AUDUBON

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution today to commemorate the birth of John James Audubon, who was born 200 years ago tomorrow. Senator KASTEN will be introducing a similar resolution in the other body.

As a strong conservationist, Mr. Speaker, and as one who recognizes the tremendous benefits James Audubon made to the Nation, I am pleased to be able to introduce this resolution. I also believe that the best opening statement I could give would be to submit for the RECORD an essay entitled "Thank You, John James Audubon, For Neglecting Your Material In-

terests" by the editor of Audubon magazine.

I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this essay be included at this point in the RECORD.

THANK YOU, JOHN JAMES AUDUBON, FOR NEGLECTING YOUR MATERIAL INTERESTS

(By Les Line, Editor of Audubon)

If John James Audubon could be here for his 200th birthday on April 26, he'd no doubt be amazed at the strength and breadth of the conservation movement he unconsciously helped to spawn.

Audubon himself was no conservationist. There seemed little need for such sentiments during his lifetime, the years between the American Revolution and the Civil War when our wildlife and other natural treasures seemed inexhaustible. And in the eyes of Audubon's in-laws, some of whom had been his partners and creditors in failed business ventures, John James wasn't good for much at all.

"He neglects his material interests," said one, "and is forever wasting his time, hunting, drawing and stuffing birds, and playing the fiddle. We fear he will never be fit for any practical purpose on the face of the earth."

What Audubon did do exceedingly well was to roam the wilds of North America from Florida to Newfoundland, identifying, observing, collecting and drawing the birds of this continent. Whether his subject was a bald eagle or ruby-throated hummingbird, Audubon painted them life size. Most important, he was the first wildlife artist to portray birds as living, breathing creatures, and to show them as dynamic and dramatic components of a larger environment.

In so doing, Audubon made millions of Americans aware of birds and of the wonder and beauty of nature. Through his paintings and his lively written descriptions of bird behavior, he sparked a latent interest in America's wild heritage. It is not surprising that, three decades after his death, the fledgling bird-protection movement took his name as its own.

"Audubon's greatest contribution was fostering awareness," says ornithologist Roger Tory Peterson. "Awareness inevitably leads to concern."

There are perhaps 20 million birdwatchers in the United States today, ranging from the casual kitchen-window observer with a backyard bird-feeder to the zealot who will travel to Patagonia for a rare sighting. If Roger Peterson is the father of this modern birding boom, as many believe, then J.J. Audubon must be the granddaddy.

"Birds are a vivid expression of life," explains Peterson, "and because of their high rate of metabolism and furious pace of living they reflect change in the environment rather quickly. Birds are indicators of environmental quality—an ecological litmus that sends out warnings when things are out of kilter."

Which may also explain why so many birdwatchers, from Teddy Roosevelt to Rachel Carson, have spearheaded the environmental movement.

Were Audubon present at his 200th birthday party, his response to present-day America would probably be a mixture of distress and joy. He would cry, I think, at the loss of so much of his beloved wilderness and the marvelous wildlife that was integral to it. But he could only be heartened by the legions of nature lovers who are fighting to preserve what remains of our natural beauty and biological diversity, who are even striving to make amends for man's previous mismanagement by restoring endangered species like the California condor and the whooping crane.

Love of nature is an indispensable ally of the conservation movement, and John James Audubon did much to spread this love. Today, as a consequence, an environmental ethic is ingrained in our national consciousness. Audubon's namesake organization, founded to protect birds from market hunters and egg collectors, now numbers more than half a million members. Together with many other citizen conservation groups, the National Audubon Society has broadened its mission to include the protection of all life—animal, plant and human—and the air, land and water on which all life depends.

Happy birthday, John James Audubon—and our heartfelt thanks to you for neglecting your material interests!●

NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS REAUTHORIZATION BILL

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, and my distinguished colleagues, I am introducing a bill today that will protect, preserve and enhance the health care delivery system in rural America. The National Health Service Corps Reauthorization bill will provide key medical personnel to our citizens living in medically underserved areas throughout this great Nation.

The National Health Service Corps serves over 2 million Americans. In my Third Congressional District of New Mexico alone—over 100,000 people who live in rural and remote areas have come to depend on the National Health Service Corps staffed clinics for their principal sources of health care.

The National Health Service Corps reauthorization bill that I am introducing today addresses many of the concerns expressed in the President's veto message last year and includes all provisions agreed upon in last year's House/Senate conference report. The bill will authorize the National Health Service Corps Program for an additional 3 years. It will authorize the Health Service Corps Scholarship Program for the same period of time and provide funding for 1,175 new scholarships to train and educate medical personnel in addition to continuing current scholarships.

The National Health Service Corps provides medical personnel to medically underserved areas throughout the country. It is not a government giveaway program. These medical personnel in return for Government scholarship aid, make a commitment to serve in a health service corps clinic for a limited period of time. The clinics then pay back the Government for its cost in educating the individual—in addition to a salary.

Mr. Speaker, the National Health Service Corps is vital national program that makes a major difference in the lives of rural Americans who have come to depend on the services provided.

Since President Reagan took office there have been virtually no new National Health Service Corps scholarships. Without new doctors in the pipeline the program will die.

A high percentage of the patients who use Health Service Corps staffed clinics throughout the country are older Americans living on small fixed incomes who have chronic health problems.

This bill benefits the Nation as a whole. It is a creative, low cost, common sense approach to successfully deliver quality health care to those in need. I hope that my colleagues will join with me in supporting the reauthorization of the National Health Service Corps Program and not allow this administration to roll back the clock to a time when many rural Americans had no access to health care. I hope the President will develop some compassion and see the wisdom in continuing a health care program which is so critical to the needs of rural Americans.●

NEVADA'S VOICE FOR DEMOCRACY

HON. HARRY REID

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct the Voice of Democracy scriptwriting contest. This year more than 300,000 secondary school students participated in the contest competing for the six national scholarships which are awarded as top prizes. The contest theme this year was "My Pledge to America."

For the benefit of my colleagues I include in the RECORD the winning speech from the State of Nevada, delivered by Chance Meng, a 17-year-old from Bonanza High School in Las Vegas. Chance's eloquent winning speech follows:

MY PLEDGE TO AMERICA

(By Chance Meng)

America, America, let us tell you how we feel. You have given us your spirit, we love you so.

This song, entitled the American Chant, is a song which all of us, at one time or another, have heard in our hearts. The singing of pride and spirit. America has given us her spirit. The spirit to succeed, the spirit to live, and the spirit to strive for excellence; for without her, we are lost.

In the year 1600, people wanted her, but she did not exist. By 1700, people needed her, but she had not yet been born. In 1776, people died for her, because they knew her and the glorious gift of freedom that she had to offer. Now she was alive! Much blood was spilled as men fought for her existence, for at last a truly free nation had an opportunity to survive. A land where no one man ruled, but instead a land where the people created the governing rules, and a land where all people were equal. America.

America; my country, I am proud to be an American, but without the sacrifices made by courageous men and women, this country could not offer the freedom she possesses today. Many wars have been fought to ensure her safety, standards, and beliefs, and it is to these participating men and women, I owe my gratitude; for without their sacrifices, I would not enjoy the freedom which I cherish today. Their courage, pride, honor, and determination have inspired me to accept my role as an American. To participate in America, to get involved in the spirit and pride around me, to donate my time and efforts just as the thousands of heroic men and women in the past; to further enhance the freedom which she breeds. As a citizen of these United States, I have obligations—obligations not enforced by the government by secret services, or by—big brother; but only which lie on my shoulders, for I make the decision to abide by them or not.

In America, I have the freedom to choose my beliefs, my faith, and my actions. A freedom which many take for granted, and it is these unknowing people who do not understand their role as an American. We are given a choice whether or not to be patriotic, and the least good Americans can do for our country is to choose patriotism. Patriotism may not mean we sing praises to America every moment of our lives, but it does mean to put aside time in our lives to do for others what America has done for us.

By supporting charities, homes for the elderly, and youth groups, we are contributing to the growth of America. But my role as an American goes one step further in understanding my own goals and duties as a citizen. A pledge. A pledge unlike any other. A pledge for myself, and for my country. I pledge to dedicate myself to understanding my country and supporting it. My loyalty and determination shall flourish to further enhance the pride and spirit that is the United States. And above all, I pledge my life, in hopes that it will assure the freedom of America for generations to come.

A pledge. A simple pledge to remind me of my duties as an American citizen. We all have duties, the only difference is whether or not we follow them as many past generations have. My time has arrived, and now it is my turn to sing the song of spirit and pride that is America.●

REPRESENTATIVE HYDE ANNOUNCES SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL ESSAY CONTEST WINNERS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I recently conducted my annual Sixth District Congressional Essay Contest for junior and senior high school students in my district, and earlier this week I announced the names of the junior high school winners in the RECORD. Today, I am very pleased to share with my colleagues the names of the senior high school winners. The first place winner is Stephen Rule of Addison Trail High School in Addison; the second place winner in Ray Schmitz of Glenbard North High School in Carol Stream; and the third place winner in Lyle Brenner of Glenbard West High School in Glen Ellyn.

The essay contest theme I asked our senior high school participants to expound on was "What Does the Concept of 'Separation of Powers' Mean in Our Government, and How Well Does it Work?".

All three students have written excellent essays on the concept of separation of powers and the importance of our system of checks and balances among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

I commend all three students for their insightful essays, and am pleased to include them in the RECORD:

WHAT DOES THE CONCEPT OF "SEPARATION OF POWERS" MEAN IN OUR GOVERNMENT, AND HOW WELL DOES IT WORK?

