

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, November 18, 1985

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FOLEY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 18, 1985.

I hereby designate the Honorable THOMAS S. FOLEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let justice roll down as waters and righteousness like an everflowing stream.—Amos 5:24.

We pray this day, O Lord, for peace in our world that righteousness will be done and freedom will flourish. We remember especially all those who meet in Geneva that their minds will be set on the vision of justice that Your Word has given. May Your blessing be upon all who participate that they will receive strength and encouragement from above, and may Your peace that possesses all understanding be with them this day and every day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 232. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the restoration of democracy in the Philippines.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1562. An act to achieve the objectives of the Multi-Fiber Arrangement and to promote the economic recovery of the United

States textile and apparel industry and its workers; and

H.R. 2672. An act to redesignate the New York International and Bulk Mail Center in Jersey City, NJ, as the "New Jersey International and Bulk Mail Center", and to honor the memory of a former postal employee by dedicating a portion of a street at the New York International and Bulk Mail Center in Jersey City, NJ, as "Michael McDermott Place."

WEINBERGER LETTER SIMPLY A STRAW MAN FOR PRESIDENT REAGAN

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the Weinberger letter to the Geneva summit bound President Reagan is merely a straw man. This will permit President Reagan to claim a summit victory by just rubber stamping the status quo.

For 5 long years we have achieved no new meaningful nuclear arms limits; now the DOD Secretary Weinberger suggests that we go backward. Weinberger advises Reagan to pursue the star wars-SDI Program, disavow the 1972 ABM Treaty and the SALT II accords, belittles past Presidents' arms agreements and the Soviet compliance to existing accords.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress and our Nation deserve far better and want progress on the agenda of nuclear arms reduction. Just avoiding the rehashed Weinberger issues is not good enough.

We should expect the summit to set in motion new meaningful nuclear arms reductions and grant the proper perspective on past agreements—not the gratuitous undercutting of the past Presidents' achievements or the overblown rhetoric concerning Soviet compliance.

The Weinberger letter is clearly extremist rhetoric that has led the American, and world, media on a wild goose chase.

Nothing in this Weinberger letter or Secretary Shultz' reaction concerning continued SALT II compliance is new—and if indeed the President were to take this advice we would have an unravelling of current nuclear limitations.

Then why this outburst? Is the Reagan administration at war with itself? Hardly. What is being attempted and really quite successfully, is manipulation of the news. This not only makes President Reagan look moderate, but provides a safe harbor when

he comes up empty. Everyone can breathe a sigh of relief. In other words, at least he did not accept Weinberger's advice.

Frankly, that type of conclusion just won't do. There is no substitute for meaningful progress at this summit when both the Americans and Soviets have offered significant cuts in nuclear weapons. To achieve the status quo of weapons and development is a failure and a victory of politics over good policy.

NETWORK SCRAMBLING OF THE NEWS

(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, earlier today I wrote the three television networks, ABC, CBS, and NBC, and asked them to refrain from scrambling news programs.

Recent reports have indicated that all three television networks were considering scrambling their transmissions via satellite to protect the privacy of those signals. The often unedited signals which were formerly transmitted across television lines are now being received by owners of backyard Earth stations.

Mr. Speaker, it seem to me that the fruits of the telecommunications revolution have made important news programming available to many Americans, largely in rural areas, who would not be able to get national television news otherwise. Scrambling the news would forfeit one of the gains technology has brought to thousands and thousands of Americans.

I asked the networks to do this on a voluntary basis. I do not intend to pursue it legislatively at this time, but I think it would be in the public interest for the television networks to refrain from scrambling the television news and I am making that request today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bill on Thursday, November 14, 1985.

S. 1851. An act to extend temporarily the Dairy Price Support Program and certain Food Stamp Program provisions, and for other purposes.

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

Boldface type indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

And the following enrolled bill and joint resolution on Friday, November 15, 1985:

H.R. 3447. An act to amend and extend the Congressional Award Act; and

H.J. Res. 449. Joint resolution to provide for the temporary extension of certain programs relating to housing and community development, and for other purposes.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 15, 1985.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 5, Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received at 10:50 a.m. on Friday, November 15, 1985, the following message from the Secretary of the Senate: That the Senate passed H.J. Res. 449.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 15, 1985.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 5, Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House at 4:00 p.m. on Friday, November 15, 1985 and said to contain H.R. 3036, an Act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes, together with a veto message thereon.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1986—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99-130)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 3036, making appropriations for the Treasury Department,

the United States Postal Service and certain Independent Agencies for the fiscal year 1986.

In my budget last February I proposed reforms, reductions, and terminations in some 50 domestic programs to start us on a sensible path to lower budget deficits. Because Congress has accepted very few of these proposals, it is now clear that all of the non-defense appropriations bills will be far above my budget.

However, in the interest of accommodation, I have indicated that I would accept appropriations bills, even if above my budget, that were within the limits set by Congress' own budget resolution. This bill does not meet that test.

For discretionary programs the bill provides \$900 million more than my budget and is \$180 million above the level for budget authority and other discretionary resources implied in the budget resolution. For example, my budget proposed a major paring of the remaining postal subsidies, and the Congressional budget resolution envisaged a lesser saving. This bill provides \$820 million for these subsidies, which represents little saving from current levels and is \$72 million above the budget resolution level.

Apart from its spending levels, this bill contains a number of language provisions that are highly objectionable. Among them are provisions blocking performance-based regulations for civil servants issued by the Office of Personnel Management, curbing the authority of the General Services Administration to contract out certain services to the private sector, forbidding review by the Office of Management and Budget of marketing orders for agricultural products, and one section of the bill raises serious constitutional concerns with respect to presidential appointments.

The presidential veto is an instrument to be used with care. But until the Congress comes to grips with the problem of the large budget deficit, it is an instrument that I shall not hesitate to employ.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 15, 1985.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and without objection, the message and bill will be printed as a House document.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the veto message on the bill H.R. 3036, be postponed until November 19, 1985.

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

There was no objection.

SOVIETS HAVE WON OPENING SALVO OF GENEVA SUMMIT

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, regrettably, the Soviets have won the opening salvo of the Geneva summit. The disgraceful and irresponsible leak of the Weinberger letter has produced four unfortunate repercussions:

First, it has given a boost to the Soviet propaganda machine, already cranking out its anti-United States message.

Second, it gives the impression of an American negotiating team in disarray.

Third, it shows that there are irresponsible leakers in the U.S. Government who are insisting on sabotaging the talks.

Fourth, it demonstrates that there are those in the Pentagon who have some inflexible positions, that if they should prevail, will hinder the chances of a successful summit.

Mr. Speaker, despite this initial setback, the President has shown courage and commitment in pursuing a successful arms control summit. His plans for student and cultural exchange are important. They are two areas that we have been losing the battle to the Soviets. We have been losing and it is important that we give his initiatives enthusiastic support.

Mr. President, our prayers are with you as you enter these critical talks, and if you need any help in tracking down those leakers and firing them, I am sure you will find many Members of this Congress ready to help. Whomever leaked this letter should consider joining the Soviet negotiating team.

RETIREMENT TRUST FUNDS PROTECTION ACT OF 1985 (COOKIE JAR PROTECTION ACT)

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it has been jokingly said that Uncle Sam has been caught with his hand in the cookie jar. But dipping into the trust funds for Social Security, civil service retirement, military retirement, and railroad retirement is no laughing matter. If the House had followed the lead of many Members, it would not have adjourned at the time it was needed to act on Senate changes to the debt limit extension. As a result, the Treasury Department resorted to divesting the trust funds that so many of our elderly citizens depend on.

The bulk of this bailout came from the old-age and survivors' and disabil-

ity insurance trust funds—mostly in long-term securities, some yielding up to 13½ percent, and some with maturity dates as late as the year 2000. Disinvesting and reinvesting at a lower rate of interest could result in the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

Today I am introducing the Retirement Trust Funds Protection Act of 1985 to protect and restore already lost interest earnings of the Social Security and other Federal trust funds, and in the event of any future disinvestment to require reinvestment at terms and rates of interest equivalent to the projected annual interest income. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to protect the vital interests of our retired citizens.

SERIOUS CONCERNS ABOUT REVISION OF JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, soon we will have the Joint Chiefs of Staff revision before us. I have very serious concerns about this. The Constitution provides that the President shall be Commander in Chief of all the Armed Forces.

It also provides that the Congress shall provide for the national defense of our country, providing necessary material and things like that for the Army, and the Navy, et cetera.

I think this measure is well intentioned, but I think there are very many problems involved in revising the Joint Chiefs of Staff along the way in which it has been suggested we should go.

Mr. Speaker, I expect to have some amendments, at least one amendment, to that bill.

On final passage, unless it is revised considerably more than it is now, I would expect to oppose it because it seems to me that it goes contrary to the Constitution where it places power and responsibility and is something which really is not needed.

□ 1215

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to official business, I was unable to be present and voting for rollcall vote No. 407 on November 14, 1985. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on roll No. 407, Philippine elections.

IMPENDING FARM CREDIT CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to address the House on the question of the impending farm credit crisis that plagues our Nation and makes the financing of next year's agricultural production questionable.

This morning, I had the opportunity to address the American Bankers Association and to discuss the politics of the farm credit crisis. I was introduced with remarks by one of the officers who explained to the bankers, and I quote, "That there will be a bailout of the Farm Credit System." We need to focus on how and what Congress will do to respond to this crisis.

As a preface for my remarks there and again here today, I would like to make three basic observations.

First of all, there is an enormous credit problem in the farm community today. The Farm Credit System owes \$74 billion which farmers cannot repay at this time. In addition, there is another \$51 billion owed to commercial banks that farmers cannot repay. That is \$125 billion in outstanding debt which cannot be redeemed by current profits from the agricultural sector of our economy.

Of the Nation's 2.2 million farm operations: 98,000 are technically insolvent; 109,000 have extreme financial problems and are rapidly moving toward insolvency; and 417,000 have financial problems so severe that they may require some form of debt or asset restructuring assistance in order to help them survive.

In short, there is more debt than there is income among farmers to repay that debt. This has been due, in part, to a devaluation of assets, particularly land, over the last 5 years. The collateral no longer exists to justify the continuation of this debt. The Government must now intervene to provide additional backing to the FCS.

The problem of declining asset values results from U.S. farm policy geared to exporting our produce. In the past, we exported approximately 30% of all our produce, but now farmers cannot export their products because competing and conflicting U.S. economic policies prevent it.

How does the economic policy prevent the farmers from exporting their products? The deficit, which will be approximately \$200 billion for the current fiscal year, is consciously financed by our Government with foreign capital. Let me explain what this means. The interest rates offered by our country in exchange for investment are higher in the United States than anywhere else in the world, therefore foreign capital is attracted to the United States. In effect, we are sucking into our country the capital of the world to meet this enormous debt requirement.

The process of moving foreign capital to finance the U.S. debt bids up the value of the dollar and makes U.S. farm products too expensive for foreigners to buy. This results in what is called an overvalued dollar, or an inflated dollar. Some even boast that it is a strong dollar.

So long as the dollar is overvalued or is strong, it makes U.S. products too expensive for foreigners to buy.

Another point should be noted. Other than President Reagan's remark on March 23, 1985, that we should "keep the grain and export the farmer," the administration has no short-term policy to deal with the farm credit crisis. There is no policy. There is no bill. There is no proposal. There is only discussion by mid-level administration representatives with Members of Congress in hopes of developing a consensus solution to the farm credit crisis.

What the administration is doing is meeting with Members of Congress in order to ascertain what we will support in the Congress. They will then discern their position, and following that, a bill will be introduced which establishes that position. The administration will then proceed to address the short-term farm credit crisis based on Congressional sentiment.

The Credit crisis needs to be addressed before Congress adjourns for the Christmas recess, because a new crop must be financed next year. As of this time, the credit crunch prevents that from occurring.

A third important point to observe is that the administration has no strategy to address the long-term problem of the overvalued dollar, which is the cause of this credit problem. As I said earlier, the problem of the overvalued dollar results from the prevailing economic policy of financing the Federal deficit through foreign capital, this bidding up the value of the dollar, making our agricultural products too expensive for foreigners to buy.

When we cannot sell our farm products overseas, surpluses build up and the value of those products comes down. That is why farm prices are depressed at the present time and the credit crisis exists.

It is interesting to observe that the American Bankers had a mixed attitude toward this issue and this problem. One banker said to me, "There needs to be a washout of inefficient farmers who cannot compete under present conditions. That is the free enterprise system which rewards those who are strong and who are fit to survive within both domestic and international competition." In other words, this is a dog-eat-dog economic policy. That policy rewards those who are strong and can compete in an environment of domestic and international

competition, and it penalizes and forces out those who cannot compete.

The problem that we have in this country is that about half of our farmers will be forced out of production if the present system prevails without addressing the causes of farmers' economic disadvantages.

A question arises in my mind when that idea is presented of whether or not the American farmer should pay and bear the burden of the U.S. economic policy designed to finance our debt with foreign capital. It is this policy which causes the farmer to be in the position of inability to compete. It is not the farmer's fault that the President and his economic advisers have chosen a policy which inflates the value of the dollar and inflates the price of American farm products, making them too expensive for foreigners to buy. That is a national policy that is borne on the backs of the American farmer.

We can see the social toll imposed upon farmers and their families. A recent Wall Street Journal article, illustrates the climate of hopelessness felt within the farm communities. Stress on farm children is causing them to run away, become delinquent, and ever consider suicide.

Their parents feel the loss of this generation and of their forebears. In my district in Arkansas, a dear friend, whom I have known since boyhood, has expressed to me his great sadness at the knowledge that his farm, which has been passed through four generations of his family, will not be handed to his children. The family ties to the land will be broken.

□ 1225

We have a question of public policy. Should the farmer be allowed to be forced out? Should he be forced to compete within an environment that he has not contributed to? After all, it is not the farmer's inefficiency, as some have alleged. It is an independent intervening force of a U.S. economic policy which places the farmer in a position of noncompetition.

The farmer is a victim of the current economic policy. He is not a partner in making it. He is not rewarded by the benefits that we see reported each day when the stock markets on Wall Street continue to spiral upward at record rates. The farmer is burdened by this policy; he is penalized by it. In fact, I would characterize the American farmer as an economic serf in a system of capitalistic fiefdom which causes the farmer to be enslaved to the present policy. He supports the system without its rewards.

So what policy should we formulate? First of all, I agree that Congress and the administration should address the short-term credit crisis for next year. Our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JONES] is chairman of

the Farm Credit Subcommittee. He is working to help fashion a policy that will address that problem. I support his efforts and I will join in them.

But I think we should have a two-track policy. In addition to addressing the short-term farm credit crisis, we should also have another track that I would call the long-term exchange rate problem.

Just last week, I attended the Congressional Summit on Exchange Rates and the Dollar that was convened by our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] and his counterpart in the other body, Mr. BRADLEY, from New Jersey. Our major trading partners from around the world convened in order to present their ideas. Two unanimous points become clear, one, an enormous need for change within the international exchange rate system exists, and two, international cooperation is required to bring about this change. Currency misalignment is creating international economic hardship. Countries, their citizens and industries are rewarded and penalized, and made rich or put into bankruptcy, because of erratic fluctuations of currencies.

Some industries cannot compete. The farmers are one of those industries in this country. And while no consensus was reached at the conference, there is an emerging support for a process to deal with this problem of disparity in international exchange rates. U.S. trading partners expressed a desire to convene, as is described by some, another Bretton Woods conference, to set forth an international monetary policy stabilizing currencies around the world. Stable currencies will contribute to international stability and peace. After all, one of the essential ingredients to world peace is a stable international monetary system. Without a stable monetary system throughout the international community, peace cannot prevail. Instability breeds conflict within and among our trading partners. Some partners are unable to compete. Internal economic dissatisfaction leads falling industries to demand their legislatures and parliamentary bodies to enact protectionist legislation, as we have done in this body. The executive branch faces pressure to intervene with various mechanisms to bring down the value of the dollar. However, this option has limited capabilities and short-term results.

There is a third possibility which I recommend today, and that is the possibility of agreement and of accord in the spirit of Bretton Woods. I think we can achieve that through leadership provided in our own Government.

The first step, as I say, was taken last week. But what is lacking other than a policy is also a process. We do not have a process to achieve international accord.

In 1983, I talked to then Secretary of the Treasury, Don Regan, about the

problem of exchange rates. He said that I was a good Democrat, but for me not to worry about the international free enterprise system, that it would take care of itself and the problem would go away. He told me to go back to Congress and worry about something else. The problem has not gone away. Instead, we have built up a \$160 billion trade deficit because the disparity in international economic policies favors some economies, allowing them to subsidize their exports into our country. These are flooding our markets at the rate of about \$160 to \$180 million a year, putting shoe manufacturers and textile mills out of work in my hometown of Osceola, AR.

Last year, two textile mills closed down in 1 day, and about 800 workers were laid off. A year later, the loss in incomes to those workers has reduced the gross revenues of the merchants on Main Street by about one-third, devastating the economy of a little town in Arkansas with a population of about 10,000 people.

The problem of exchange rates and disparity in economic policy will not go away without leadership from our Government and the governments of our major trading partners. We need a policy, and we need a process. While we are developing a policy with discussion, I suggest that we also begin developing a process through which this debate can achieve an international accord.

Today, in order to take a step in that direction, not necessarily a step that will resolve all our problems, but to take a step in the direction of establishing a process, I offer a bill which would create a currency valuation board. I call this, the U.S. Dollar Valuation Board.

This board, consisting of three members, would be appointed by the President. The members would have staggered terms. It would be an independent agency and would have standing with the Federal Reserve System, the Congress and the executive branch.

The purpose of the board is to establish or create an ongoing process to reach an international accord on monetary exchange rates among trading nations. That is the overall purpose of the board. Its day-to-day functions would include three:

First, to meet daily to determine the real value of the dollar when traded against foreign currencies, taking into consideration the underlying competitiveness of our economy and the economies of our trading partners. A means of comparing currencies already exists in this recent and erudite publication by the Institute of International Economic Policy Analysis, International Economics, the Exchange Rate System by John Williamson dated September 1983, revised June 1985. It is possible to determine

the purchasing power parity of the dollar when traded against foreign currencies.

Second, the Board would also make recommendations for short- and long-term monetary policy that would encourage the realignment of the dollar to its real value. These recommendations would be presented to the President, Congress, the Federal Reserve Board, and other relevant Government agencies.

Third, the Board would also present an agenda to the President for international economic conferences so that the United States can work with our trading partners to establish realistic currency values. Included in this agenda should be the recommendation to each trading partner to establish their own currency valuation board. The cooperation of these boards would constitute an integral part of an international effort to achieve and maintain currencies of trading nations within valuation ranges that represented their true competitive levels.

The establishment of a dollar valuation board would be the first step in achieving an international agreement or treaty to mutually determine the relative real value of each participating nation's currency and thus avoid radical and unreasonable shifts in any currency's value.

A managed exchange rate system worked reasonably well from 1944 through 1973 when we had an exchange rate based upon the gold standard with the U.S. dollar as the lead currency. We decided to abandon that policy in 1973 and to allow the dollar to float, as it has since that time. For the first 5 years, the dollar was undervalued by about 20 to 21 percent and it made our products in this country inexpensive on the world market and we could export them abroad, although we paid for this through domestic inflation. But in the last 5 years, the dollar has become extremely overvalued, which makes our products too expensive to export. We are disadvantaged by our own economic policies which are forcing our people out of work, and in effect exporting our jobs overseas.

I am told that about 3 million American jobs have been exported into foreign countries as a result of our own economic policy. Many of those jobs have come from farm communities which should concern us here today.

It is possible to achieve an international accord on a continuing basis if we have such a process as envisioned in the U.S. dollar valuation board.

Now, I agree that establishing what some would call a bureaucracy is no substitution for a solution to a very, very difficult problem. Just passing a law to establish a U.S. Dollar Valuation Board alone will not do that. We have to have the will, we have to have a policy. The board would meet with

our trading partners on a continuing basis with at least one annual summit meeting each year to solve the exchange rate problem.

So to answer the critics who might say that this is another bureaucracy, I have included a sunset clause which terminates this board in 1994, December 31, 1994, which would automatically terminate the U.S. Dollar Valuation Board in the event it did not serve the purpose for which it was intended. And admittedly, if our leaders in this country in economic policy and political concerns do not wish for this type of a policy to be devised, to be formulated, a process would be of little value. Again, we must have both the desire to establish an international monetary system that brings into parity the various currencies among the trading nations, and we must establish a process through which that goal can be attained.

□ 1240

It is with these thoughts in mind, ladies and gentleman, that I address this body today. I would like to add that Fred Bergsten, of the Institute of International Economics, as well as other renowned economists, blame the overvalued dollar for 75 percent of the current negative trade balance. Even Martin Feldstein, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Reagan, admits that the strong dollar has created the trade deficit. In a recent Washington Post article, he wrote, "The Treasury has at last acknowledged that the overvalued dollar is the source of the overwhelming trade deficit * * * The current huge trade deficit is not due to any fundamental weakness of American industry or to increases in unfair trade practices of other nations." I agree with these economists in their belief that the dollar is largely responsible for our current economic woes.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that I will come to this body in future dates, within the next several weeks, to add additional comments to the remarks that I have made today, but for openers, I would like to offer the proposal to establish the U.S. Dollar Valuation Board as a process, as a way to achieve a continuing international economic accord, international monetary accord among trading nations who cannot continue in peace without a stable international monetary system.

The file follows:

H.R. 3771

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 "Dollar Valuation Board Act."

SEC. 2. UNITED STATES DOLLAR VALUATION BOARD.

There is hereby established the United States Dollar Valuation Board (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Board"), as an independent agency for the purpose of

creating an ongoing process to reach an international accord on monetary exchange rates among trading nations.

SEC. 3 DUTIES OF BOARD.

The duties of the Board are as follows:

(1) DETERMINATION OF DAILY REAL DOLLAR VALUE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Before the close of each business day, the Board shall determine the real dollar value for such day.

(B) NOTICE AND PUBLICATION OF REAL DOLLAR VALUE.—The Board shall transmit its determination of the real dollar value for each business day to the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the International Monetary Fund and shall publish such determination in the Federal Register.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MONETARY POLICY.—

(A) SHORT-TERM.—Before the end of each calendar quarter beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board shall prepare a report containing its recommendations for a short-term monetary policy which will bring the value of the dollar in the foreign currency exchange markets into line with the real value of the dollar. The Board shall transmit a copy of such report to the President, the Congress, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and such other Federal agencies and departments as the Board may determine to be appropriate.

(B) LONG-TERM.—Before the end of each calendar year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board shall prepare a report containing its recommendations for a long-term monetary policy which will bring the value of the dollar in the foreign currency exchange markets into line with the real value of the dollar. The Board shall transmit a copy of such report to the President, the Congress, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and such other Federal agencies and departments as the Board may determine to be appropriate.

(3) INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CONFERENCES.—The Board shall make recommendations to the President with respect to items to be included in the agenda of any international economic conference to which the United States is a party, including the recommendation that the President urge the major trading partners of the United States to set up their own currency valuation boards.

(4) REAL DOLLAR VALUE DEFINED.—For purposes of this Act, the term "real dollar value" has such meaning as the Board shall prescribe by regulations taking into account—

(A) the purchasing power parity of the United States dollar,

(B) United States budget deficits or surpluses,

(C) the average rates of interest in the United States and each of its major trading partners,

(D) high rate of foreign investment in the United States,

(E) the average rates of inflation in the United States and each of its major trading partners, and

(F) such other factors as the Board may determine to be appropriate.

(5) BUSINESS DAY DEFINED.—For purposes of this Act, the term "business day" means any day other than a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday.

SEC. 4. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Board shall consist of 3 members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from persons who are not officers or employees of any government and who are specially qualified to serve on the Board by virtue of their education, training, and experience.

(2) **VACANCY APPOINTMENT.**—A vacancy on the Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(3) **POLITICAL PARTY AFFILIATION.**—Not more than 2 members appointed under this subsection may be of the same political party.

(4) **APPOINTMENT NOT SUBJECT TO CAP ON EXECUTIVE LEVEL POSITIONS.**—Appointment may be made under this subsection without regard to section 5311(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(b) **TERMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), members shall be appointed for terms of 7 years.

(2) **STAGGERED TERMS.**—Of the members first appointed—

(A) 1 shall be appointed for a term of 3 years;

(B) 1 shall be appointed for a term of 5 years; and

(C) 1 shall be appointed for a term of 7 years,

as designated by the President at the time of appointment.

(3) **VACANCY APPOINTMENT; SERVICE AFTER EXPIRATION OF TERM.**—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which such members; predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. A member may serve after the expiration of such member's term until such member's successor has been appointed.

(c) **QUORUM.**—2 members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

(d) **CHAIRPERSON.**—Of the members appointed to the Board, one shall be designated by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, to serve as chairperson of the Board for a term of 4 years.

(e) **FULL-TIME SERVICE.**—Members shall devote their entire time to the business of the Board.

SEC. 5 DIRECTOR AND STAFF: EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.

(a) **DIRECTOR.**—The Board shall have a director who shall be appointed by the Board and shall be paid at a rate established by the Board.

(b) **STAFF.**—The Board may appoint and fix the pay of such additional personnel as the Board determines to be appropriate.

(c) **APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.**—The Director and Staff of the Board may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the classified service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that no individual so appointed may be paid at a rate in excess of the maximum rate of basic pay payable for GS-18 of the General Schedule.

(d) **EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.**—The Board may procure temporary and intermittent service under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent of the maximum rate of basic pay payable for GS-18 of the General Schedule.

(e) **STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—Upon request of the Board, the head of any Federal agency or department may detail to the Board, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to assist the Board in carrying out its duties under this Act.