(By Stephen Rule, Addison Trail High School)

James Madison eased into his bed and let the frustration of the last hectic months subside. It was September 17, 1787, and for the last four months, he and his colleagues had agonized over the many decisions necessary in drafting the Constitution of a country that would become a world power. Now as he lay on his bed trying to sleep, his mind began to race over the many things that could go wrong. Perhaps in his zeal for a strong nation, he had helped to create a government with too much power. Would the citizens of the young United States of America be denied their hard won freedoms? But most of all, he worried over the possibility that some day, a sector of the government would become too powerful and the citizens of the United States would once again be enslaved. Perhaps he had been wrong, and a four-year Presidential term was really too long. Or maybe allowing all laws to be created by two small bodies of men would plunge the new nation down the road to disaster. When he finally fell asleep, his mind continued to conjure up graphic scenes, each one depicting the demise of the country.

One hundred ninety-eight years and eight wars later, it has become clear that the ability of the United States to wend its way through the pitfalls of time is truly unique. "Separation of Powers," to our forefathers, meant dividing the responsibilities of running our government in such a way that no one person or ideological group could foist its views on the nation. The dividing of responsibilities and privileges between the two legislative bodies, the Presidential veto and policy powers, and the right of the Supreme Court to decide the legality of a law are all the components of a system of checks and balances that have made this country strong and flexible.

Many countries, most notably the Latin American nations, have attempted to emulate the American Constitution when creating their own governments. Their efforts to create stable governments have failed almost without exception. Why? I believe it is because of their failure to create a government which does not allow one man too much power. On a practical level, rhetoric aside, "Separation of Power" simply means that I am able to sit here composing this paper with absolutely no fear that President Reagan will one day be crowned king.

In recent years there have been a number of well-meaning citizens concerned over what they felt was an over-abundance of power invested in the Supreme court. "Isn't it true," they say, "that this judicial body is not specifically guaranteed the right to judical review." They claim that because the Supreme Court has the final word on any act of Congress, this body has become too powerful. At a cursory glance, it would appear the citizens have a right to be seriously worried. During the 1950's and 60's Congress became more and more concerned over what it felt were poor court decisions dealing with everything from busing to school prayer. But as has always occurred when American tradition seems threatened, the true strength of "Separation of Powers" manifested itself. In 1976 and 1979 Congress ruled against legislation that would have overturned the Supreme Court decisions. Through the almost 200 years since our Constitution has become law, there have been hundreds of heated debates over whether a branch of our government has become too powerful. Does this mean that the ability of the American system to control itself isn't alive and well? The mere fact that Congress has the opportunity to contradict the Supreme Court is answer enough.

The course of our nation can be compared to a river. At times our waters have boiled and raged, but they have never overflowed the banks created to contain them. The answer to the question of how well "Separation of Powers" works can be found in the fact that the American river is still on course. In retrospect, James Madison's loss of sleep seems ill-founded.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES: FREEDOM, EFFICIENCY, AND EFFECTIVENESS THROUGH "SEPARATION"

(By Ray Schmitz, Glenbard North High School)

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal . . ." Although these timeless words, established in the Declaration of Independence by Thomas Jefferson, are instantly recognizable, the phrase that followed, "It is the right of the people to institute government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness," is especially relevant because it seemed to foreshadow the plan of government which was to follow. This idea served as the prelude to the Constitution of the United States and the concept of "separation of powers" on which this doctrine is based. An analysis of the theoretical definition of this concept as well as its actual role in our government throughout history will lead to an insightful evaluation of its effectiveness.

By definition, the term "separation of powers" refers to the theoretical division of our government into three distinct branches: the legislative branch, the executive branch, and the judicial branch. Because each of the three major functions of

our government is so complex, this diversity necessitates "separation" and "specialization" in order to preserve the freedom and efficiency characteristic of the great democracy in which we live. This "separation" brings with it a system of checks and balances in which no governmental branch has supreme power. Because each branch has its own unique frame of reference, these separate branches view aspects in different ways and mutually "check" each other to keep the entire three-faceted network in "balance." In other words, the "separation of powers" was established in order to prevent any tyrannous concentration of power by our government.

In practice, because the spheres of influence of our governmental branches overlap, they are vested with the power to check each other's actions. To begin with, the President has the power to appoint all federal judges. However, this appointment, like treaty proposals, can only become reality through Congressional ratification, illustrating the multi-layered check on the judicial branch by the executive and legislative branches. Our Chief Executive also has the power to convene or adjourn Congress in certain instances and has the power to fill vacancies that occur during the recess of the Senate. He can veto laws and acts of Congress and has control over the Armed Forces of the United States due to his role as Commander-in-Chief on the military. On the other hand, the legislative branch can curtail these executive powers by overriding a presidential veto with a two-thirds vote in each Congressional House, by using its exclusive power to declare an official state of war, or by regulating political campaign expenditures on the part of the executive branch. The judiciary has the power to monitor the actions of both the executive and the legislative branches through the process of judicial review which stems back to the case of *Marbury* v. *Madison* at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Through this process, the judiciary checks the executive and legislative branches by ruling on the legality and constitutionality of laws and actions. As Alexander Hamilton so accurately stated, "Laws are a dead letter without courts to expound their true meaning and operation." Federal judges are therefore appointed for a lifetime tenure in order to maintain the independence of the federal judiciary by insuring that these judges cannot be punished for an unpopular or displeasing judicial decision. However, these federal judges are impeachable, as are all federal officers, illustrating how the three governmental branches are related through the mutual constraints they place upon each other.

As evidenced through both its theoretical and practical merits, the concept of "separation of powers" in our government is undoubtedly the fairest and most effective form which our American democracy could have taken. The "supreme" irony, however, is that our government has purposely and successfully divided in order to work as one. In other words, although the three branches of our government are independent of each other, they are at the same time dependent upon each other. They are related purely by their mutual desire to insure the virtues of democracy which this concept of "separation of powers" had established in the first place. These "powers," rather than competing and conflicting with one another, complement each other in an epitome of symbiosis. As James Madison and the other Founding Fathers had so optimistically anticipated, by diffusing governmental power into three branches, we have realistically upheld the ideology inherent in democracy itself. In essence, the value and effectiveness of the concept of "separation of powers" in our government is evidenced by the longevity of the United States Constitution itself, nearing its two hundredth birthday. After all, what is more accurate and revealing than the test of time itself?

THE SUCCESS OF SEPARATION OF POWERS
(By Lyle Brenner, Glenbard West High School)

In the mid-eighteenth century, Baron Charles de Montesquieu published The Spirit of the Laws, a book which attempted to analyze and explain the British government at that time. In his book, Montesquieu presented a system of government in which the government would be divided into three branches, each branch wielding an equal amount of power. There would be a system of checks and balances between the three branches, to prevent any one branch from becoming too powerful. This system was Montesquieu's view of how the British government worked at that time. He was mistaken, because Parliament has almost all of the power at that time. However, his work was not in vain. The rebelling British colonies adopted his ideas in their (our) Constitution. Today, this system of separation of powers is one of the United States' most powerful democratic concepts. The system works as both Montesquieu and the Founding Fathers had planned.

In the United States government, the power is divided among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. By dividing the power, the government is protected against a monarch. No one person can control all three branches. With no monarchial leader possible, the government is more likely to represent the needs of the people.

The system has worked reasonably well throughout American history. The system has succeeded in preventing monarchial leaders. Although some Presidents have been stronger than others, none has had total power over the government. In all cases, the actions of the Presidents have been affected by the mixture of authority of Congress and the Supreme Court. Likewise, the actions of Congress and the Court are modified by the executive branch. In practice, each branch compromises with the other two, preventing a tyrannical branch from gaining control.

The separation of powers system, besides protecting society from a monarch, provides a mixture of ideas in government. Since each branch compromises with the other two, every view finds an outlet in the government. This, again, places power in the hands of the people, and reinforces our democracy. If only one branch existed, some views would certainly not be represented. By separating power, more people are represented by the government, and are helped fairly by the government.

The places of the power divisions are fair and appropriate. Each branch is most powerful in one major aspect of the government. Each branch takes care of small details itself, but all of the branches work on the major political concepts. This set-up prevents quibbling over small details and, thusly, it makes the government more efficient.

Another successful aspect of the separation of powers system is that it protects the government from sudden, radical mood swings of the public. If our government had only one branch of power, a total governmental change could be easily brought about. However, by separating the power, and staggering the elections of the officeholders, the government does not change suddenly very easily. The composition of Congress and the Supreme Court tend to change quite slowly. This set-up lends itself to gradual changes, thus protecting the public and the government from irrational, ephemeral mood swings and making the government much more stable.

The separation of powers system has few negative points. However, in wartime, it can pose a problem. During war, a country often needs a single leader (the President) to control war strategy. If there is strife within the three branches during a war, matters are complicated immensely. A single-branch government is advantageous in this outstanding case.

By separating the power of our government the Founding Fathers, with help from Montesquieu, have helped to strengthen and stabilize our government. Also, the system helps to further the ideal of democracy through the nation. The system prevents a monarch from coming into power, provides a mixture of ideas in government, and makes the government more efficient. Montesquieu's ideas, mistakenly attributed to the British government, have helped to form the successful democratic government we have today.●

IN DEFENSE OF CIVIL SERVICE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been the pattern of this administration to recommend cuts in benefits and reductions in force for the civilian sector of the Federal Government, while encouraging the greatest peacetime defense buildup this Nation has ever experienced. The administration is quick to denigrate domestic programs, accuse them of being profligate and to call for their cancellation to reduce the deficit. However, the President is strangely permissive and forgiving of enormous cost overruns incurred by the Department of Defense's [DOD] procurement of expensive and often ineffective weapons systems. The savings accrued from following the administration's penurious proposals for cuts in the civil service would prove to be inconsequential when compared to the outlays for DOD programs. Congress could slash Federal employee benefits to the bone, and we still would not be much closer to balancing the budget.