SEC. 6. POWERS OF BOARD.

(a) **HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.**—The Board may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold such hearings, sit and act at such time and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Board determines to be appropriate.

(b) **POWERS OF MEMBERS AND AGENTS.**—Any member or agent of the Board may take, to the extent authorized by the Board, any action which the Board is authorized to take under this section.

(c) **OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.**—The Board may secure directly from any Federal agency or department information the Board determines to be necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chairperson, the head of such agency or department shall furnish such information to the Board.

(d) **MAILS.**—The Board may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other Federal agencies or departments.

(e) **ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.**—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Board, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services as the Board may request.

SEC. 7 SALARIES OF MEMBERS.

(a) **CHAIRPERSON.**—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Chairperson, United States Dollar Valuation Board."

(b) **MEMBERS.**—Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Member, United States Dollar Valuation Board."

SEC. 8. TERMINATION.

The Board shall cease to exist on December 31, 1994.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HILLIS, for 60 minutes, on November 19.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. NELSON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. GAYDOS, for 30 minutes, on November 19.

Mr. GAYDOS, for 30 minutes, on November 20.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. COURTER.

Ms. SNOWE.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. SOLARZ in two instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.

Mr. BONER of Tennessee in five instances.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. ALEXANDER in two instances.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3447. An act to amend and extend the Congressional Award Act, and

H.J. Res. 449. Joint resolution to provide for the temporary extension of certain programs relating to housing and community development, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1851. An act to extend temporarily the daily price support program and certain food stamp program provisions, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following days present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolution of the House of the following title:

On November 14, 1985:

H.R. 3721. An act to temporarily increase the limit on the public debt and to restore the investments of the Social Security Trust Funds and other trust funds, and

H.R. 3038. An act making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations,

and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

On November 15, 1985:

H.R. 3447. An act to amend and extend the Congressional Award Act, and

H.J. Res. 449. Joint resolution to provide for the temporary extension of certain programs relating to housing and community development, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 19, 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:

2259. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of the President's 12th special message for fiscal year 1985 and the first special message for fiscal year 1986, proposing two new deferrals and two revised deferrals, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685 (H. Doc. No. 99-128); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2260. A letter from the General Manager, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the District of Columbia Armory Board's annual report and financial statement for Starplex (Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium and District of Columbia National Guard Armory), pursuant to 2 D.C.C. 1710 and 1728; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2261. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a report on the development of the strategic petroleum reserve during the period June 1, 1985, through September 30, 1985, pursuant to EPCA, section 165(b) (95 Stat. 620); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2262. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Department of the Army's proposed letter of offer to Bahrain for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 86-10), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2263. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2264. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report covering the history of the FMS Financing Program, the condition of the Guaranty Reserve Fund, and recommendations for its replenishment, pursuant to Public Law 99-83, section 106(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2265. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting notice of a new Federal records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2266. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Credit Corporation, transmitting a report on compliance with the laws relating

to open meetings of agencies of the Government (Government in the Sunshine Act), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2267. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Attorney General for fiscal year 1984, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 522; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2268. A letter from the Special Counsel, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report on the results of an investigation into allegations of a violation of law and regulations, mismanagement, waste of funds, and abuse of authority by officials of the Atlanta Regional Office of the Interstate Commerce Commission, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1206(b)(5)(A) (92 Stat. 1125); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2269. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a report of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, on Kill Van Kull and Newark Bay Channels, New York and New Jersey, together with other pertinent reports (H. Doc. No. 99-129); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and ordered to be printed.

2270. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the impact of the Medicare hospital prospective payment system (PPS), pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395ww (Public Law 98-21, section 603(a)(2)(A)); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2271. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the place for filing tax returns pertaining to alcohol, tobacco and firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2272. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report of the nondisclosure of safeguards information for the quarter ending September 30, 1985, pursuant to AEA, section 147e (94 Stat. 788); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3456. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to extend it for three fiscal years, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 99-377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing and referred as follows:

Mr. MICA: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 2851. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide certain benefits for Government employees and similarly situated individuals who are captured, kidnapped, or otherwise deprived of their liberty as a result of hostile action directed against the United States; to provide for certain pay-

ments to individuals who were taken hostage as a result of the seizure of the United States Embassy in Iran in 1979; and for other purposes; with amendments; referred to the Committee on Appropriations for a period not to exceed 15 legislative days with instructions to report back to the House as provided in section 401(b) of Public Law 93-344 (Rept. 99-201, Pt. 2). Ordered to be printed.

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. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 3770. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide funding for the U.S. Olympic Committee by imposing an excise tax on amounts paid for U.S. television and radio broadcast rights for Olympic events; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 3771. A bill to establish the U.S. Dollar Valuation Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 3772. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize economic relief and rehabilitation assistance for Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FUQUA (for himself, Mr.

MICHEL, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. RITTER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. HENRY, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. COBEY, and Mr. WIRTH):

H.R. 3773. A bill to amend the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 to promote technology transfer by authorizing Government-operated laboratories to enter into cooperative research agreements and by establishing a Federal Laboratory Consortium for Technology Transfer within the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. GRAY of Illinois:

H.R. 3774. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to assist severely disabled individuals to attain or maintain their maximum potential for independence and capacity to participate in community and family life; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 3775. A bill entitled: "The Retirement Trust Funds Protection Act of 1985"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr.

FISH, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LUKE, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah):

H.R. 3776. A bill to protect patent, trademark and copyright owners from importation into the United States of goods made overseas in violation of U.S. patent, trademark and copyright law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 457. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal

year 1986, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By My SOLARZ (for himself and Mr. LEACH of Iowa):

H. Con. Res. 233. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress concerning representative government, political parties, and freedom of expression on Taiwan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

282. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, relative to a memorial to the veterans of the Korean Conflict; to the Committee on House Administration.

283. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, relative to the establishment of a Mississippi River National Heritage Corridor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 512: Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 1030: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1769: Mr. LUNDINE and Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 2483: Mr. FUSTER and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 2701: Mr. UDALL and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 3024: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. OLIN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 3121: Mr. UDALL, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 3203: Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 3408: Mr. LELAND, Mr. KASTENMEIER, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 3438: Mr. KINDNESS.

H.R. 3730: Mr. STARK, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LaFALCE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. WIRTH.

H.R. 3736: Mr. KASICH, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.J. Res. 101: Mr. MONSON and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 127: Mr. FROST, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. PASHAYAN, and Mr. LOEFFLER.

H.J. Res. 292: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. STRANG, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MACK, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. WORTLEY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LENT, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CONTE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KASICH, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SWINDALL, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.J. Res. 421: Mr. MOORE and Mr. TAUKE.

H.J. Res. 439: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. LUKE, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PRICE, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. BONER of Tennessee.

H. Con. Res. 173: Mr. COBEY and Mr. PACKARD.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

251. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Council of the city of New York, NY, relative to the immigration of Soviet Jews; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE—Monday, November 18, 1985

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

In a moment of silence, let us remember more than 40 years of honorable public service by Senator Sparkman on Capitol Hill.

Thine, O Lord is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty; for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the Kingdom, O Lord, and Thou art exalted as head of all. Both riches and honor come to Thee, and Thou rulest over all.—I Chronicles 29: 11,12.

God of peace, in the words of Israel's great King David, we acknowledge Who Thou art, as the world looks anxiously to Geneva. Some are pessimistic, some, perhaps, overly optimistic, some cynical—many are hopeful. Wisdom of the ages, guide President Reagan, his advisors, General Secretary Gorbachev and his advisors, that every detail of the agenda and every moment of meeting will be constructive. Guide those responsible for security that all who participate may be free of threat or danger.

God of Infinite Love, move in the hearts of these two powerful men; make them aware of their common humanness, and the profound destiny their few hours together involve. If they cannot be friends, help them not to meet as adversaries, but as leaders with a common concern for all people. Dissolve alienation and nurture reconciliation. Give each a vision of the people of the world joining hands around them in universal longing for peace. In the name of the Prince of Peace. 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 leaders have 10 minutes each, and I will reserve any time I do not use.

Then there will be a special order in favor of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] for not to exceed 15 minutes and routine morning business

not to extend beyond the hour of 12 noon.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended to 1:30 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for not more than 5 minutes each.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I know there were a number of requests for special orders this morning. It may be that we can honor some of those requests.

Following morning business, the Senate will resume the unfinished business, S. 1714, the farm bill.

Votes could occur during today's session, but I indicate to my colleague if there is a vote it would probably be a procedural vote, and I may be able to advise colleagues on both sides that there may not be a vote today.

I know there are a number of meetings going on with farmers, farm groups, and Senators on both sides of the aisle. We may accomplish more in some of those sessions than we would here.

In addition, there are some Senators who are attending the services for our late colleague, Senator Sparkman.

I will advise the minority leader at the earliest opportunity of our plans.

We will stay on the farm bill. There will be no intervening business, unless there is something to be done by unanimous consent, or we could work out some early morning schedule.

It seems to me that we probably have about 3 legislative weeks remaining before adjournment, hopefully three—maybe it could extend to four. If it extends much longer than that the year will be over.

We did meet with the Speaker. He said he would work toward a December 6 adjournment date.

But there are some things we must complete, and one of those is the farm bill. I am hopeful we will pass the bill and go through conference prior to the adjournment. Hopefully, the bill will not be subject to a veto. This is why I think it is important that many of us who want a bill passed and signed, not vetoed, will have an opportunity to maybe discuss some of our concerns during the day.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EVANS). The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

SENATOR JOHN STENNIS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, last Friday, November 15, marked a very significant day in the history of the U.S. Senate, and in the life and career of our distinguished and esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Mississippi.

As of November 15, 1985, Senator JOHN C. STENNIS had served in this Chamber for 38 years and 10 days. Senator STENNIS then became the second longest-serving Senator in the history of the United States as he surpassed the length of service of the late Senator Richard Russell of Georgia.

Having observed and admired Senator STENNIS' performance in this Chamber since I was elected to the Senate in 1958, I can say emphatically that he has faithfully and successfully served the people of Mississippi and the United States.

Mr. President, in today's political world we too often hear flamboyant speeches about the "man who did this" and the "man who did that." These speeches are often filled with exaggeration and hyperbole. But in speaking of the career of the senior Senator from Mississippi, there is no exaggeration or hyperbole.

Senator STENNIS is a man who has been and is a dominating figure in the U.S. Senate, an adviser to Presidents, and a man of enormous power and influence.

His tenure as a U.S. Senator has included valuable service on many subcommittees, and as an active and important Member, and currently ranking democratic member, of the Appropriations Committee. As a member of the Senate Space Commission, he played an important role in moving the United States ahead in putting a man on the Moon and in the current interplanetary competition.

Senator STENNIS also has been one of the best and most effective chairmen of the Armed Service Committee in the history of the Senate. During the 12 years (1969 to 1981) in which he held this position, it has been reported that "more than 50 new weapons systems were authorized." Equally important, however, is the fact that Senator STENNIS never gave the Pentagon a blank check—he demanded close and

careful scrutiny of every proposed defense outlay. In words that it would do well for all of us to heed, Senator STENNIS stated:

I will strongly support whatever is essential for national security in the way of modern weapons and quality fighting forces. I will try to see that these essentials are provided—and no more." This attitude, undoubtedly, came from the fact that, as Senator STENNIS explained on another occasion, he "was raised to believe that waste is a sin."

Senator STENNIS has consistently opposed what he considered excessive and gratuitous intrusions of the Federal Government into the rights and privileges of the States and the American people.

But he also has recognized and actively supported, expanding the creative functions of the Federal Government in a number of areas including agriculture, medical research, forestry, small business, public works, and, especially, industrial and rural development. And he has been a consistent champion of education at all levels.

The senior Senator from Mississippi has brought to the U.S. Senate the judicial skills and temperament acquired during a decade on the judicial bench (1937-47), and has put them to effective use in this Chamber. When Mississippians first sent Mr. STENNIS to the U.S. Senate in 1947, they did so based on his pledge to "plow a straight furrow right down to the end of my row." They have been neither disappointed nor betrayed.

In this Chamber, Senator STENNIS has secured a justly-deserved reputation for unimpeachable integrity and fairness.

In recognition of his high ethical standards, in 1965 Senator STENNIS was made the first chairman of the Senate Committee on Standards and Conduct. In this position, he was instrumental in developing the Senate code of ethics.

But all those accomplishments and experiences—and they are great and many—are dwarfed by the courage and strength that Senator STENNIS has continuously demonstrated during his years in this Chamber. He has had to endure personal pain and hardships that most of us, we hope and pray, will be spared. And the Senator has endured them, and risen above them, in a way that is an inspiration to us all.

We remember all too well our sadness just last year (1984) when it was learned that the Senator was about to lose one of his limbs to cancer. But we also remember our joy barely a month later when he was back in this Chamber, admirably performing his duties to his State and country.