In an effort to maintain a strong defense, we have created an industrial glutton. If anybody is slurping at the Federal trough, it is not the bureaucracy, but the defense industry in general. I personally support a strong defense and the maintenance of national readiness in order to meet any foreign challenge. I am also aware of many re-

liable and conscientious defense-related companies. However, the kind of gross overspending by the DOD, as evidenced in the disclosures about General Dynamics and General Electric and, especially in light of record deficits, is intolerable.

There is little incentive for many defense contractors to be conscientious when spending the taxpayers' money. In fact, defense contractors have little or no fear of being penalized by the Pentagon for waste or cost overruns due to the solicitous nature of the procurement process. This industry should be as carefully scrutinized as any other industry contracting work from the U.S. Government. The DOD is carrying on a courtship with defense contractors, while the administration is attacking its own civilian employees. In fiscal year 1984, the Federal Government paid more tax dollars—$122 billion—to just 13 top defense contractors than it spent on the combined salaries and retirement benefits of all civilian Federal employees.

Taxpayers literally pay the bills for the defense industry. Employees of defense contractors get paid 21 percent more than the average Federal employee, even after adjustment for higher skills and training. These inflated salaries can be found throughout the industry. The lowest annual pay for a chief executive among the top 10 defense contractors is just under $500,000; several earn more than twice that amount. DOD auditors found that security guards at 13 defense plants were earning as much as $26,000 a year more than guards at nearby commercial plants. Other studies show similar results for secretaries and janitors. Of all defense contract dollars, 70 percent are used to underwrite corporate wages. Is it fair that the employees of an industry that is supported by the Federal Government be compensated so generously, while civilian Federal employees are asked to make financial sacrifices?

The problem of overcompensation is compounded by unpenalized cost overruns by companies that do not provide quality work in a timely manner, as outlined in contractual agreements. For example, in 77 cases of shoddy construction work reviewed by DOD auditors in 1982, only once was the contractor forced to pay for his mistake. I support a strong defense and the idea of maintaining our defense industrial base, but I draw the line when it means excessive compensation costs that line the pockets of executives and administrators.

The Federal Government is willing to pay top dollar to defense contractors, who pay top salaries to their employees; but the sad fact is that we're getting fewer bangs for a lot more bucks. There is little evidence that the equipment the Pentagon purchases from the defense industry is worth the huge price tags. If we are going to ask Federal employees and retirees to take cuts in an attempt to balance the budget, it is absurd to be so extravagant in our defense spending. It is a slap in the face to Federal employees, and it belittles their sacrifices.

The fiscal year 1986 Federal budget is a continuation of the administration's attempt to cripple domestic programs. These program cutbacks mean tens of thousands of jobs will be lost. At the same time, the President is again boosting the defense budget. It is my feeling that there is easily $50 billion that can be cut from the defense budget. For example, I have been working in Congress to keep the star wars plan at the level of a prudent research program that it should be. If the President's strategic defense initiative budget is approved, the program will cost the taxpayer as much as $1 trillion by the time the system is fully deployed. In only the second year of star wars research funding, the price tag is $3.7 billion. We are financially committing our Nation to a program whose technological viability is yet untested and whose strategic implication could be globally destabilizing.

The defense buildup has created many civilian Federal jobs. Many domestic programs, however, have been reduced or cut to make room for defense spending, resulting in a net loss in Federal jobs. Instead of a prudent and responsible rate of growth in defense, this administration has created a boom/bust scenario. Because the bills on many of our defense systems will not be due for 5, 10, or 15 years—years in which the deficit will continue to grow—attempts to reduce the cost of defense will result in the recommendation to reduce the number of employees who are to administer these programs. In fact, this is already occurring. The Senate Budget Committee has recommended a reduction in Department of Defense personnel. Again, hardware takes precedence over individuals.

We must not allow defense considerations to outweigh our domestic commitments. Realistic retirement programs and a competitive payscale for civil servants must be preserved in order for the Federal Government to attract the best and the brightest in the service of our Nation. Otherwise, our ability to deliver vital assistance and necessary services to our citizens will be severely compromised.●

LEGISLATION TO INCREASE RATE OF DUTY ON BICYCLES

HON. WILLIAM HILL BONER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today legislation which would increase the rate of duty on imported bicycles and bicycle parts to 19 percent ad valorem. If enacted, this legislation would halt the dramatic escalation of imports that has been the cause of serious injury to the U.S. bicycle industry and its suppliers. Passage of this legislation would also ensure that the rate of duty on imported bicycles and bicycle parts is more consistent with the rates of duty currently maintained by the principal nations exporting these articles to the United States. I would note, for example, that Taiwan, by far the largest exporter of bicycles and a substantial exporter of bicycle parts to the United States, maintains a 35-percent tariff on imports of bicycles and a 30-percent tariff on imports of most bicycle parts.

A review of recent import trends clearly demonstrates the compelling need for this legislation. In 1982, bicycle imports accounted for 23 percent of the U.S. market, a sharp jump from the 1979 import penetration level of 17 percent. In 1983, the situation worsened with imports dominating 30 percent of the U.S. market in that year. Indeed, the Taiwanese increased the volume of their imports from 976,000 units during 1982 to 1.9 million units during 1983. Significantly, imports from Taiwan accounted for 71 percent of total imports in that year.

Moreover, there is no relief in sight. In 1984, when I first introduced a similar version of this bill, imports captured 42 percent of the domestic market, an excessive 12-percentage point increase in a brief 1-year period. In terms of absolute volume, imports were more than 56 percent higher in 1984 than they were a year earlier. Imports from Taiwan alone increased 69 percent between 1983 and 1984 and accounted for 77 percent of total imports. Furthermore, through January 1985, total imports accounted for over 50 percent of the domestic market, growing 16 percent over the same period 1 year ago.

Similar trends have characterized the components market, with the total value of imported bicycle parts increasing from $126.1 million in 1982 to $189.5 million in 1984. This constitutes a growth rate of 50 percent. Moreover, in the last 2 years, import penetration in this market has expanded sharply from an already strong 65-percent base to more than 75 percent of the parts consumed in 1984.

As a result of this dramatic escalation of imports, the health of the U.S bicycle industry and its suppliers has deteriorated sharply. In 1984, 5.9 million bicycles were shipped by domestic manufacturers, a figure which was 32 percent below the level of 1979 and more than 6-percent below the 1983 level. This decline is especially noteworthy since the U.S. market for bicycles increased by more than 12 percent between 1983 and 1984; thus, absolutely all of the market growth, plus a portion of the market share previously held by U.S. producers, was taken by imports. In January 1985, domestic shipments were down 16-percent over the same period 1 year ago. Needless to say, the industry's financial performance has been adversely affected by these trends.

Employment in this industry has also declined significantly as a result of these import trends. Production worker employment among bicycle manufacturers alone in 1983 was 20-percent below the level of 1981. Moreover, in 1984, the level of production worker employment was more than 18 percent below the level of 1983. Among U.S. parts producers, employment in 1984 was only half of what it was in 1980. The remaining 15,000 jobs in the bicycle and bicycle parts industries are threatened by a continuation of the current import surge.

The surge in imported bicycles and bicycle parts that began in 1983 shows every sign of continuing into 1985 and beyond. I therefore urge the Congress to take the necessary steps to halt this trend through the enactment of this legislation, which would enable U.S. producers to compete with those foreign manufacturers who have taken unfair advantage of the openness of the U.S. market, at a time when their own markets remain closed to outside competition.●

WE MUST OPPOSE RACISM AND DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, for the last several days students at colleges and universities across our Nation have been holding rallies opposing investment in South Africa and urging their university administrations to withdraw investment in American corporations with holdings in South Africa.

One of the more important of these rallies is being held at my alma mater—the University of California, Berkeley. At that rally today, Mr. David Levin, a student at the University from Daly City, CA, who served on my congressional staff last year will read a statement on my behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the members of the House to know that I am appalled and outraged at the racism and discrimination practiced by the Government of South Africa. The statement which will be read in Berkeley today is as follows:

I congratulate you students here at my own alma mater who are raising this most important issue. Americans—like you—are speaking up across our Nation, and they will be heard.

The administration's policy of constructive engagement has failed to change this most repugnant and abhorrent system of apartheid in South Africa, which challenges our fundamental beliefs about principles of equality and justice.

Human rights and the fight against discrimination are firmly supported by the American people. We can no longer stand aside, we can no longer remain silent in the face of such egregious violations of human rights.

Luthern Pastor Martin Niemoller an opponent of the policies of Nazi Germany, gives the justification when he said:

First Hitler came after the labor unions and I did not speak up because I was not a union member. Then Hitler came for the Jews, and I did not speak up because I was not a Jew. Then Hitler attacked the Catholics, and I did not speak up because I was not Catholic. When he came for me no one was left to speak up.

I know you will be interested to know that along with my good friend Congressman BILL GRAY, the distinguished chairman of the House Budget Committee, and a number of other colleagues in Congress, I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985.

This legislation imposes stringent economic sanctions against South Africa. It prohibits new investment by American companies in South Africa, prohibits U.S. bank loans to public agencies in South Africa, prohibits the importing of Krugerrands into the United States, and prohibits the export of American computer equipment to South Africa.

It is critically important that those of us who feel strongly against discrimination continue to provide leadership against apartheid, as we did in the last session of Congress by voting to ban new U.S. investment in South Africa. We must continue to send a clear and unequivocal signal to the executive branch of our own Government that a new direction in U.S. policy toward South Africa is necessary.

Apartheid remains one of the most abhorrent and repugnant authoritarian systems in the world. South Africa's policy of state-sponsored, state-enforced racism and discrimination must be fought by freedom loving men and women everywhere.●

NANCY REAGAN'S INTERNATIONAL DRUG CONFERENCE

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a Washington Post editorial regarding Nancy Reagan's fight against drug abuse. Mrs. Reagan deserves our applause for her personal commitment and important contributions to what is an extremely serious problem throughout the world. The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 25, 1985]

NANCY REAGAN'S DRUG CAMPAIGN

This city is rough on the spouses of its wielders of power, and most of all on the wife of the president of the United States. Whoever she is, she operates by borrowing the earned authority of her husband, and she is constantly reminded that she is something of an interloper. She has no official duties, but she is accountable unofficially to a vast fight of eagle-eyed obsevers. In these circumstances, it is hard to do much right.

Nancy Reagan, however, has done something extremely right. She has thrown herself into the fight against drug abuse with vigor and intelligence. If she had simply been shopping for a worthy cause, she might have picked a homier, more heartwarming or more photogenic one. Instead, she picked a relatively ungainly and untended one where her particular contribution could be of special value: to display a personal commitment and to use the public's, the media's and even the bureaucracy's inevitable interest in her to draw others to the cause.

The conference that Mrs. Reagan is running yesterday and today is a good illustration of her work. In an unprecedented initiative, she has brought together the wives of the leaders of 17 foreign countries in order to publicize the global nature of drug abuse—and of caring about drug abuse. This latter element emerged strongly from the conference yesterday. The women attending seemed quite aware of the limitations of what they in their particular role can do. There was evident however, an awareness of the human dimension of the drug problems in their respective countries, and of the requirement for a stronger community of concern rooted in family values and family ways.

Does it make a difference in the end? How can it not make a difference for the idea to spread that drug abuse compels the alarm and the informed attention or responsible women like these? Their governments, while all friendly to the United States, are not all equally cooperative and like-minded in the often very political matter of drug cooperation. Such difficulties are not to be swept under the rug, but the personal warmth and the shared purpose evident at the conference are important assets. For using the resources of her position to increase them, Mrs. Reagan deserves gratitude.●

FDA APPROVAL LABELING ACT

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with Mr. MADIGAN, the distinguished ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, in introducing H.R. 2244, the FDA Approval Labeling Act.

While we have made one minor change, this is the same bill which passed the House of Representatives last year by voice vote. The bill was originally requested by the Food and Drug Administration.

The FDA Approval Labeling Act permits the manufacturers of prescription drugs to state "FDA Approved" followed by the approval number in their drug label and advertising.

Currently, section 301(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act prohibits drug manufacturers from making any representation regarding FDA approval in their label or advertising. During our hearing last year, the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment heard numerous complaints from pharmacists about section 301(1) because of the difficulty of determining whether a drug has been approved by FDA. In fact, the terrible tragedy surrounding the unapproved drug, E-Ferol, might never have happened had this bill been law last year. E-Ferol was given to premature infants and is believed to be responsible for over 30 deaths. The drug was sold without FDA approval, but pharmacists at the hospitals where it was used had no way of knowing of its unapproved status.

Others have questioned the constitutionality of section 301(1)'s absolute ban on statements regarding FDA approval. Recent Supreme Court decisions have extended first amendment protections to commercial statements that are accurate and not misleading, such as whether a drug has FDA approval.

The FDA Approval Labeling Act addresses these concerns in two ways. First, the bill requires that all approved prescription drugs manufactured 18 months after enactment be labeled as FDA approved followed by the approval number. Second, the legislation permits drug manufacturers to use the approval statement in their promotional materials and advertising in accordance with current FDA regulations.

H.R. 2244

A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to remove the prohibition against stating in the labeling and advertising of a drug that it has been approved under that Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "FDA Approval Labeling Act".

SEC. 2. LAW AMENDMENTS.

(a) SECTION 301.—Section 301(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 331(1)) is amended by striking out "The" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) Except as provided in section 505(k), the".

(b) SECTION 505.—Section 505 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 355) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(k) A drug which is subject to section 503(b)(1) and which has an application approved for safety and effectiveness under this section may include on its label the statement 'FDA Approved' followed by the number assigned to the application by the Secretary and, upon the expiration of eighteen months from the date of the enactment of this subsection, such a drug which is manufactured after the expiration of such months shall include such statement and number. Such a drug may also include, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, such statement and number in its advertising and in any labeling (other than the label).".

SEC. 3. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, not later than one year from the date of the enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations under the last sentence of section 505(k) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (as added by subsection (b) of section 1).●

NIE REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1985

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to extend and improve the National Institute of Education. I am including in this statement a section-by-section analysis of the legislation and the legislation itself.

NIE REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1985

SECTION 1

Title: NIE Reauthorization Act of 1985.

SECTION 2

Extends the authorization for one year at "such sums."

SECTION 3

Changes the Council from a policy making body to advisory and provides for their appointment by the Secretary of Education instead of the President.

Requires that the Chairperson be elected at an announced open meeting.

Requires that eight Council members shall represent the interests of education organizations that utilize educational research.

Eliminates the Council's link to the Assistant Secretary and has the Council report to the Secretary and the Director.

Changes the language so that it is gender-free, e.g. "chairperson" instead of "chairman."

Adds new language that prohibits Council members from using Institute or Council Staff, facilities, equipment, supplies, or franking privileges to promote personal or political views or values.

SECTION 4

Existing language requires Council to make annual report to President and the Congress. This bill moves this function to the Director of NIE.

Changes language that requires Director to report to Assistant Secretary; new language has Director reporting directly to the Secretary.

SECTION 5

Sets effective date as October 1, 1985.

Terminates terms of existing Council members effective September 30, 1985.

H.R. —

A bill to extend and improve the National Institute of Education

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Institute of Education Reauthorization Act of 1985".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 405 of the General Educaition Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221e) (hereinafter in this Act referred to as "the Act") is amended in subsection (j) by striking out paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(j)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1986 to carry out the provisions of this section.".

SEC. 3. COMPOSITION AND FUNCTIONING OF COUNCIL.

(a) APPOINTMENT BY SECRETARY.—

(1) Section 405(c)(1) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) The Council shall consist of fifteen members appointed by the Secretary. The Director shall be a nonvoting ex-officio member of the Council. A majority of the members of the Council shall constitute a quorum. The chairperson of the Council shall be elected by the Council from among the members at a meeting open to the general public for which public notice has been given. The members of the Council shall be broadly representative of the education profession, including practitioners and researchers, and shall include individuals with special knowledge of the various fields of education that predominate at the preschool, elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels. Not less than eight of the members of the Council shall represent the interests of education organizations that utilize educational research to enhance learning and other positive school-related behaviors.".

(2) The first sentence of section 405(c)(2) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking out "President," and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary,";

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking out "his predecessor" and inserting in lieu thereof "such member's predecessor"; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking out "and confirmed by the Senate by such date"; and

(ii) by striking out at the end of such subparagraph "and confirmed".

(b) COUNCIL'S RESPONSIBILITIES.—The first sentence of section 405(c)(3) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

"(A) advise the Secretary and the Director on general policies for the conduct of the Institute;";

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking out "assistant";

(3) in subparagraph (C) by striking out "Assistant Secretary and the Director such recommendations as it may deem appropriate" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary and the Director recommendations";

(4) in subparagraph (E) by striking out "Assistant Secretary" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary and the Director";

(5) by striking out subparagraph (F) and redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph "(F)"; and

(6) in subparagraph (F) (as so redesignated in paragraph (5)) by striking out "Chairman," and inserting in lieu thereof "chairperson,".

(c) LIMITATION ON ACTIVITIES.—Section 405(c) of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) Neither the Council, nor any member of the Council, may use Institute or Council staff, facilities, equipment, supplies, or franking privileges to promote personal or political views or values.".

SEC. 4. DIRECTOR'S FUNCTIONS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 405(e) of the Act is amended by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) The Director shall submit an annual report to the President and the Congress on the activities of the Institute and on education and educational research in general which (A) shall include such recommendations and comments as the Director considers appropriate, and (B) shall be submitted not later than March 31 of each year.".

(b) REPORT TO SECRETARY.—The second sentence of section 405(d)(1) of the Act is amended by striking out "Assistant Secretary and shall report to the Secretary through the Assistant Secretary and not to or through any other offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The provisions of this Act shall take effect October 1, 1985, except that the terms of members of the National Council on Educational Research appointed under section 405 of the Act, as in effect on the day before the effective date of this Act, shall terminate on September 30, 1985.●

NINTH ANNUAL SWEET POTATO AFFAIR

HON. CATHY LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mrs. LONG. Mr. Speaker, the golden sunshine of spring calls to mind that most nutritious of foods—the delicious golden yam. Today, April 25, we are observing the ninth annual "Sweet Potato Affair," to celebrate the flavor and nutritional value of this excellent vegetable.

Our Nation is enjoying an upsurge of attention to our health and physical condition. We've learned that the kinds and amounts of food we eat can have a definite effect on our well-being.

In fact, the National Academy of Sciences recently came up with a number of suggestions on how our diet can affect our susceptibility to several diseases, including cancer. One of the recommendations was that we eat more fruits and vegetables rich in vitamins A and C.

These new facts make our annual "Yam Day," with its goal of encouraging greater consumption of the Nation's sweet potatoes, even more worthwhile. One sweet potato proudly claims 9,230 units of vitamin A, a greater proportion than almost any other comparable food.

The yam is a natural way to satisfy our sweet tooth without adding sugar, and without gaining weight. A medium baked sweet potato adds only 82 calories to a meal.

Bake them, mash them or, for an occasional treat, serve them candied. Sweet potatoes are especially good with poultry and pork, and don't forget that Southern favorite, sweet potato pie.