And we remember those dark days of January 1973, when Senator STENNIS was shot twice during a robbery in front of his house in northwest Washington. Although the bullets penetrated several vital organs, and his condi-

tion was considered "grave," Senator STENNIS survived and was back in his Senate seat within 9 months.

Recalling those dark days of January 1973, I recollect the words of one of his dear friends. The friend assured worried Members of this Chamber that, "JOHN STENNIS will make it because he is not yet prepared to leave the Senate."

Upon his return to the Senate on September 5, 1973, I pointed out that Seneca wrote in his moral essays, that "fire is the test of gold: adversity, of strong men." This philosophy, I said then, "has never been better proved than by the most welcome presence on the floor of the Senate today of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]."

Mr. President, I have never had reason to question, much less doubt that assessment that I made more than 12 years ago.

Mr. President, Bill Peterson noted in the Washington Post, on September 28, 1982:

It's hard to imagine the Senate without John C. Stennis or John C. Stennis without the Senate.

I know that the Senate is proud of Senator STENNIS, and am sure that the people of the United States, as well as his beloved State of Mississippi feel likewise. All of us wish him the best of health in all his future service.

Last week, Senator STENNIS was the subject of an article in the New York Times written by Steve Roberts (November 4, 1985), which illuminates other notable aspects of this remarkable Senator's life and Senate service. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Nov. 4, 1985]

WISDOM IN JUDGMENT, 38 YEARS IN THE MAKING

(By Steven V. Roberts)

WASHINGTON, November 3.—When Senator Richard B. Russell died in office on Jan. 21, 1971, he had served in the Senate for 38 years and 9 days. That record placed the Georgia Democrat second on the Senate's seniority list behind Carl Hayden of Arizona, who held office for more than 41 years.

Today, Senator John C. Stennis of Mississippi occupies Mr. Russell's old office and sits at Mr. Russell's old desk, a huge mahogany table that easily seats a dozen Senators. The office building is named for Mr. Russell, one of the most respected legislators of his generation.

On Nov. 15, Mr. Stennis will pass Mr. Russell's record, and while the Mississippi Democrat takes pride in his longevity, he does not want any fuss made about it.

"ALL-AROUND A STATESMAN"

"With all deference to everyone," Mr. Stennis said the other day, "Russell was the No. 1 man that I have been associated with in all this tenure in the Senate. He was all-around a statesman and a gentleman and a very able man."

Today, many legislators would use the same words about Mr. Stennis. He is the undisputed patriarch of the Senate, a teacher to younger members and a conscience for the entire institution. He seldom makes national headlines, but he wields considerable influence in the Senate itself. And that influence comes from the quality of his personal judgment, not from the quantity of his television appearances.

Mr. Russell noticed Mr. Stennis in his first year in the Senate, when the young Mississippian wrote a report on a civil rights bill. As a result, Mr. Russell picked Mr. Stennis to lead off the floor debate for the Southern bloc, an unusual honor for a junior legislator.

"IT WAS UNTHINKABLE"

"Well, good Lord, the telephone went ringing around at my office, the press was calling," Mr. Stennis recalled with some glee. "The word had gone out that I was going to open the debate. It was unthinkable."

Within a year or two, Mr. Russell had found places for his protégé on his own committees, Appropriations and Armed Services. "Well, the vacancies were there, and he just filled them about the way he wanted," Mr. Stennis recalled. "He was a great worker, but he needed somebody of similar thought along with him, I think."

Those common ideas included unswerving support for the military, and for the President, particularly in foreign policy matters. Mr. Stennis was shaped by the post-World War II era, before Vietnam and Watergate soured the relationship between the White House and Capitol Hill, and today he says that he never tries to "second guess" a President.

"I LEAN WITH THE PRESIDENT"

"I lean with the President on our system of Government," said Mr. Stennis, in terms that many modern Senators would consider old-fashioned. "Makes no difference who he is. I would back those fellows on a lot of things."

Mr. Stennis also shared with Mr. Russell a Southern viewpoint on race relations, and he did not vote for his first civil rights bill until 1982, when he was running for re-election. But he has adjusted to the changing climate of his home state and now runs well among black voters.

The Senator has also seen many changes in the Senate, and in his view, most of them have been for the worse. He remembers the Senate of a generation ago as a "well-ordered parliamentary body that operated strictly under the rules."

MORE TIME ON OTHER TASKS

Today, Mr. Stennis asserts, the legislative load in fields like education and health has grown enormously. Constituents are able to hop on an airplane and demand a slice of their Senator's day. And the skyrocketing cost of campaigning causes legislators to spend more and more time raising money.

"So we are not the deliberative body that we were," the Senator added. "It is a rush job all the time."

Mr. Stennis came to a Senate dominated by barons like Mr. Russell, who had patiently worked their way up through the seniority ladder. Now that he is at the top of the ladder, however, Mr. Stennis finds himself surrounded by a new breed of legislators, who refuse to wait their turn or hold their tongue.

"I am not blaming them," he said of his junior colleagues. "They come here on the

average well-educated. But they don't have the maturity if I may use that term. They don't have the experience in public affairs that the old-timer had. It takes time to mature."

NOW THEY'RE "BENDING RULES"

Moreover, Mr. Stennis added, some of these newcomers have become so adept at "bending the rules" that at times, the Senate seems paralyzed, a giant enmeshed in its own traditions of unfettered debate.

Perhaps, the Senator mused, the lack of maturity on the Senate floor is related to the changing atmosphere in the cloakroom, the private precinct just off the Senate floor.

"Well, we used to be back there quite a bit and talk to each other, explain bills to each other, ask each other questions about matters they saw in the press, and we would train and educate each other," Senator Stennis recalled. "Well, I was in there not long ago and there were about 14 Senators in there. And there wasn't a soul talking to each other. They were all looking at the television."

HE GOT 60 PERCENT OF VOTE IN 1982

Mr. Stennis faced a stiff challenge for reelection in 1982 but he raised almost \$1 million, made his first television commercials, and wound up winning over 60 percent of the vote. Last year, his left leg was removed because of a malignant tumor, but his health seems sound and if he wants to run again in 1988, his seat is probably safe.

Asked for his reflections on his impending milestone, Mr. Stennis replied: "Well, I am proud that I did have the opportunity to become a member of the Senate. I've expressed it one time that my work is my play, and my play is my work. I used to think a man that was in his 80's was an old man, but I've changed my mind about that."

Then his weathered face crinkled into a smile. "I may make a career out of this thing yet," said the patriarch. "I'm thinking about it."

A MAN FROM "BIG SKY COUNTRY"

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in area, Montana is the fourth largest State in the Union. With the spectacular Rockies in the west and a vast, rising plain stretching farther east, Montana is a State of seemingly limitless spaces, and has justly earned the name "Big Sky Country."

Since January 1977, Montana has been represented in the Senate by our distinguished colleague Senator JOHN MELCHER. Prior to being elected to succeed retiring Senator Mike Mansfield, Senator MELCHER served 8 years in the House of Representatives. Prior to launching into politics, Senator MELCHER's profession was veterinary medicine.

Montana is fortunate to have Senator MELCHER as one of its spokesmen on Capitol Hill. In the House of Representatives, he had long experience as the Congressman from an important agricultural region and one of the largest congressional districts in the country. As a member of the Senate Committees on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, and on Energy and Natural Resources, Senator MELCHER is in-

involved in issues of great significance to Montanans and to Montana industries. With a wide understanding of the problems facing many people in his and other States, Senator MELCHER has brought a thoughtful and challenging perspective to many Senate questions.

Recently, the Washington Post carried an article on Senator MELCHER. I request that that article, "Sen. Melcher Is Smiling Again," be printed in the RECORD.

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

SEN. MELCHER IS SMILING AGAIN

(By Ward Sinclair)

The elfin fellow with the enigmatic smile is down there again on the Senate floor, driving Republicans out of their tree, which must mean that farm legislation is pending again and that John Melcher of Montana is up to his old tricks.

As often happens to others in this curious city, Melcher has somehow got a reputation—not necessarily pejorative—as an obstructer of farm legislation and as a man of unfathomable motivation.

But in another sense, as the Senate debates a new farm bill, the Democrat from Montana is all that stands in the way of a Reagan administration steamroller that wants to squash federal farm spending and reshape the rural countryside.

Once again, as has happened in the past, the rules of the Senate have given Melcher a whip hand in the debate and the Republican leadership is pulling out every parliamentary stop it can find to sit him down.

Majority Leader Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.) has denounced him in the floor, blamed him for thwarting passage of the bill and called into question the sincerity of his professed aim of aiding farmers. Agriculture Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) sputters and gets emotional when Melcher starts talking.

Through it all, Melcher cracks a small smile that never lets on what he is really thinking, and just keeps coming back at them. He did it again last week and, sure enough, the Republicans were dispirited.

The background is that Melcher led a campaign in the committee to stop the administration's plan to cut income supports, known as deficiency payments, that are paid to grain, cotton and rice farmers. With help from GOP defectors, Melcher got the panel to adopt a four-year freeze on the subsidies instead of the one-year freeze the White House sought.

Back in the summer, when it appeared Melcher had the votes to carry the day, Helms refused to reconvene the committee to allow the inevitable vote. Then the Senate left on August recess and did not confront the Melcher four-year freeze again until mid-September.

But the freeze carried and went to the floor as part of the farm bill, despite efforts by Dole and Helms to get the committee to reverse itself. Things have been nasty ever since.

On the floor last week, Dole and Helms flexed their muscles a couple of times, trying to upset Melcher, but it didn't exactly work. They rallied at Melcher for backing budget-busting legislation, but then blocked his bid to call up an amendment that would have trimmed \$7.6 billion from the farm bill.

They lost, 51-48, when they tried to pass their one-year freeze on subsidy payments. Through a complex parliamentary move, Dole regained control and got the Senate to support him on a test vote that left a substitute, with the one-year freeze, as the pending business.

Through it all, John Melcher just smiled. Dole denounced his budget cut ideas as "smoke and mirrors," Melcher smiled.

When Dole put some of the Melcher ideas in his own substitute, Melcher forced him to admit they were the same smoke and mirrors. Melcher smiled again.

"There are other places in the farm bill to save money, not just by cutting target prices," Melcher said in an interview. "They have dealt with target prices as a crucial part of the bill and I thank them for it. It is a symbol to the rural community whether we are going to do something for farmers. They have handed us the high ground and I thank them for it."

The issue is important enough to the GOP leadership that Dole has threatened senators from the cotton and rice areas—where deficiency payments tend to be highest—that the subsidies will be cut if they do not come out for the one-year freeze.

Melcher is smiling, in part because he has been there before—and stopped the seeming juggernauts. At least four times since 1981, with farm-related legislation hanging fire on the floor, Melcher has thrown up roadblocks because he did not like what was happening.

The odd thing about this, considering Melcher's reputation as a blind defender of the federal farm support programs, is that he actually does not like them.

"I have a problem with the whole scheme," he said. "Why do we have to have a program that pays farmers in lieu of them getting a price from the marketplace? The only reason I vote for these things is to keep them going until we come to our senses in this country. Why don't we find other mechanisms?"

Another tag they keep hanging on Melcher is that he is obsessed with ideas for sending more surplus food to the needy around the world. Mention "food aid," and a Melcher dissertation is sure to follow.

He probably is the foremost congressional champion of feeding the hungry in other nations. The specter of American grain and dairy products going unused drives him batty.

"If I were dictator for a day? I would set up exports, provide more impetus on exports, and my policy would be to try to turn our production machine loose to try to meet the world's needs," he said.

"This administration is blatant in its belief that there are too many farmers in this country. There really are not. There simply isn't too much food in the world. We're blessed in the variety of foods we have and there's just a breakdown in supplying that food to people who need it."

"And I say that's a hell of a lot more important right now than whether we have Reagan's 'Star Wars' defense or MX missiles."

Back to the farm bill, Melcher is smiling that smile again. "I don't care what Dole does to me. I don't mind his verbal assaults. But, obviously, he's been doing the stalling around here. . . ."

Will Melcher block it in the end? Will he talk the bill to death? He's smiling again, and the enigmatic plainsman is riding again. "The rules allow you to express your judg-

ment," he said. "And sway the vote one way or another."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may reserve the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield the floor.

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.

WISE ADVICE FROM AMERICAN BUSINESS FOR THE PRESIDENT AT THE SUMMIT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there have been many editorials and columns in the past few weeks urging one kind of approach or another on the President of the United States as he proceeds to his first-ever meeting with a head of the Soviet Government at Geneva tomorrow, November 19 and Wednesday, November 20. One of the most impressive and thoughtful opinions comes from the November 11 issue of *Business Week*. *Business Week* speaks out often as a kind of conscience of American business. Most Americans would expect that voice to be conservative. We would expect that voice to be leaning toward the past foreign policies advanced by the Reagan administration. That is why this Senator found the *Business Week* editorial to be a pleasant surprise. The editorial makes five main points:

First, Soviet Secretary Gorbachev has a strong motivation to seek an agreement with President Reagan to slow down the arms race. He also has good reason to seek to find a way to get out of Afghanistan and other areas in the world that are absorbing Soviet resources without significantly advancing Soviet interests. This is especially true because military spending constitutes an immense burden on Russia's limited economic resources. For this reason *Business Week* urges President Reagan to push hard to explore whether the U.S.S.R. is serious about a mutual slowdown in the arms race now going on in both countries.

Second, the President should recognize that he has expressed two views about the Soviets which contradict each other. And both of them are at least partly wrong. The first view is that the Soviet Union is an aggressively expanding global empire. The second view is that the Soviet Union is an economic and political failure. So what are the facts? The facts are that the Soviet Union would like to be an aggressively expanding global empire. It is largely failing. But second, the failure is only partial. The Soviet Union has immense economic

strength. It also has the capacity as a totalitarian dictatorship to focus, concentrate, and direct that strength on military objectives that exceed the capacity of free, pluralistic democracies.

Third, the Soviet Union is characterized by *Business Week* as bogged down in a political morass in Afghanistan and in a "basket case" in Ethiopia and Angola. If Gorbachev can be persuaded to resist the temptation to take advantage of the turmoil in South Africa in advancing the Soviet cause in Angola, Reagan should seek out a way to enable both the United States and Soviets to reduce their costly activities in these areas. As for Nicaragua, *Business Week* contends that both superpowers could save resources and embarrassment by supporting the political solution urged by the Contadora nations.

Fourth, President Reagan should recognize that although the United States owns a big technological advantage over the Soviets in any arms race in space, the Soviets do have the technological and the economic capability to make such a race a contest and an immensely expensive one, burdening both economies and sharply increasing the danger of nuclear war. The President should, therefore, ease up on star wars and move decisively toward an arms control agreement that would include an end to the arms race in space as well as offensive missiles.

Fifth, the President should heed the advice of our allies who tell us that arms control agreements should not be held hostage to "linkage" with settlements of conflicts all over the world. The United States should strive to make progress in both areas. But we should not junk arms control because the Soviet Union is engaged in aggression. And we should not throw in the sponge on stopping Soviet aggression because we cannot agree on arms control. *Business Week* is right. These problems are separate. They can be handled best separately.

Business Week acknowledges that not all these problems can be solved at the summit. But the summit conference does offer an excellent opportunity to begin moving constructively in each of these areas.

Mr. President, I congratulate *Business Week* on an extraordinarily thoughtful and responsible editorial. If the President will follow this advice that comes from the "conscience" of the American business community, he will take a very long step toward promoting world peace.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred, entitled "Seize the Moment at the Summit," be printed in the *Record*.

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

SEIZE THE MOMENT AT THE SUMMIT

President Reagan approaches the Nov. 19-20 Geneva summit with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev at a time when the Soviet Union may be entering a period of major change. The vigorous new boss at the Kremlin is launching a fresh effort to put new life into the Soviet Union's sputtering economy and narrow the widening technological gap between his country and the U.S. His economic strategy opens the possibility for the first time in two decades that the Soviet Union will shake off some of the fetters of the rigid central planning system imposed by Stalin.

Gorbachev has a powerful motivation to agree with President Reagan to try to slow down the nuclear arms race. If that can be done, he will have more resources to invest in modernizing Soviet industry. Similarly, by extricating Soviet troops from the war in Afghanistan and lowering tensions with the U.S. over other trouble spots, Gorbachev could also ease the drain of military spending, which siphons off 14% of the Soviet gross national product. President Reagan's primary goal at the summit and in subsequent contacts should be to find out whether the General Secretary is serious about exploring ways to achieve both these goals.

To do that, the President should decide, for starters, which of the two views he regularly paints of the Soviet Union will shape his approach to Gorbachev. Is Reagan dealing with an aggressively expanding global empire or an economic and political failure? U.S. policies toward Moscow will more effectively advance U.S. interests if the rhetoric of both these views is tempered with large doses of realism.

Moscow's direct and indirect roles in Ethiopia, Angola, Cambodia, Afghanistan, and Nicaragua—cited by Reagan in his Oct. 24 speech at the U.N.—date back to the 1970s. There is no sign that Gorbachev, any more than his two immediate predecessors, wants to take on more such commitments around the world: Ethiopia and Angola are basket cases, and Afghanistan is, for Gorbachev, a political morass. Beyond the rhetoric, Reagan should look for practical ways to accommodate U.S. and Soviet interests in these areas. In Nicaragua, under attack by a U.S.-sponsored army, the Contadora group has already created negotiating mechanisms. What is lacking is a U.S. decision to support a political, rather than military, solution. Gorbachev, for his part, must avoid any temptation to use the Soviet presence in Angola to take advantage of the turmoil in South Africa.

Despite the Soviet Union's lagging economy and technology, and realistic assessment of the risks of an open-ended nuclear arms race would discourage the illusion that the U.S. can gain a decisive edge over the Soviets, militarily or politically, by launching a massive competition in space weapons. On past performance, there is little doubt that the Kremlin under Gorbachev will mobilize resources, if a Star Wars competition commences, to build space weapons and more nuclear missiles as well. The cost of such a rivalry could be staggering for both sides and the outcome more, not less, danger for both.

Clearly, Gorbachev and Reagan cannot reach specific agreements on nuclear arms or regional tensions at the summit. But U.S. allies in Europe are right in insisting that arms negotiations must not be held hostage, through "linkage," to settlements of complex conflicts around the globe. Both sets of

problems must be tackled. And the time to start is now, while the new man in the Kremlin is still shaping his foreign policy goals and strategy.

THE STATES BALANCE THEIR BUDGETS—WHY CAN'T THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, why is it that States and cities in this country are able to bring their fiscal policy under control but the Federal Government cannot? The recession of 1982 was the worst since the Great Depression. States like Michigan, Wisconsin, and others have moved into late 1981 and 1982 with sharply falling revenue and rising welfare and unemployment costs. A number of these States seem on the verge of bankruptcy. The Governors and State legislators faced exactly the same political pressures to keep popular spending programs moving ahead that Members of the Congress have suffered. Elected State officials faced a virtual taxpayers' revolt. A Michigan State senator actually suffered defeat in a recall election because he favored a tax increase to meet the State's obvious necessity to cover its essential expenditures with revenue. Because State legislators are necessarily closer to their constituents day in and day out, the prospect that any of these elected State officials could meet their obligations by cutting their strongly supported programs and raising taxes seemed remote.

THE MICHIGAN STORY

So what happened? How many States were capable of cutting spending enough or raising taxes enough to survive that unusually deep recession of 1982? Answer: Every last one of them. Not only did they master a far more difficult situation than has lately confronted the Federal Government, they achieved an even more remarkable miracle. They sharply cut popular spending programs. In most cases, they increased taxes. Was this spending reduction and tax increase policy political suicide? No! They survived the next election. Mr. President, the most heartening political picture of 1985, in the judgment of this Senator, was that great shot of the beleaguered Governor of Michigan, James Blanchard, grinning ear to ear as he held up a sign emblazoned: "Michigan Debt—Paid in Full." Mr. President, that was a great achievement by Governor Blanchard and his Michigan Legislature. It was a great example to the Federal Government.

THE WISCONSIN STORY

In Wisconsin, Governor Tony Earl and his legislature have been equally courageous and successful in fighting what appeared to be an impossible combination of a massive threatened State deficit, a heartbreakingly deep recession, and a citizenry adamantly opposed to either widespread cuts in

State spending programs or an increase in State taxes. Wisconsin State government, like Michigan, has had to work with an economy that is very heavy in industry that has suffered grievously from the bloated dollar and the consequent sharp diminution in exports and the onrush of cheap imports. In autos, in farm equipment, in machine tools, in textiles, and in shoes, the last few years have been an economic nightmare, a disaster, for Wisconsin. To make matters worse, Wisconsin already suffered from a high personal income tax and very high property taxes.

Meanwhile, Wisconsin's agricultural economy—especially its dairy farmers—have been struggling with devastating reductions in price supports. Since 1980, Wisconsin dairy farmers have not only had to endure substantial inflation. They have suffered an 11-percent cut in the price they receive for their milk. But milk is not the only Wisconsin agricultural product that has taken a painful beating. Wisconsin is No. 1 in the production of some vegetables. It is near the top in potato production. It is high in the production of soybeans, corn, and hogs. Every one of these commodities has dropped cruelly in the price the farmer receives.

The effect on Wisconsin farms and our rural communities has been depressing. How to pay State and local taxes has haunted hundreds of thousands of Wisconsin rural residents. At the same time, how to keep body and soul together through many long months of unemployment has been the problem for Wisconsin's urban residents. Consider, therefore, how much more imposing the fiscal problem must have seemed for our Governor and our State legislators than the fiscal problem that faced the President and the Congress over the past 5 years.

So what happened? Did the Governor appeal to the Congress for a bailout? Did anyone suggest that the State should repeal its constitutional requirement for a balanced budget and try to borrow its way out of its difficulty? Did the State government cave in in the face of popular opposition to spending cuts and a tax increase? No; none of these dire developments occurred. Governor Earl and the Wisconsin Legislature found ways to hold down spending. They temporarily increased taxes. But most recently, they have reduced taxes including Wisconsin's previously high income tax. They have also found a way to provide more State assistance to local and county governments so that local property taxes can be kept out of the stratosphere.

WHY CAN'T THE FEDS DO IT?

Mr. President, if States like Michigan and Wisconsin, which have suffered economic consequences that

could have been expected to make them basket cases, can summon the will and the courage to cut spending and bring in whatever tax revenues are necessary, why can't the U.S. Congress and the President? What is the answer? The answer is that, unlike the Federal Government, the States cannot print money. They have no Federal Reserve Board that can provide them with a bottomless pit of cash. So whether they have balanced budget requirements in their constitutions or not, they have no choice except to cover their spending with taxes. If they do borrow, they find themselves strictly disciplined by a bond market that insists on embarrassingly high and costly interest rates unless they are following a prudent fiscal policy.

So why have the States behaved with fiscal prudence? Because they have to do so. This is why some kind of institutionally imposed restraint like Gramm-Rudman or a balanced budget constitutional amendment is an imperative necessary for the Federal Government. The Governors have shown that elected public officials can take the painful, unpopular spending and taxing steps necessary to bring public fiscal policy under control. They can vote to cut spending. They can vote to increase taxes. And they can survive. Members of the Congress should show the same kind of will to bring fiscal policy under control. So far, Congress has failed. We have had 3 years of disgracefully high budget deficits. More are surely on the way.

Why does Congress fall short year after year? Because we can always escape the consequences of our profligacy by going into debt and printing money. How do we stop this wastrel habit? We stop it by adopting some kind of institutional restraint to force Congress to reduce the deficit. That is why such badly flawed proposals as Gramm-Rudman and a constitutional requirement for a balanced budget are a grim necessity.

THE MYTH OF THE DAY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the myth of the day is that small levels of carcinogens pose no risk to the American consumer.

Latest industry arguments in the color additives debate attempt to convince the public that certain small cancer risks are acceptable in color additives use. Cosmetic industry representatives claim that a new scientific technique is reliable enough to accurately measure the potential hazards of small amounts of carcinogens. By accepting this newly found and purely arbitrary technique, they believe that certain color additives possess only insignificant cancer risks and are not harmful to the public.

The cosmetics industry is convinced that this technique, called quantitative risk assessment, or QRA, is a scientifically sound practice. In reality, QRA has never been established as scientifically valid. The National Cancer Institute reports that QRA has only primitive application and makes only rough approximations of actual risks—hardly appropriate for establishing safety standards for dyes known to be carcinogenic.

The National Cancer Institute also reports that QRA must rely on simplistic and untestable assumptions. Yet, large factions of the cosmetics industry believe that QRA is sufficiently developed to merit the approval of cancer causing color additives. They ignore the real fact that QRA is scientifically unsubstantiated and a highly disputed practice, all at the risky expense of the American consumer.

The Reagan administration seems to have taken a powder from their duty to enforce the law as a result of cosmetics industry pressure. The Department of Health and Human Services, because of the industry claims that I have described, has allowed six color additives known to cause cancer to remain on the market. For 25 years the DHHS has ignored congressional direction to take responsible action on these six carcinogenic dyes.

Mr. President, I have introduced legislation that will bring an end to this. My bill, the Color Additives Amendments of 1985, will force the DHHS to require industry to obey the law and not the myth governing carcinogenic risk.

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION: CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS ARE PRESERVED

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, opponents of the Genocide Convention warn that ratification of the convention would invalidate our treasured constitutional protections. Are these critics right? Would ratification of the convention give the World Court the power to grab American citizens by the scruff of the neck and haul them into court?

The short answer to that question is an emphatic "no." The long answer reveals the many protections built into the convention and into the U.S. Constitution.

First, U.S. ratification would not take effect until the Congress—through its normal legislative procedures—hammered out and passed implementing legislation. The Genocide Convention is not self-implementing which means that the convention does not reach behind domestic law to affect U.S. citizens directly; it can only work through laws passed by the Congress. Article V of the convention explicitly acknowledges this limitation because it calls on each country to

pass implementing legislation that is "in accordance with their respective constitutions."