Because we have such a plentiful yam harvest, the Government uses large amounts of sweet potatoes in its food programs for the military and for schoolchildren. Since a major concern of these programs is to provide foods with a high nutritional value and tasty flavor, the Louisiana yam is custom made. Yams have three great characteristics that make them ideal for Government feeding programs: they are extremely nutritious, they are very versatile and can be prepared in many different ways, and they have a natural sweet taste that people—especially children—enjoy.

I encourage the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense to continue and increase their purchases of sweet potatoes, and hope that purchasing decisions will be made as early as possible to assist production planning.●

COMMEMORATING ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1985

● Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 70th anniversary of what has been termed as the first genocide of the 20th century, occurring in Turkey during the First World War. The periodic deprivations of Armenian lives, lands, and other properties by successive Turkish Governments reached an appalling climax in 1915. Over 1.5 million Armenians were murdered or displaced between 1915 and 1923.

It is important for our future that this grim segment of history be recognized as an historical fact. All the world should know the truth of what occurred on April 24, 1915, as stated by Archbishop Mesrob Ashjian.

The cream of the Armenian leadership and intelligentsia became the target of coordinated arrests throughout the length and breadth of Turkey. Educators, clergy, and even Armenian members of the Turkish Parliament were forcibly removed from their homes, and later summarily executed without charges or trial.

Thousands of Armenians were subsequently persecuted. And now, if anything good is to rise out of this tragic time, it will be grounded in the knowledge of the truth. Let us hope that future generations, in their attempts to build a better world, will wisely use these tools of truth that they inherit. This is why I have long supported and promoted the recognition of the Armenian genocide by our Nation and by all the nations of this world.

Elie Wiesel, in his acceptance of the Congressional Medal of Achievement, related that in the last 40 years, he had, "learned the perils of language and those of silence * * * learned that in extreme situations when human lives are at stake, neutrality is a sin. It helps the killers, not the victims." I believe that the story of the 1.5 million Armenians who perished must be told over and over again for the sake of honor and with hope in the future.●

OCCASION OF THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1985

● Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this week we commemorate the 70th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Throughout World War I and for 5 years thereafter, the Ottoman Empire engaged in a most brutal war against its Armenian subjects; 1,500,000 Armenians died of execution, starvation, or disease and 500,000 were exiled from their historic homeland.

During those dark days, voices, including our own, were raised to the Ottoman Empire, imploring them to end the Armenian persecutions. Sixty-four years ago the Congress of the United States helped to document this slaughter of the Armenian people. And the American people, too, opened their hearts to the victims of persecution. Near East Relief, an aid organization chartered by the U.S. Congress, contributed some $113 million between 1915 and 1930 to aid the Armenian genocide survivors; 132,000 orphans became foster children of the American people. Our own communities thrive because of the contributions of these survivors.

We cannot undo the crimes against and the suffering of past victims, but we can stand as witnesses that history

will not be forgotten and that it will not be rewritten.●

COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF USA ENTERS NEW ERA IN 69TH YEAR

HON. JAN MEYERS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the annual meeting of the Cooperative League of the USA takes place in Washington next week, April 29 to May 1. That occasion offers us an opportunity to reflect upon the institution of cooperative business and praise the job that the Cooperative League has done over the years since its founding in 1916 to further the cause of cooperative business.

The Cooperative League of the USA is a national membership and trade association representing America's cooperative business community. The league serves as a chamber of commerce for cooperative businesses, representing the unique and mutual needs of the various industries.

Membership includes farm supply, agricultural marketing, insurance, banking, housing, health care, consumer goods and services, student, credit union, worker, fishery, rural electric, telephone, State associations, and other types of cooperatives.

The Cooperative League program includes:

Supporting the development and expansion of cooperative businesses in the United States;

Representing the cooperative business community in Washington, DC, through the legislative, policy, and regulatory advocacy before Congress and Federal agencies.

Developing, building, and providing technical assistance to cooperatives in lesser developed countries;

Representing American cooperatives to the world cooperative business community through membership in the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA);

Promoting and developing international commerce, banking, insurance, trade, joint ventures, and other business interconnections by and among the world's cooperatives.

There is much more, Mr. Speaker. Over the years, the Cooperative League has developed a number of related entities that pursue specific missions in close coordination with the Cooperative League. They include the Cooperative League Fund, the Cooperative League Political Action Committee, the Cooperative Hall of Fame and Historical Society, the Rochdale Institute, and Cooperative Business International.

I know my colleagues join me in congratulating the Cooperative League of the USA for 69 years of splendid service to America's cooperatives and wishing the league well in its endeavors over the next 69 years.●

A TRIBUTE TO HENRY OSSIAN FLIPPER

HON. CHARLES HATCHER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. HATCHER. Mr. Speaker, April 26 marks the 45th anniversary of the death of Henry Ossian Flipper, the first black graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Born a slave on March 21, 1856, in Thomasville, GA, which is in my home district, Lieutenant Flipper lived an extraordinary life filled with many outstanding accomplishments. He had not only the intelligence, but also the pride, stamina, and indomitable courage to complete 4 years of study at West Point in the unfriendly environment prevalent during the early reconstruction era.

After graduation, Lieutenant Flipper's 50 year span of activities included being a cavalry officer, surveyor, cartographer, civil and mining engineer, published author, newspaper editor, special agent for the U.S. Department of Justice, assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, and pioneer in the Nation's oil industry. He also worked in a rugged environment in many western frontier communities as they were being developed. He became a legend in the territory, where his West Point discipline, civil engineering training, and social ideas were put to use in border disputes, mining claims, irrigation projects, and land development.

Earlier this year an application was made to the Postmaster General, the Honorable Paul N. Carlin, to request the issuance of a commemorative stamp in honor of Lieutenant Flipper. I ask my distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in support of this worthy project by writing a letter of endorsement to Postmaster Carlin. Americans deserve to know about this hero and inspiration to our youth—Lt. Henry Ossian Flipper.●

THE TRAGEDY OF ARMENIA

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1985

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I join my friends on this solemn occasion. This week we remember the fate of thousands of innocent Armenians who died 70 years ago. It was truly one of the real tragic moments in world history.

This Armenian holocaust was followed around the world by other equally brutal ones. Who can forget the Nazi genocide of the Jews, the forced labor camps of Siberia, and Stalin's planned starvation of millions of Ukrainians?

In the past, forces of evil and hate pushed aside the rule of reason and law. Men of goodwill were intimidated and banished. In tragic result was the deaths of members of a race, an ethnic group, a religion, or a social class. That is why we are here. By remembering past tragedies that defy imagination, we will ensure that these sins against the innocent will never happen again. This is our commitment to past generations. This is our promise to generations to come. Let us again commit ourselves to ensuring that this will never happen again.●

CONGRESSMAN MILLER SALUTES VETERANS ON HISTORIC ANNIVERSARY

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago today—April 25, 1945—the American and Soviet Armies, together with other Allied forces, met at the Elbe River in Germany and unified for the final assault against Nazi Germany.

Within a few weeks, Hitler and most of his lieutenants were dead; Nazi Germany prostrate; Europe liberated and the Allies victorious. On this 40th anniversary of that historic meeting at the Elbe, we should recall the common peace we sought with the Soviet Union, and the need to reactivate the search for a way to reduce the terrible threat of war which has hung over the uneasy peace between our nations since 1945.

It is interesting to note that before the United States and Soviet troops on opposite sides of the Elbe established their identities, there were several hours of gunfire exchanged. When each side realized who the other was, however, champagne and handshakes replaced the gunfire, and the soldiers of both nations congratulated their counterparts for their success and their sacrifice.

Today, 40 years later, it is the hope of hundreds of millions of people in both the Soviet Union and the United States that we silence the diplomatic gunfire and establish a firm and longstanding peace reminiscent of those cordial relations on the Elbe.

But there is something else, equally inmportant, for us to remember today. And that is the great burdens borne, and the great sacrifices made by the men and women who fought in World

War II and who made that day at the Elbe possible.

Millions of Americans served in our Armed Forces during World War II. Hundreds of thousands became casualties of that conflict. To those men and women, and to the veterans of all our wars, we who have lived in peace because of their sacrifice owe an unrepayable debt.

It has been said, especially of our Vietnam veterans, that this Nation has not done enough for our former soldiers upon their return home. Looking at the sacrifices made not only during World War II and Vietnam, but during all of our conflicts, I frankly doubt that we could do enough to those who served and the survivors of those who gave their lives in defense of this Nation.

So on this 40th anniversary, let us commemorate not only those of the 69th Division who took part in that meeting at the Elbe, but our Nation's veterans in general. And let us use this opportunity to once again, recommit ourselves to the defense of liberty, knowing full well the great burdens and sacrifices that liberty demands of those fortunate few who enjoy it.●

INTRODUCTION OF URANIUM MILL TAILINGS LEGISLATION

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues here today in introducing legislation which addresses a serious environmental and health concern for many parts of the United States—active uranium mill tailings across the country which have not been cleaned up or reclaimed in any way.

Our uranium mill tailings cleanup legislation will virtually guarantee the safe disposal of currently licensed mill tailings and thus abate any potential health hazards attributable to them. Further, this bill includes a fair and equitable allocation of the costs of cleanup between the uranium producers, the Federal Government, and those who have benefited from nuclear power. This bill recognizes that at least 30 percent of the tailings are the result of defense work for the Atomic Energy Commission and are, therefore, properly chargeable to the Federal Government.

The uranium mill tailings cleanup bill is especially important to the domestic uranium industry. The domestic uranium industry is vital to our national security and our energy independence, yet it is in a very depressed condition. Employment has gone from 22,000 workers to 2,000 workers nationwide. Over 7,000 of these unemployed miners are New Mexicans. Indeed, New Mexico, once our Nation's prime uranium producing State, now has only one mill operating, which is in danger of a shutdown in the near future. Hopefully, along with eliminating the environmental and health hazards resulting from these mill tailings, this legislation will assist the domestic uranium industry in this time of severe financial crisis.●

IRONBOUND EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL CENTER AWARDS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize the winners of this year's Outstanding Service Awards given by the Ironbound Educational and Cultural Center.