Second, the World Court's role extends only to disputes arising under the terms of the convention—the interpretation, application, or fulfillment of the agreement. Over 60 treaties and agreements that the United States already has signed contain the same provision. This provision has not threatened the United States in any of these agreements. Regardless of this provision, the World Court could never try an American citizen because only states—not individuals—can be defendants before the court. Theoretically, a new tribunal could be created to try individuals on charges of genocide, but the creation of that tribunal is an entirely separate matter that would require a new treaty and new Senate debate.

Third, the Supreme Court has been unambiguous that no treaty or law can violate the Constitution. Should a Federal law or treaty conflict, the most recent action of Congress would be controlling. However, neither a law nor a treaty could ever undercut the Constitution. We have the assurance of a noted conservative on this issue—Supreme Court Justice William Rehnquist. When Rehnquist was serving as Assistant Attorney General in the Nixon administration he declared that "the Constitution is superior to a treaty no matter how interpreted."

Ratification of the Genocide Convention would not threaten the constitutional protections of American citizens. Noted jurists throughout this country have stated and restated that assurance. Rather than reviewing long-resolved questions, the Senate should act swiftly to ratify the Genocide Convention.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to extend beyond the hour of 1:30 p.m., with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased once again to participate in the Senate's commemoration of Latvian Independence Day.

This month marks the 67th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Latvia. The unlawful incorporation of Latvia by force into the U.S.S.R. in 1940 has never been, nor should it ever be, recognized by the United States. We uphold the rights of Latvians, like all peoples of the world, to determine their own national destiny.

Despite almost 45 years of Soviet subjugation, the courageous Latvian people continue to display an indomitable spirit which, I am confident, will one day set them free. Today, we rise to pay tribute to Latvia and remind its people that the United States has not forgotten, nor will it ignore, the political injustice, religious persecution, economic exploitation, and cultural deprivation Latvians continue to suffer at the hands of an oppressive Soviet Government and military.

Mr. President, I sincerely pray that one day soon the people of Latvia will regain their independence and begin anew to enjoy the freedom they so rightfully deserve.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE NEW GATT ROUND

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, an historian once observed that, "The real crises are often concealed in occurrences so trivial in appearance that they pass unobserved."

Last Thursday, the economists at the GATT Secretariat released statistics that may at first appear insignificant, but have profound implications for the economic health of this country.

The economists estimated that world trade will grow by only 2-3 percent in 1985, much less than the 9-percent expansion last year.

They attributed the slowdown to rising protectionism in the world today.

These seemingly dry statistics—possible to lose in a flood of numbers—give an ominous warning that protectionism is dragging down the growth of all countries, just as it did during the depression years.

However, this report can also be a guide for the future. It gives us a clear indication of what we must seek in a new GATT round.

Mr. President, next week the GATT ministers will meet in Geneva to discuss setting the agenda for a new round of GATT negotiations.

Those negotiations could easily take 5 years to complete.

But I am hopeful that this meeting will be a first step in the right direction: reversing the decline in the growth in world trade.

Mr. President, the report released last Thursday shows that, at a minimum, we must achieve at least three goals in any new GATT round.

ENFORCEABILITY

First, GATT rules must be enforceable.

The growth of protectionism in the world today reflects the fact that GATT rules are not enforced.

The dispute resolution mechanism is inefficient and unwieldy. It moves at the pace of a snail.

It is also ineffective. Countries violate the GATT with impunity, and other countries respond by erecting barriers of their own.

The result is that all countries lose.

In fact, the GATT process is so inefficient and clumsy that most observers more correctly call GATT not the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade but the "gentlemen's agreement to talk and talk."

COVERAGE

Second, a new GATT must be complete.

By some estimates less than half of all international trade is conducted under the principles of GATT.

The current GATT does not cover trade in services. Trade-related investment issues are largely excluded. Commercial counterfeiting and other intellectual property questions are not covered.

It does not cover trade practices, which, while technically not in violation of the GATT, nevertheless violate its underlying principles of free, open, and fair trade.

Its provisions on agriculture are inadequate.

And the subsidies code is so vague as to be the source of endless dispute.

SUCCESS

Third, and perhaps most important, a new GATT agreement must be reached.

The report just released reminds us we cannot afford to be without some type of GATT system.

We need a set of rules that promotes free trade among nations.

We need a system that discourages countries from retreating into the false haven of protectionism. Countries cannot build one-way walls around their borders.

The statistics released by the GATT provide a disturbing inkling of what happens when such a system does not exist.

SUMMARY

Mr. President, the administration must begin consultations with the Congress, business, and labor about U.S. aims and goals in any new round.

But as we move toward a new round of GATT negotiations, all participants should remember that international trade is not a zero-sum game.

We must insist that trade be reciprocal and fair. We should seek complete coverage by trade rules.

And when we have achieved an agreement that embodies those principles, we can begin a new era of international economic growth among all nations.

ROBERT LEWIS

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I rise to commend Robert Lewis, the dean of Michigan's Washington press corps, on his election as president of the Society

of Professional Journalists, Sigma Delta Chi.

Bob Lewis has been covering the Michigan congressional delegation since he and I came to Washington nearly 20 years ago, and I can say that he has always provided the firm and fair coverage of our activities that the readers of Michigan's eight Booth newspapers deserve.

In his nearly two decades of Washington reporting, Bob Lewis has always sought to meet the principles of Sigma Delta Chi, the organization he will lead for the next year. Those principles include raising the quality of journalism and adhering to the highest standards and ethics. In addition to these concerns, Bob Lewis has also led SDX in other areas, serving as chairman of its National Freedom of Information Committee, and as one of the originators of "Project Watchdog." The latter was prompted by the concern of Bob and others that the public was losing its sense of how valuable a free and independent press is to democracy and to a self-governing people.

Admittedly, those of us in public office do not always appreciate every story written about us and our activities—we often make subjective judgments about what a reporter might consider an objective story. But, I think I can join my Michigan colleagues in saying that whenever Bob Lewis writes about us, he has been fair and has written what he perceives to be the truth. That is all that we and the public can ask.

Over the years of our professional relationship and regular working contact, I have particularly admired Bob Lewis' desire to get the full story to the people. In that sense, he is a classic newsmen—a passionate guardian of a free press—believing that the public has a right to know, and that the news reporter must dig out the facts and get them to the people. His thoroughness and patient marshaling of the facts are hallmarks of his work, as one finds in reading the stories he has written.

The Society of Professional Journalists is to be commended for electing Bob Lewis as its president. I am sure that he will provide the kind of principled leadership that the society's 24,000 members deserve, and I join my colleagues in congratulating Bob Lewis on his election to this honored post.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CRANSTON TO NURSES ORGANIZATION OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, Senator CRANSTON, the ranking democratic member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, shared with me the speech he recently gave to the Nurses Organization of the Veterans'

Administration [NOVA]. Not only does the speech outline congressional actions which have been taken to improve the recruitment, pay, and working conditions of nurses within the VA, it provides a succinct summary of the funding and program improvements that have been made generally in the VA health care system over the past few years. In addition, the speech points out the staffing and funding problems the system faces today and will continue to face in the years ahead.

No Senator has been more committed to ensuring the maintenance of an independent, high-quality, and comprehensive health care system within the VA than Senator CRANSTON. I highly recommend Senator CRANSTON's speech to my colleagues and request that the full text of the speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON AT THE PUBLIC RECOGNITION AWARD CEREMONY—NURSES ORGANIZATION OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Thank you very much, Noreen. I am deeply honored to receive this award from your fine organization. It is always gratifying to have one's work recognized. That is especially so where the recognition comes from those who really know the score.

I've worked with NOVA from your earliest days and greatly respect and admire the work you are doing—collectively as an organization, and individually, as working nurses in the VA.

Speaking of the early days of your organization, I remember wondering why an organization representing VA nurses—such as NOVA—did not exist in 1973 and again in 1979 and 1980 as our Committee grappled with the very serious nurse recruitment problems that were then afflicting the VA. I was, therefore, delighted when NOVA was born. I've been pleased to watch your growth and development since then. I'm especially pleased, of course, by the presence of Californians in the leadership of NOVA, your current president, Elaine Lloyd, and Board members Lenore Manak and Noreen Sommers.

My interest in VA health care dates from my first days in the Senate. When I came to the Senate in 1969, my first assignment was the chairmanship of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the then-Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the Senate unit with jurisdiction over VA health-care programs. Since then, I have been either the Chairman or the Ranking Democratic Member of the subcommittee or full Committee with jurisdiction over these programs.

The VA health-care system that I encountered in 1969 was not in good shape. Years of indifference had taken their toll, and the system was simply unprepared to meet the special health-care needs of the injured and disabled veterans returning from Vietnam.

I recognized then, and continue to believe very strongly today, that the heart and soul of the VA system is sufficient, qualified health-care personnel. Without caring, compassionate, competent health-care staff, all the buildings, beds, and equipment cannot do the job.

From the beginning, therefore, I undertook an effort to markedly increase the number and quality of health-care staff in the VA, an effort that I think has been remarkably successful up to this date.

Between 1971 and 1985, we in the Congress have taken the initiative to add approximately 66,000 full-time-equivalent employees to the system. In my opinion, these increases have made a dramatic difference in the quality of care available in the VA.

In order to add this staffing and make other improvements, the funding of VA medical care has been increased 5-fold since 1971. This funding and the increased staffing have permitted tremendous expansion of the system's capacity. Over these 15 years, we've added 6 hospitals, more than 50 nursing homes, and 25 outpatient clinics, and we've gone from treating approximately 780,000 inpatients in 1971 to treating more than 1.2 million inpatients in 1985 and from providing approximately 7.4 million outpatient visits to providing more than 18.6 million such visits now.

In addition to this critical staffing and funding improvement and program growth, numerous legislative initiatives that I've authored have been enacted to improve the VA's ability to recruit and retain the necessary numbers and caliber of health-care staff, especially nurses.

For example, in 1973, my legislation became law to authorize the payment of overtime pay, shift differentials, and premium pay for holidays and Sundays for VA nurses at rates generally comparable to those paid to G.S. employees. I insisted that Congress deal fairly with the nursing situation in the very legislation in which the physician special pay program was being established. I have continued and will continue to ensure this parity of consideration of the needs for legislation to improve nursing as well as doctoring in the VA.

In 1980, we enacted the legislation I introduced giving the VA new authority to modify rates of basic pay for certain health-care personnel when necessary to compete with the private sector. This authority has been widely used to improve the recruitment and retention of VA nurses.

In that same 1980 legislation, the VA was also authorized to offer scholarships to nurses in exchange for a commitment to work in the VA. I was pleased to collaborate on the final version of this legislation with its author, then-House Committee Chairman Ray Roberts, who took the initiative on this measure. I believe that this program has made a significant contribution to VA nursing, especially in support of further education for current VA nursing personnel—a change I pushed hard to achieve in 1982.

Perhaps the most significant recent initiative affecting VA nursing was one that did not, ultimately require legislation, although I was prepared to pursue legislation if necessary. As the result of an agreement I reached with then-Chief Medical Director Dr. Donald Custis in 1980, the Head of the Nursing Service in Central Office was elevated to the Deputy-Assistant-Chief-Medical-Director level.

The fortuitous selection of the current Director of the Nursing Service, Vernice Ferguson—together with the higher status of the office—has, I believe, led to important improvement in the extent to which VA nursing personnel, both in the Central Office and in the field, participate in planning, policy development, and decision-making activities throughout the VA

health-care system. Vernice has been a very real leader in that regard.

Because I believe these changes have been so important, I was very concerned when I learned, earlier this year, that the Central Office Nursing staff was being cut in half. I wrote to the Chief Medical Director to express my apprehension that this change could impair the ability of the Nursing Service to continue to play the leadership role it has assumed.

In a recent response to my letter, Dr. Ditzler indicated that the change in Central Office was in the nature of a decentralization, not a reduction. He stressed that, as a result of this change, together with the assignment of additional personnel, there will now be a person with nursing expertise in the field office of each of the DM&S 7 Regional Directors. According to Dr. Ditzler, this means the Nursing Service will actually have a total of eleven persons rather than the 8 it did have, in addition to the Chief of Nursing.

Frankly, I am not persuaded one way or the other on the merits of this new reorganization and, in this regard, have written to your President, Elaine, to solicit NOVA's views on it and how it is working. I extend that request to all of you here today and to your members around the system. Please let me know how you believe this reorganization is working in actuality. I am totally committed to maintaining the important role that the Nursing Service is playing and will oppose any change that would dilute that role.

Underlying all of the significant changes for VA nursing in recent years has been the challenge of maintaining the long tradition of providing quality nursing care to eligible veterans, even under difficult staffing situations. The VA, even more than most health-care systems, depends on nursing personnel to provide the lion's share of the actual, hands-on care.

Continuing this tradition of quality nursing care will become even more critical in the months and years ahead as the veteran population ages. Increased emphasis on extended care, new forms of noninstitutional care, and what I hope will be, at long last, a new VA emphasis on preventive care, to name just a few of the changes that can be expected, will all place new and greater emphasis on nursing personnel.

Despite my strong belief in the importance of the VA health-care system and its future role, I cannot paint a very rosy picture of the future this morning, unfortunately. My view is that the new deficit-reduction climate in the country and in the Congress makes it necessary for the system to face up to even greater challenges than in the past.

The deficit-reduction effort now before Congress is of enormous importance for our Nation. It is absolutely imperative that we take dramatic steps to reduce the deficit sharply and to bring the budget into balance.

As I mentioned earlier, we have been very successful in increasing the system's resources over the last 15 years. Although the process of improvement slowed greatly in the 1980's, even last year we still were able to add 620 more staff above the budget request level and have continued over these last 5 years to bring on line new nursing homes and outpatient clinics.

This trend was maintained as recently as this July, when the House and Senate insisted on the VA achieving and maintaining the 194,000 staff-year level Congress had intend-

ed for fiscal year 1985. Despite the Administration's objection, we added \$80 million in funding for that purpose. OMB had proposed cutting the staffing level for fiscal year 1985 to 192,000 and had held back funds for the 1985 civilian pay raise to accomplish that result. That effort failed, fortunately.

But now for fiscal year 1986, the situation is in the process of changing very dramatically and the problems created by the deficit make the situation all the more ominous.

As I've indicated, in virtually every year since 1971, the Congress has increased, and in many years very substantially increased, VA medical care funding and staff above the levels requested in the President's budget. Now, for this fiscal year, there is a real potential for reductions.

And here's the situation: For this fiscal year 1986, the House Appropriations bill is \$76 million higher than the Administration's medical care request and retains the 194,000 staff years that the Administration wanted to reduce by 1,000 for this fiscal year. However, the Senate Appropriations Committee, in August, recommended a cut of \$230 million below the budget request.

This action by the Appropriations Committee was a truly unprecedented move. We had all we could do to restore \$100 million of that reduction on the Senate floor and obtain a commitment for a supplemental appropriation later this year if proven necessary to maintain the 194,000 staff-years level.

As a result, the Senate bill is \$130 million below the Administration's budget request. The conference outcome is still unknown, but the very best we can hope for for fiscal year 1986 and beyond is a no-growth budget in VA medical care.

And now it must be asked, what effect will the new deficit-reduction legislation have on funding for VA health care this year and in the years to come?

Let me provide some ideas on that.

On Tuesday, in an attempt to resolve this uncertainty, I joined with Senator Don Riegle of Michigan to offer an amendment to that legislation on the Senate floor. Our amendment would have provided that, in the event there was to be an automatic across-the-board reduction pursuant to the new deficit-reduction legislation, the VA medical care account could not be cut below a level equal to the prior year's appropriation level plus the additional amounts needed for pay increases to maintain the prior year's staffing level.

In our view, this amendment would provide the type of protection needed to maintain a stable VA health-care system.

We came close to having the Senate adopt our amendment but lost 44-52. Incidentally, only 5 Republicans voted with us, I regret to say.

It is virtually certain that deficit-reduction legislation in some form will be enacted this year, probably along lines relatively close to the Senate-passed version. Although I have strongly opposed this particular version of deficit-reduction legislation—I voted for alternatives that I think would be far wiser—I believe that something like that approach is, regrettably, the only way that Congress will come to grips with the incredibly tough decisions that need to be made to reduce the deficit and balance the budget. And I believe we must make those decisions.

What this means, as a practical matter, is that the VA medical care account will be placed in a limbo of uncertainty year after

year after year. Even when its appropriations is enacted at a reasonably adequate level in the late summer or early fall, the whole process will be reevaluated at the beginning of the fiscal year, each October first.

Congress is looking at across-the-board cuts in excess of 20 percent to reduce the deficit and balance the budget over the next five years. That could mean a total reduction, over this period, of 60,000 staff-years in VA nursing and medical care for American's veterans.

No one should be lulled into any false sense of security because the cuts are not that deep this year and would come about over 5 years. I know you, on the front lines, truly understand what the numbers I've cited would mean in day-to-day, real-life terms.

Worse yet, I'm afraid, if anything could be much worse, while the deep cuts take effect, the need will continue to climb as the nation's veterans become older and less able to care for themselves.

These very deep cuts, then, are a certainty as long as there is no real reduction in defense spending and no significant new revenues.

The non-defense side of the budget just cannot alone bear the brunt of the enormous cuts needed to meet the new deficit-reduction targets between now and fiscal year 1991.

I know that you understand very well the value of federal programs, such as VA medical care. As nurses, you especially know how vital, also, are other health and health-related programs such as women and infant child feeding, Headstart, Medicaid, school lunch, food stamps, child immunization, and many more—not to mention many other programs that serve many other valid public purposes.

The reality is that if the American people want to fulfill our societal obligations to veterans, to children, and to disadvantaged men and women, they have to be willing to foot the bills for these programs.

Veterans will continue to receive adequate health care from the VA only—if the public is willing to pay for it! That is the simple truth! That is today's reality!

The Nation is so deeply in debt and the deficit is so high that the American people must make a decision: Are we willing to support new revenues to finance adequate health and hospital care for our Nation's veterans?

If the answer is yes, then tell it to President Reagan. That is my message to you and that is my message to all Americans today.

President Reagan refuses even to consider, in order to reduce the deficit, a minimum tax on corporations and on high-income individuals who pay little or no taxes—minimum taxes the Senate has endorsed three times over the past eight months.

Indeed, the President still talks of cutting taxes while our total federal debt approaches 2 trillion dollars. Speak of Rome burning . . .

Those, then, are some of the grave issues confronting the Congress and the American people, and confronting you in VA health care.

This is a strong and resilient Nation—the greatest Nation on Earth. In times of national crisis, our people have always risen to the challenge to do what is right. I'm confident they will do so again if they're told the truth and not fed a line of Presidential pabulum!

Your efforts to serve veterans deserve the continued backing of the American people. They have mine. My commitment to maintaining and strengthening the VA health-care system will continue unabated, as will my support for those who make that system work—you, the providers of that care.

Together we can still accomplish much—as we have in the past. I urge you to spread the word, both individually and through NOVA. Stay in touch with the Executive Branch and with members of Congress so that our people and our Government will do what must be done to ensure the continued strength of the VA health-care system and good medical care for the Nation's veterans.

I thank all of you for what I know you will endeavor to do toward these needs.

FARM CREDIT PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1985

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am pleased to have joined in introducing the Farm Credit Partnership Act of 1985.

America's farmers have been beset by a series of plagues. Farmland prices fell over 12 percent for the year ending April 1, 1985.

Sales are sagging. Wheat exports alone are expected to be down 349 million bushels from last year, a decline of about 49 percent.

Farmers simply cannot make a profit. Between 1980-84, net farm income was half what it was in the previous 4 years.

And among the biggest losers in all this have been the issuers and users of farm credit—both farmers and farm lenders.

Agricultural debt has skyrocketed from \$50 billion in the mid-1970's to more than \$200 billion in 1985.

Two hundred thousand farmers—approximately 10 percent of this Nation's 2.4 million farmers—could well be out of business within 4 years.

We must act now.

But at the same time, we must be sure that we do not simply prop up those farmers who are inefficient and can never be competitive.

We must separate the wheat from the chaff.

This bill does that. The main goal of this bill is to help farmers who are carrying heavy debts but have the management ability and the assets to work out their problems with some assistance.

This bill would restructure outstanding agricultural debt to reduce the debt load and interest costs of family farmers.

This bill is geared toward family farms with gross sales of more than \$40,000 per year and debt-to-asset ratios of above 40 percent.

This group of farmers accounts for about 10 percent of all farmers, but they carry 45 percent of the nation's farm debt.

Too often farm credit legislation has been designed to protect the assets of lenders without regard to farmers.

This bill is aimed at helping overloaded farmers survive.

And when we help these farmers, we help the entire Nation.

You will hear it said that we need this legislation to help preserve America's rural heritage.

That's true. But we need this legislation because it makes good, hard economic sense for this country.

Last year agricultural exports provided this country with a \$16.7 billion trade surplus.

That's no small contribution when this country faces record trade deficits.

And American farmers feed this country and the world.

That is not only essential to our physical health but also to our position as the leader of the Free world.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to continue to watch the decline of the American farmer.

For them, and for our Nation, I support this legislation.

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, November 18 is a day of great importance to the people of Latvian descent all over the world. Sixty-seven years ago on that day, the nation of Latvia was declared an independent republic. Unfortunately, remembrance of this day is not a celebration of freedom, but a painful reminder of the Soviet domination Latvians have been forced to endure.

There are approximately 85,000 people of Latvian ethnic background in the United States today. Many emigrated to this country during World War I to escape the ravages of war that existed in their homeland during German occupation. When the Germans were defeated and a free nation was established, thousands returned to their native Latvia. Their period of self-government was tragically short-lived, however, as the Soviet Union forcibly annexed Latvia as a Soviet territory in 1940. Gross deprivations and violations of fundamental human freedoms punctuated the Soviet invasion. Thousands of Latvians judged to be politically "unreliable" were deported eastward to Siberia.

Latvians are a very proud people, nationally loyal and possess a strong desire to preserve the Latvian culture. Their heritage is rich with poetic folk songs or dainas, art forms, and crafts, some over 3,000 years old. The native language, which is most closely related to ancient Indo-European tongues, is very unusual in that Lithuanian is the only language directly related to Latvian that is still spoken today. Although foreign control dominates Latvian political history, the distinct customs and traditions of the Latvian nationality have been kept alive by the hearty,

courageous spirit of the Latvian people.

The Latvians who came to the United States not only brought their unique history with them, but also the sorrow of a captured homeland. Their yearning for freedom and desire for a national identity have not diminished with time, and neither have their hopes for reestablishment of free Latvia. As members of the free world, it is our responsibility and privilege to remember and support the people of Latvia. Our protest of their captivity by an aggressor nation is renewed today, Latvian Independence Day, as we denounce Soviet denial of Latvian human rights, and every day, so long as oppression and injustice exist in the world.

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, on this, the 67th anniversary of Latvian independence, it is an honor for me to join with Latvian-Americans in celebrating their quest for human dignity and freedom. Symbolizing the determination of the Latvian people, November 18 provides an opportunity to reflect on the rich heritage of the Latvian people and their abiding faith in the future. For while personal and national integrity may be cruelly oppressed in their homeland it has not been extinguished.

The Latvians are a proud and spirited people who through the long centuries were able to repulse the attempts of conquest by their stronger neighbors including the Russians, Germans, Poles, and Swedes. During the period between 1721 and 1795 Russia gained control of Latvia, which remained in Russian hands until 1918. During the last half of the 19th century the national consciousness of the Latvian people reemerged. Thus, when the Russians adopted a russification policy in 1888-89, the Latvian people responded with a determined assertion of their own national identity. Their unyielding efforts were finally triumphant and on November 18, 1918, they declared their independence as the Latvian Republic, 1 year after having adopted a resolution calling for a united Latvia. This resolution, which sounded the note of self-determination, has been characterized as Latvia's first declaration of independence. Although the new state soon became a battleground for German ambitions, Russian designs, and Latvian national aspirations, she at last began her independent existence with the signing of a Latvian-Soviet peace treaty on August 11, 1920. On February 15, 1922, Latvia adopted its constitution.

The newly found freedom of the Latvian people, however, was short-lived. During the Second World War, conflict ravaged this small and vulnerable country. First, the Soviet Union

invaded and annexed Latvia in 1940, and then Germany invaded in 1941, occupying the country for 3 years. Eventually, the Soviet Union drove the Germans out but then forcibly incorporated Latvia into the Soviet Union as one of its republics. A Soviet regime was established and thousands of Latvians were deported to northern Russia and Siberia. Approximately 100,000 of those who escaped at that time settled in the United States and have contributed to the economic, cultural, political, and academic growth of their adopted American communities. It is their efforts that have brought public awareness to the Latvian situation.

Today the plight of the Latvians continues: The Soviets have embarked upon a systematic campaign of cultural repression. Preference for jobs and housing is given to non-Latvians, in an effort to make Latvians second-class citizens in their own country; by 1979 only 55 percent of the population of Latvia was ethnically Latvian. Their art and native tongue are threatened with calculated extinction, and those who openly practice religion are targets of various forms of harassment by the government. Nonetheless, the Latvian people have bravely resisted these Soviet efforts to suppress their national identity and have steadfastly persisted in the preservation of their cultural integrity.

We find leadership and inspiration in those who, at great personal cost, have lived courageously by the principles they espouse—Ints Calitis, Gunars Astra, Juris Bumeistars, and Teovils Kuma. Their names are well known to us. Countless others whose names we do not always know have joined them in openly protesting cultural repression, religious persecution, and economic exploitation, and like them, many have gone to prison for daring to express their most deeply held convictions.