The center has been a pivotal part of the community life in the Ironbound section of Newark, and is committed to expanding the educational, social, and cultural opportunities of this multiethnic community. Three outstanding individuals were honored for their participation in the center and in the civic activities of the Ironbound area.

A.R. "Bud" Gennet served as president and chairman of the board of Serta Mattress Co., which was founded by this parents in 1910. In addition to this extremely successful business career, Bud Gennet has played a tremendous role in community activities throughout his life. He served as chairman of the Salvation Army Ironbound Boys & Girls Clubs; president of the Ironbound Educational and Cultural Center; president of the New Jersey division of the American-Israel Chamber of Commerce; and was the recipient of the Leadership Citation Award from the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Joseph Parlavecchio is the principal of the Dayton Street School in Newark. He has had an active political career, as a member of the Essex County boards of chosen freeholders. He serves on numerous boards and commissions in Essex County and is greatly involved in health and environmental issues affecting the people of our community.

Joseph Parlapiano, an attorney, has served as legal counsel to the Ironbound Educational and Cultural Center, and has been appointed acting judge of the Newark Municipal Court. In his legal career, he has served as hearing officer with the New Jersey Department of Labor and as general attorney with the Immigration and Naturalization Service, in addition to his years in private practice. I have known Joe Parlapiano and his wife Catherine for many years, as Catherine's father, Tony Suriano, is my administrative assistant in my Newark office.

To all of the three awardees, I send my best wishes and congratulations on this very special honor.●

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST LEGAL GAMING

HON. HARRY REID

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Nevada, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, joined me last week in introducing two bills which seek to curb discrimination against patrons of legal gaming establishments.

Currently, the IRS requires taxpayers to itemize returns in order to deduct legal gaming losses. Past studies have shown that almost half of the players reporting winnings take the standard deduction, and thus are unfairly deprived of tax credit for their losses. H.R. 2126 provides a remedy by allowing a deduction of net gaming losses from gross income.

In 1976, the Federal Commission on the Review of the National Policy Toward Gambling noted that, statistically, few players realize net gains over the long term. Thus, the facts refute claims of perceived tax liability and the need for compliance requirements in most circumstances.

In addition, H.R. 2126 would provide a logical, consistent and necessary component to any tax-reform measure. As debate unfolds in the coming months on the overhaul of our Tax Code, I will strongly urge that equity in this area receives the attention it deserves.

The Commission, in its final report, recommended that Congress ensure the freedom of competition between legal and illegal gambling operations. This, they concluded, will be accomplished only by restoring equity to Federal tax laws. Organized illegal gambling persists in this country because current Federal tax treatment of legal payouts gives the illegal operator a price advantage that legal operators cannot possibly overcome.

In this regard, we have also introduced H.R. 2125, to disallow aggregation of identical parimutuel wagers in order to achieve levels subject to withholding. The sums collected by the IRS through these channels are vastly overshadowed by the loss in State and local revenue. In particular, unfair tax discrimination against the bettor assails not only parimutuel revenues, but suppresses the livelihood of the agribusiness sector, a major source of employment in many States and localities.

Mr. Speaker, tax reform in these areas is of vital concern to the thousands of patrons and employees in the 30 States with legal parimutuel operations, those with State lotteries, and of course my home State of Nevada.

I urge prompt atttention to these concerns.●

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, along with Congressman ED MADIGAN of Illinois, the ranking minority member of the Agriculture Committee, a resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Program.

This is an important milestone in history. Just 50 years ago, in May 1935, President Roosevelt created the Rural Electrification Administration by an Executive order and we were launched into one of the greatest eras of change and progress in our Nation's history.

Out of that first step came the development of a nationwide network of rural electric cooperatives. Men and women in every part of the country, working in partnership with the REA Program, began the development of a new rural America—a new America in which power paved the way to revolutionary progress in agricultural productivity, and to dramatic new strides toward building the economy of rural areas and the quality of life outside our giant cities.

Since 1961 alone, for instance, REA borrowers have helped to establish and expand more than 20,000 commercial and industrial enterprise and community facilities—development that has created nearly 1 million new jobs.

The resolution we are introducing today expresses the sense of the House that this 50th anniversary should be recognized and commemorated by the people, and by Federal and State agencies. Also, our resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the Rural Electrification Program must continue to provide access to credit and technical assistance at reasonable cost to ensure, in the words of the resolution "that the modern living standards of rural Americans and the quality of their communities are preserved through access to reliable and competitively priced electricity."

I hope all Members of the House will join me and Mr. MADIGAN in sponsoring this resolution.●

SUWANNEE COUNTY DEDICATES PARK COMPLEX

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I have long and often maintained that the constituents of Florida's Second Congressional District are without equal, but, today, I am compelled to repeat myself. On this day, the citizens of Live Oak and Suwannee County are dedicating the Suwannee County Museum Park Complex, a testament to commitment and perseverence.

Over a year ago, these citizens learned that two railroad depots located in Live Oak were to be demolished in the interest of progress. Mr. James Crapps, Mrs. Laura Helvenston, and Mr. Mike Herrell, all of Live Oak, began negotiations with the owners to preserve the depots, which had played such an integral part in the city's past. They were able to secure the depots as a donation from Seaboard System Railroad with the small string attached that one building had to be moved within 60 days and the property under the other hand to be purchased to the tune of $25,000. Since Suwannee County has under 25,000 residents all totaled, I don't have to point out that $25,000 was, indeed, a substantial sum of money. Further the citizens learned that the cost of moving the other depot would be $86,000.

At this point, you or I might have given up on the project, but the citizens of Suwannee County took it as a challenge, and one that could be mastered. Since that time, concerned individuals have been able to raise over $50,000 and their goal is $100,000 more. Today's dedication is testament to the fact that the money is as good as in the bank.

Although I could individually praise the entire population of this county, I do want to personally commend the steering committee of the park complex, by whose efforts the depot was moved and the first $50,000 raised. Daniel Crapps, Zoe Townsend, Jerry Scarborough, Sam Carter, George Knight, Vernell Johnson, Carol Herring, Virginia Engstrom, Bill Howard, Mary McLeod, Pam Mantooth, Myron Holmes, Wesley Goff, Seymour Chotiner and, of course, James Crapps, Laura Helvenston, and Mike Herrell are to be congratulated on this special day.

As Laura Helvenston put it not long ago, "If the citizens of Live Oak and Suwannee County decide they want to do something, they just do it." To that statement I can only add, they surely do.●

RAY McDONALD ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take a moment to recognize and honor Mr. Chris Dakajos, the recipient of the Ray McDonald Community Achievement Award for the month of April 1985.

Chris Dakajos presently owns seven McDonald's restaurants on the southwest side of Chicago and one in Hickory Hills. This award was given to Chris for his dedication and service to the community.

Chris became a member of the southwest side community of Chicago in 1967 with the purchase of his first McDonald's at 6720 West Archer Avenue. However, he did not begin his career in the restaurant business but as a tool and die maker. He was also in the automobile business for some 20 years.

During the first several months of operating his newly acquired McDonald's, Chris and his wife, Evelyn, worked day and night trying to build it into the restaurant they thought it could be. For many nights Chris would sleep on the potato sacks in the basement because he was either too tired to go home or he had too much work to do early the next morning. Chris was a firm believer in Ray Kroc's formula for operating a successful restaurant business. The three ingredients being the highest quality products, service that is prompt and courteous, and most importantly cleanliness. Chris also believed that a strong marketing base was a necessity. He and Evelyn went door to door in the neighborhood introducing themselves and offering coupons to come and try the McDonald's products.

From the beginning Chris' top priority was geting involved in the community. He has actively supported mayor-sponsored youth programs, little league teams, bowling leagues, church programs, and several school programs. He is also a member of the local chamber of commerce.

Chris has frequently been recognized by McDonald's for his restaurants, decor, playland, and landscaping designs. He has also served as an officer and director of the Chicagoland McDonald's Association.

On a national basis, Chris is a fundraiser for the Shriner's Crippled Children Hospitals, and he is an active supporter of muscular dystrophy and Ronald House charities.

Taking into account all of his restaurants, Chris currently has some 500 employees, primarily young persons. His employment philosophy has

always been to make sure his young employees have a positive experience at the workplace so as to prepare them for their careers. Chris strongly believes in hiring his employees from the community and promoting from crew to management. For example, Wayne Adamczyk, his operations director, started with Chris 16 years ago as a crewperson. Chris's two children, John and Stephanie, are also actively involved in the business.

A lot has changed in the 18 years since Chris took over the red and white tiled McDonald's on Archer Avenue. The original restaurant has been remodeled three times and now has the largest McDonald's playland on Chicago's south side, reflecting the growth and change of the neighborhood. Although Chris cannot possibly be as active as he would like to be in all of his McDonald's restaurants, he has an excellent supervisory and management staff.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank Chris Dakajos for his dedication and unselfishness throughout the years to the youth and the community of the southwest side of Chicago. He is a model businessman who has truly earned the Ray McDonald Community Achievement Award for the month of April 1985.●

EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, today I and two of my colleagues—the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KINDNESS]—are introducing legislation to extend and clarify certain provisions of the Equal Access to Justice Act (title II, Public Law 96-481). The act expands the liability of the United States for attorneys' fees and related expenses when it loses in certain adversary adjudications and civil actions.

The major part of the act covers cases and proceedings which were filed before October 1, 1984. The act, which has been in effect since October 1981, has been particularly helpful to small businesses and other persons of limited resources. Less than $5 million has been awarded under the act.

During the last days of the 98th Congress, H.R. 5479, a bill to extend certain provisions of the act and to clarify it, was passed unanimously and sent to the President. Unfortunately, the President vetoed it after the Congress had adjourned.

This year my colleagues and I have worked with the administration, the small business community, and other persons to improve the legislation. The legislation which is being introduced today clarifies that the United States will be liable unless the position of the Government—including the litigation position as well as the action or failure to act by the Government upon which the proceeding or action is based—is substantially justified, or unless special circumstances would make an award unjust. Eligibility would be limited to individuals with a net worth of $2 million or less businesses with $7 million or less.

The legislation allows the agency rather than the adjudicative officer to make the final decision on fee awards at the agency level. A party dissatisfied with the award may appeal the denial of or measure of the award. The legislation makes other improvements in the act. The legislation is a priority issue for the small business community, and is a valuable vehicle for improving access to justice.

A hearing is scheduled on the legislation on April 30, 1985, in room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building. Witnesses include representatives of the U.S. Department of Justice and the small business community. I welcome cosponsors for the legislation.●

REPEAL DEFERRAL PROVISION IN IMPOUNDMENT CONTROL ACT

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill to repeal the deferral provision in the Impoundment Control Act (title X of Public Law 93-344). Under this act, deferrals must be proposed by the President whenever any executive action or inaction effectively precludes the obligation or expenditure of budget authority. In such cases, the President is to submit a special message to the Congress recommending the deferral of that budget authority. The President is required to make such budget authority available for obligation if either House passes an "impoundment resolution" disapproving the proposed deferral at any time after receipt of the special message.

The Supreme Court in INS versus Chadha invalidated a one-House legislative veto in the Immigration and Nationality Act in terms so sweeping as to render suspect all such legislative veto devices. Under the Chadha rationale, the one-house disapproval of Presidential deferrals of budget authority would likely be held unconstitutional.

In reviewing the history of the Impoundment Control Act, it is highly unlikely that the Congress, on the heels of nearly unanimous judicial rejection of Presidential impoundment authority and as part of comprehensive legislation designed to wrest control of the budget process from the President, would have delegated such an impoundment without the one-House legislative veto check.

Currently, the only way for the Congress to disapprove a deferral is to proceed as if it were a rescission. Thus, a joint resolution—passed by both Houses and signed into law by the President—is the only procedure available to reject a deferral.

The bill I am introducing today would simply repeal the deferral provision (section 1013 of Public Law 93-344), thus directing the executive branch to use the rescission (section 1012 of Public Law 93-344) process for any rejections of spending authority. This bill will restore the constitutional balance of authority between the Congress and the President when the Impoundment Control Act was signed into law.●

ELIMINATE ICC REGULATION OF FROZEN FOOD TRANSPORT

HON. JIM MOODY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, this year we in Congress are quite properly putting heavy emphasis on squeezing all the fat we can out of the Federal budget, and eliminating unnecessary Federal regulations which constrict productive private enterprise.

I am pleased to have been associated with a very successful program of this kind in Wisconsin, the deregulation of truck transport. Since the first legislative steps toward motor carrier deregulation were taken on the Federal level in 1980, the Nation has saved several billions of dollars in freight bills, and the Interestate Commerce Commission's budget has been reduced tens of millions of dollars.

I believe that we need to complete the regulatory reform efforts which were begun in 1980 and give the Nation the full benefits of trucking deregulation. However, passage of a full deregulation bill is likely to be time consuming and complex. In the meantime, we can continue to cut transport costs by eliminating particular segments of truck regulation where the case for change is so simple and clear that quick legislative action can be taken.

Today I am introducing a bill that would accomplish this goal by eliminating Interstate Commerce Commission [ICC] regulation of frozen food transport.

Unprocessed agricultural products are now exempt from ICC regulation

as are a number of processed agricultural products. However, regulation of frozen food products is anomalous and full of paradoxes. For example, beef frozen dinners are regulated but poultry frozen dinners are not. Frozen poultry dinners are exempt from ICC regulation but poultry pot pies are regulated. Load beef dinners, poultry dinners, and pot pies on the same truck and you have a half regulated truck. Put the same load on a piggyback trailer and it is all exempt from ICC regulation.

Elimination of the artificial and excessive regulations governing frozen food transport will reduce costs and will improve trucking efficiency and productivity. In today's economic climate, I don't believe that we can afford to pass up opportunities to make American industry more productive and competitive. I invite my colleagues to join me in taking another step in the direction of regulatory reform, reduced Federal spending and increased productivity of American businesses.●

A TRIBUTE TO AUDREY SCHIEBLER

HON. BUDDY MacKAY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, before another day passes, I wanted to offer my congratulations to Audrey Schiebler for winning the Sun Community Service Award.

Being one of Florida's leading advocates for children, Audrey was honored by the Gainesville Sun newspaper for her efforts.

This recognition is a tribute to her skills as a successful child advocate, mother, and wife.

Our finest citizens are those who care enough about themselves to develop their abilities to the fullest and who care enough about others to give freely of those abilities for the good of the community. This award is a just recognition of Audrey's many accomplishments, both as a child advocate and a community leader.

I am certainly proud to honor Audrey's contributions and pleased to hold them forth as ideals for all those who would aspire to succeed in child advocacy. The example Audrey has set is worthy of emulation by all of us.●

TRIBUTE TO MRS. ADA HACKERSON GIVENS JENKINS

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to an inspiring member of the Philadelphia community, Ada Hackerson Givens Jenkins. Mrs. Givens has recently experienced an extraordinary milestone in her life. On April 17, 1985, Mrs. Givens celebrated her 100th birthday.

Born on April 17, 1885, Mrs. Givens has since dedicated herself to the service of the Lord. She has, time and again, actively participated in functions aimed at the embetterment of the individuals of the various communities to which she belongs.

After her mother's death in 1897, she returned to her birthplace, Burke County, GA, where she joined the Morgan Grove Presbyterian Church and became a respected member of the Missionary Workers.

Following an interim period after the death of her husband, Howard Givens, Sr., in 1936, Mrs. Givens married Henry Jenkins and moved to Charlotte, NC, where she remained for 32 years. She then joined the Memorial Union Presbyterian Church, where her son, Reverend Givens, Jr., was the pastor. Here she earned the affectionate title of "Mama Ada."

Mrs. Givens now belongs to the Berean United Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, PA, where she is still striving to create a more unified and responsive community.

Mrs. Givens is the eldest member of a family which consists of five generations and from listening to her remarks on her centennial celebration, it appears that this enduring lady has yet to lose an ounce of her determination. "I will wear out and not rust out. I want the house of my life to be by the side of the road, where I can be friend to all of God's children."●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM LEWIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to official business, I was unavoidably absent during rollcall Nos. 70 and 71. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 70 and "yea" on rollcall No. 71.●

PULITZER PRIZE WINNERS

HON. J. ROY ROWLAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for many years, the Macon, GA, Telegraph & News has been one of the most outstanding community newspapers in the country.

Considering this tradition, Mr. Chairman, it is not surprising that among the journalists who won Pulitzer Prizes this year is reporter Randall Savage, assisted by Jackie Crosby, of the Telegraph & News. The whole community is proud of these fine reporters and everyone at the newspaper who contributed to their winning series of articles.

I congratulate the Macon Telegraph & News, and look forward to a continuation of this tradition of enterprising journalism in our area of Georgia.●

ADELANTE MUJER CONFERENCE SATURDAY, APRIL 27, 1985

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 27, 1985, the Adelante Mujer Hispana, or Onward Hispanic Woman, Conference III will continue its focus of assisting the Hispanic woman to develop goals and improve her lifestyle within the El Paso, TX, community.

Now in its third year, the conference will offer seminars in education, professional development, and socioeconomic concerns. These training and information sessions have inspired many women to meet the challenge of becoming more independent, productive, and successful.

This year's theme, "Our Success Continues," reflects the concept of the Adelante Mujer Conference, which is to provide key elements in setting goals for the future enhancement of the Hispanic women of El Paso.

I salute those who have made these conferences a success, and may their success continue in the future.●

CHILD SAFETY IN TEXAS

HON. LARRY COMBEST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to apprise this distinguished body of a pro-

gram that was recently adopted by the Texas Jaycee Board of Directors.

As I am sure you are well aware, the problem of missing and abused children is escalating. Last year alone, an estimated 1.5 million children disappered. The Texas Jaycees are attempting to deal with this national problem by adopting a Child Safety Program as their top priority for 1986.

The Child Safety and Protection Program will provide parents with an avenue for identifying their children through vital statistics, fingerprints, photographs, and dental records. In addition, the Texas Jaycees will work to help prevent child abuse, and will attempt to raise public awareness of the missing children problem by distributing photographs of missing children throughout the State.

I applaud the efforts of the Texas Jaycees, and I plan to give my full support to their initiative to implement the Child Safety Program on a nationwide basis. As legislators, it is our responsibility to ensure the safety of our young constituents. On behalf of the Texas Jaycees and children all over the country, I encourage my colleagues to bolster any such attempts in their own districts.●

KILDEE URGES FULL COLA FOR SOCIAL SECURITY RECIPIENTS

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, over the past several months I have received hundreds of letters from senior citizens who describe in their own words the devastating effect the President's and Senate Republican leadership's proposed cuts in Social Security COLA's would have on their lives.

Despite continuous promises from the President during the past year that he would never reduce Social Security benefits to current recipients, he and the Senate Republican leadership have advanced a joint proposal to do just that. The Republican compromise budget would reduce the Social Security COLA by 2 percent in each of the next 3 years. This could reduce Social Security benefit payments by $22.6 billion over this period.

Millions will suffer greatly if the President's and Senate Republican leadership's plan is carried out. They may feel that today's elderly are affluent. However, the fact is, the median income of persons 65 and older is still only 40 percent of the median income for all adults, and more than half of the elderly's household income comes from Social Security. While poverty rates of the elderly declined during the 1960's and 1970's, that era is over, due in part to earlier cuts in Social Security, the effects of which are just now beginning to be felt.

Upon signing into law the landmark Social Security Act of 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt explained that the Social Security Program was intended to "give some measure of protection * * * against poverty-ridden old age." Fifty years later, Social Security to a great extent has achieved its stated purpose. Today, older Americans live a far more economically secure life than their counterparts 50 years ago.

I urge my colleague's to reject the administration's proposed cuts in Social Security COLA's. We cannot forget that over 50 percent of America's elderly depend on Social Security as the sole source of their income, and we should not single out older Americans living on the edge of poverty for special sacrifices. Without it, millions more of the Nation's aged would live below the poverty line, and millions more who are poor would be poorer.●

A BILL TO AID THE HOMELESS: THE JESSE GRAY HOUSING ACT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 2221, the Jesse Gray Housing Act, as a response to the existing inadequacies of public housing in America. Since the passage of the Public Housing Act of 1937, public housing stock has expanded to over 1.2 million units. But that number has proven inadequate to address the tragic plight of the homeless and the rapid deterioration of existing public housing structures. President Reagan's fiscal year 1986 budget does not improve this situation, but proposes to diminish Federal funding for low-rent housing. The budget also provides for a reduction in public housing operating subsidies, eliminates the $1.7 billion public housing modernization effort, and terminates public housing construction.

The Jesse Gray Housing Act, named after the founding chairman of the National Tenants Organization, proposes the construction of 5 million new public housing units and the revitalization of 100,000 existing units each year for a period of 10 years. In addition, a substantial percentage of the construction jobs created by this project would be set aside for individuals living in or near public housing. Finally, the bill restores the 1969 Brooke amendment which limited the percentage of monthly income that public housing tenants must pay to 25 percent, reversing the Reagan administration's decision to set the share at 30 percent.

Funding for this act will derive from three sources. During the first fiscal year, Federal grants to the Public Housing Authorities—PHA's—from general revenues would total $5 billion. During the same period, grants would be made to PHA's from the National Housing Fund in the aggregate amount of $15 billion. The fund will be capitalized through a tax on wages paid by businesses employing more than 10 employees. The rate necessary to raise $15 billion would be 1.7 percent. Finally, the Federal Government would guarantee a total of $10 billion in bonds issued annually by PHA's. Figures for funding in subsequent fiscal years would be adjusted to reflect increases in the Consumer Price Index. At the end of the 10-year period covered by this bill, the National Housing Fund should have the resources to cover a greater percentage of future public housing construction, thus reducing the need for the grants and bonds.

The Jesse Gray Housing Act prevents the "one step forward, two steps back" effect of allowing the destruction of existing public housing units while financing the construction of a smaller quantity of new ones. It bans the demolition of public housing and increases the revitalization of existing units.

Dramatic increases in the homeless population and long waiting lists for public housing units affect many American cities. Yet, the Reagan administration believes that providing shelter to the underprivileged should not be the concern of the Federal Government. A just society must ensure that all Americans, regardless of income, have shelter. Therefore, the Jesse Gray Housing Act is not a convenience, but a necessity.●

MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY LAWS

HON. CECIL (CEC) HEFTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Motor Vehicle Safety Authorization Act of 1985, introduced by my colleagues Mr. WIRTH and Mr. RINALDO. In addition to authorizing programs administered under the landmark 1966 National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, it contains several refinements critical to ensure adequate motor vehicle safety and consumer protection.

Among its new provisions are sections that require public disclosure of bumper impact capability. This will enable consumers to know how strong bumpers are before they buy an automobile. The bill also contains measures to combat odometer fraud, and

51-059 O-86-33 (Pt. 7)

increases existing criminal penalities for such fraud. These provisions will ensure that consumers know what they are getting when shopping for a new or used automobile.

To be sure, adequate information about the condition of the product, and its safety potential is important and I welcome these disclosure provisions. But the bill also contains a provision that would help prevent unsafe cars from reaching the market. I refer to section 8, which provides criminal penalties for individual automobile manufacturing executives who fail to disclose defect information to the public and Government in accordance with the 1966 Auto Safety Act. This provision is similar to H.R. 1556, which I recently introduced. Enactment of such penalties would provide a much more meaningful deterrent to corporate decisions resulting in the marketing of defective cars than the current civil penalties alone.

It is a fact of life that corporate legal expenses incurred by automobile manufacturers involved in continual public and private litigation are passed through to consumers. This penalizes those who purchase automobiles. Current civil penalties are sought against companies, not officials responsible for negligent or illegal decisions.

Adoption of criminal penalties would provide an additional, more effective deterrent to corporate irresponsibility, and would not add to the corporation's cost of doing business. Automobile executives, who often share in the profits of the company, would be held personally accountable for decisions in violation of our motor vehicle safety laws.

I commend Mr. WIRTH and Mr. RINALDO for their responsiveness and untiring diligence in addressing the deficiencies of these laws. Their efforts will hopefully lead to safer automobiles for all who travel in them. Thank you.●

THE SAN MATEO COUNTY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION CELEBRATES ITS GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the San Mateo County Historical Association is celebrating its 50th year as the institutional memory and preserver of the heritage of San Mateo County, CA. Members of the association will gather with community leaders in early May at various events to commemorate this occasion, beginning with an anniversary dinner.

I am honored and delighted to have the association and its members as may constituents. The association can boast significant accomplishments in preserving important buildings and furnishings and in maintaining and preserving records and memorabilia in an excellent museum on the campus of the College of San Mateo overlooking San Francisco Bay.

The historical association brings together more than 1,400 individuals and organizations in one of the largest and most effective nonprofit historical programs in the bay area. With a minimal membership fee, it attracts devoted docents who extend the resources and the information to thousands of school children, adults, and visitors. The association has sponsored some of the most creative fundraising events—from sales of rare and old books to an annual Victorian Days Fair in a local park with ethnic foods, costumes, music, and visible history combined in a joyful weekend for the community.

The devoted members of the association are undertaking the development of an oral history of San Mateo County and its residents, as well as continually improving and enlarging the museum. The association museum is 1 of only 600 accredited museums throughout the entire United States. This fine institution has seen more than 1 million visitors through the years. Its research library is used by students and local history buffs.

I am proud and delighted to report to the Members of the Congress that the San Mateo County Historical Association at age 50 is healthy and looking forward to completing a full century of service to the peninsula.●

THE TURKISH BRIGADE AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 192

HON. JOSEPH J. DioGUARDI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. DIOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to accomplish two tasks, recognition of the bravery of those Turkish soldiers who fought with and saved the lives of many Americans, by introducing a joint resolution to establish January 25, 1986, as Turkish Brigade Day, and to cosponsor House Joint Resolution 192, establishing April 24 as Man's Inhumanity to Man Day.

January 1986 will mark the 35th anniversary of the actions of the Turkish Brigade which saved the lives of many Americans. During the Korean War, the valor of the Turkish troops who fought alongside our troops was directly responsible for saving the lives of thousands of American troops. In fact, units of the Turkish Army fighting in Korea were twice cited for their bravery and heroism in the defense of freedom, receiving Distinguished Unit Citations for actions taken on January 25-27, 1951, and on May 28-29, 1953.

I believe that it is only appropriate that we, in Congress, establish this day in memory of the actions of the soldiers who gave their lives in defense of those of Americans. Turkey is a valued ally whose progress in personal and economic freedom makes it especially appropriate that Congress take the time to make this expression of gratitude. The hand-to-hand combat that the Turks engaged in is perhaps the most difficult and demanding form of war. They excelled at it.

In addition to my introduction of legislation commending the actions of a valued ally, I am rising to cosponsor a resolution which will offend that same ally. I was originally reluctant to take this action, but after investigating the situation, came to the conclusion that to fail to do so would be an abdication of my responsibility as a Congressman to make the tough choices I was elected to make. The loss of millions of Armenian lives during the First World War at the hands of the Turkish Army cries out for recognition. Therefore, I have taken these actions simultaneously.

I believe that we can never forget history, but I believe that we must learn from it. Armenians and Turks are intertwined by geography and, in many instances, by similar heritages because of the proximity of the two groups in the Middle East. It is my hope that they can learn to live together and work for the common good of their peoples. I deplore the current terrorist activities of militant and extremist groups in Turkey which do not represent the views of the Armenian people.●

NATIONAL COIN WEEK 1985

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1985

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, this week, April 21 through April 27, is National Coin Week. This distinctive and unique week serves to recognize the historical, cultural, and educational significance of numismatics in the United States.

The theme is of this year's National Coin Week is "Numismatics: Open the Door with Books." The theme is a timely one. Coins can be a wonderful teaching aid, and an interest in foreign coins can stimulate not only an interest in history and geography but of foreign languages and customs as well.

To many of us, coins are merely pieces of money to be used to buy a newspaper or a soda, to pay for a ride on public transit or to be left as a tip. When we take a moment, however, we will see that our coins bear the like-

nesses of our Nation's great leaders. The coin may stimulate the interest of a inquisitive child who wants to know who is it that is on the coin and why. For the parents and teachers of such a child, those questions pose an opportunity to lead that child to a book about Lincoln, Jefferson, Roosevelt, Washington, or Kennedy. The coin is the key to unlocking the child's natural curiosity. The desire to learn more about the great men on our coins is an opportunity not to be overlooked.

Numismatics are the key to opening the door. I salute our numismatists during this week in which they use their efforts to broaden our Nation's awareness of the treasures we carry in our pockets.●