Let us take this, the occasion of the 67th anniversary of independence, to salute the Latvian people, their strong sense of national and cultural identity, and their enduring, freedom-loving spirit. As we recall the sacrifices as well of these brave and courageous people, let us renew our commitment to speak out on behalf of those who suffer deprivation under a government which continues to deny basic human rights.

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, on this day, in 1918, Latvians celebrated their independence from Russian czarist rule. Over the past 67 years Latvians have both endured great suffering and achieved great accomplishments in their brief, but productive period of independence from 1918 until 1940.

After the collapse of the Russian czar in 1918, the Soviets promised the Latvians their status as a sovereign nation forever. The Latvians put forth all their efforts into creating a nation where, in the words of Prime Minister Karlis Ulmanis, there would be "neither the oppressed nor the oppressors."

Once independence was gained, the Latvians set to work to rebuild their nation which, like most of Europe, bore the scars of the First World War. Within a few short years, the Latvian people created farm outputs great enough to satisfy both domestic needs and to provide surplus for grain exports. Latvia's industrial workers grew fivefold as industries were built around natural resources such as forest, peats, clay, and limestone.

Education during Latvia's years of independence blossomed. During the 1930's Latvia had the highest percentage of youth attending high schools and colleges of all the European countries. Cultural events such as folk festivals and opera flourished. Literature and art based on folk traditions made memorable this special period of Latvian reawakening.

Following the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union, the occupation of Soviet troops soon crushed the efforts of Latvians to rebuild their own country. In defiance of international law, Moscow then declared Latvia a Soviet Socialist Republic.

In 1944 more than 200,000 Latvians and Estonians were deported from the Baltic nations to the Soviet Union. Since this time the Soviets, using such incentives as job opportunities and better standard of living, have attempted to dismantle Latvian culture by encouraging Slavs to immigrate to Latvia. This has resulted in a significant decrease in the number of Latvians as a percentage of the total population. In some urban areas, Latvians have even become outnumbered by Russians.

Russification of language has also been used by the Soviets in an effort to eliminate the Latvian cultural and social identity.

Today, Latvians continue to resist Soviet attempts to destroy their heritage. On such holidays as today, the Day of National Independence, Latvians place flowers and wreaths on the graves of Latvian heroes to demonstrate their continued commitment to independence. Another important date in all of the Baltic States is Baltic Freedom Day which marks the anniversary of the brutal occupation of the three Baltic nations by the Soviet Union. I am again introducing legislation this year to commemorate the 46th anniversary of this occupation.

The United States has never recognized the Soviet occupation of Latvia and to this day continues to recognize the accredited diplomatic representatives of the previous independent Government of Latvia. It is important that we as a nation continue to keep abreast of the ongoing struggle of the Latvians to regain their independence and maintain their culture and identity. Their efforts toward freedom from repression have not gone unnoticed and continue to have our support.

DR. MALIK SPEAKS TO THE WORLD

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, one of the more valuable privileges of membership in the Senate is the opportunity to know distinguished men from around the world, and to seek their counsel. Such a man is Dr. Charles H. Malik, one of Lebanon's most distinguished citizens, and, indeed, a friend to many in this body.

Dr. Malik's career as a diplomat, a professor, and a philosopher has often taken him out of Lebanon; but he has never left Lebanon. It remains his actual home, and his spiritual home, despite the agonies and the difficulties which wrack that unfortunate country.

Dr. Malik has much to say to the world. Some superficial commentators might think that someone who lives in the midst of the convulsions in that country would have little to say to the world. But the very trials to which that country is subjected represent a microcosm of the problems which we face on global scale.

Just last week, we learned that a suicide truck, loaded with dynamite, virtually destroyed an historic building where four of the most distinguished leaders of the Christian community in Lebanon were considering recent proposals for putting an end to the turmoil. At the last minute, the truck's trajectory was somewhat deflected. As it was, four persons died in the resulting explosion, including three soldiers who deflected the truck. Although the room in which the leaders were meeting was badly destroyed, the four leaders themselves escaped with superficial wounds.

Had Dr. Malik been in Lebanon last week, instead of in Washington urgently seeking attention for his country's problems, he would have been the fifth official in that room.

Mr. President, perhaps the best way to get some idea of the way in which the world has honored Dr. Malik, is to read the entry in the current "Who's Who," and I ask unanimous consent that it appear at this point in the RECORD:

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

WHO'S WHO IN THE WORLD (7th Edition 1984-1985)

Malik, Charles Habib, philosopher; b. Bteram, Al-Koura, Lebanon, 1906's. Habib Khalil and Zareefi (Karam) M.; B.A., Am. U., Beirut, 1927; M.A., Ph.D., Harvard, 1937; student U. Freiburg (Germany), 1935-36; hon. doctoral degrees 50 univs. and colls. in U.S., Can. and Europe including Princeton U., Harvard U., Yale U., Columbia U., U. Calif. at Los Angeles, Notre Dame U., Brown U., Ill. Inst. Tech., Cath. U. Am., Georgetown U., Williams Coll., Dartmouth Coll., U. Freiburg, St. Mary's U., others; m. Eva Badr, 1941; 1 son, Michael Habib Charles. Teaching and adminstrv. positions Am. U. Beirut, 1927-76, dean grad. studies, 1955-60, distinguished prof. philosophy, 1962-76, disting. prof. emeritus, 1976-; Jacques Maritain disting. prof. moral and polit. philosophy Cath. U. Am., Washington, 1981-82; vis. prof. Dartmouth and Harvard, 1960; Univ. prof. Am. U., Washington, 1961-62; E.E. and M.P. to U.S., 1945-53 to Cuba, 1946-55; ambassador E. and P. to U.S., 1953-55; mem., sometime chmn. Lebanese del. UN, 1945-54, Signatory Charter UN, San Francisco, 1945, chmn. delegations Lebanon to UN, 1956-58; chmn. 3d Com. UN Gen. Assembly, 1948-49; pres. 13th Session, UN Gen. Assembly, 1958-59; mem. UN Security Council, 1953-54, pres., Feb. 1953, Jan., Dec. 1954; mem. UN ECOSOC Council, 1946-49, pres., 1948; mem. UN Human Rights Commn., 1947-54, chmn. commn., 1951, 52; rep. Lebanon Internat. Bank Fund and UNESCO, various times, 1947-52; Signatory for Lebanon, Japanese Peace Treaty, 1951; del. Bandung Conf., 1955; minister fgn. affairs Lebanon, 1956-58, minister nat. edn. and fine arts, 1956-57, mem. Parliament, 1957-60, Grand 1st magistrate Holy Orthodox Ch.; pres. World Council Christian Edn., 1967-71; v.p. United Bible Soc., 1966-72; former pres. bd. trustees Orthodox Coll. Annunciation, Beirut; dir. Woodrow Wilson Found., 1961-63; sometime vis. com. philosophy dept. Harvard and physics dept. Tufts U. Fellow Inst. Advanced Religious Studies, U. Notre Dame. 1969. Fellow AAAS, Am. Geog. Soc. Spring Arbor Coll.; mem. Am. Bible Soc. (hon. life), Am. Philos. Assn., Am. Philos. Soc., Assn. Realistic Philosophy, Assn. Symbolic Logic, Metaphys. Soc. Am., Am. Acad. Arts and Scis., Am. Polit. Sci. Assn., Am. Acad. Polit. and Social Sci., Am. Soc. Internat. Law, Internat. Law Assn., Union Internat. Assns., Internat. Polit. Sci. Assn., Nat. Geog. Soc., Acad. Human Rights, Internat. Movement for Atlantic Union, Internat. Platform Assn., Lebanese Acad. (a founder), Société européenne de Culture, Assn. mon diale de la Culture. Decorated by the governments of Lebanon, Italy, Jordan, Syria, Iraq, Cuba, Iran, Brazil, Dominican Republic, Austria, Greece, Nationalist China; holder highest order Lebanon for distinguished service, Clubs; Cosmos (Washington); Century, Harvard (N.Y.C.). Author; (essays) War and Peace, 1950, Problem of Asia, 1951; Christ and Crisis, 1962; Man in the Struggle for Peace, 1963; God and Man in Contemporary Christian Thought, 1971; God and Man in Contemporary Islamic Thought, 1972; The Wonder of Being, 1974; A Christian Critique of the University, 1982; author numerous books in Arabic, most recent Almuqaddimah, 1977; contrb. parts to 20 books; author over 200 articles, Am., European, Near Eastern mags. Home: Harvard Club 27 W 44th St New York NY 10036 also Cosmos Club 2121 Massachusetts Ave NW Washington DC 20008 also Rabiya, Almatn, Lebanon.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, last summer, Dr. Malik gave a notable address at the Cosmos Club, whose members comprise a group of men distinguished in science, literature, the arts, and public service. As usual, his remarks reflected his vast erudition and practical experience in the world of diplomacy.

Although Dr. Malik brought a message from Lebanon, it was not narrowly directed at the problems of his own country. No, it was a message that went to the essence of the problems facing the West. I will give just one example of his wisdom from the summing up. Dr. Malik said:

The fundamental element in the situation is neither political, nor social, nor economic, nor material, nor international: It is spiritual and religious. This is what the West does not understand. The West has become so politicized, socialized, and economicized, in short, so secularized, and so determined by world relations of power, that it thinks that history hinges on considerations of power and material deprivation and development alone. This is one of the principal fallacies of this age. Men are actuated and moved by spirit and mind and fundamental convictions and attitudes and conflicting wills to power more than by anything else.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire address by Dr. Malik be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

A MESSAGE FROM LEBANON

(An address by Charles Malik—Delivered on Monday noon, June 3, 1985 at the Cosmos Club, Washington, DC at a Special Noon Forum)

The title "A Message from Lebanon," which was announced without previous consultation with me, is misleading. It does not mean a message from Lebanon about Lebanon. The message is about the state of the world. It is the state of the world that has occasioned the present sad state of Lebanon. Let us then go straight to the origin, the source, the fundamental cause, and let us not waste any time on subsidiary issues.

I discuss the state of the world under six headings: the rivalry between Washington and Moscow; China; the so-called Third World; the Near and Middle East; the technological revolution and the state of the mind and spirit; a summing up. I discuss these matters topically; for the most part I only list under each heading the fundamental topics to be gone into in depth, trusting that in the question and answer period you will challenge me to enlarge on some of them.

(1) RIVALRY BETWEEN WASHINGTON AND MOSCOW

So far as I understand it, the Strategic Defense Initiative (popularly called Star Wars) is purely defensive. In fact it is the ultimate weapon of defense. Destroy the rockets in flight rather than on the ground—this is the principle of this initiative. Nobody objects to nations building fortifications, or developing strong armies to defend themselves, or creating shelters against nuclear explosions; if all these measures have always been regarded as legitimate, the Stra-

tegic Defense Initiative, as a defensive mechanism, appears to me to be ten times more legitimate. If this system, when perfected, should render obsolete all long-range nuclear weapons, then it would be the greatest boon to mankind in this nuclear age. From the first moment ICBM's and medium range nuclear missiles were invested, the mind at once turned to what would neutralize them. We appear to be there now, or near there. It is a compelling argument for disarmament. Only nuclear devices poised for offense will be the casualties. Therefore it is only the offensive mind bent on aggression that will be offended by the SDI.

The development of nuclear arms is not an end in itself. One of its effects is to help prevent a Third World War. If the balance of terror is maintained, then I believe both the Americans and the Soviets are rational enough not to initiate a world war in which both will be losers, and losers on an incomparably unprecedented scale. The paradox of nuclear rearmament is that the very arms that are thus devised are destined not to be used but only to induce the scrapping of them. The rearmament is precisely for the sake of disarmament. Man is such that only terror can cause him to disarm. The danger of accidents is real, but even this danger, I believe, can be controlled. And with the certain proliferation of nuclear weapons, some madman or mad movement in Asia or Africa or the Middle East, namely, other than the superpowers, might be tempted to use them. My bet is that neither the Soviets nor the Americans are mad, and that they will not be drawn into such a local conflict, but that they have the power then to work together to force it to remain localized.

Why, then, the whole exercise of rearmament if it is only for the sake of disarmament? Why not disarm forthwith? Because there is a profound mistrust between Washington and Moscow. And mistrust of this nature is not subject to material or military determination: it is something profoundly spiritual. We have two different, and in many respects contradictory, fundamental interpretations of man, history, society, government, freedom, destiny, and the right scale of values: two interpretations fatefully confronting each other in this physically unified world. The communists themselves are the first to emphasize this fact. Who started this opposition? This is the fundamental question. The confrontation is about history itself, and the final things. We shall inherit the earth—and now also the moon and the planets and the solar system and the whole galaxy? This is what is at stake. A mistrust of this order of magnitude raises the question of the meaning of the whole of recorded history for 6000 years for the present and for the future. And the categories, conditions and procedures of how to deal with this kind of mistrust are all psychological, intellectual and spiritual.

Communism has developed refined techniques for addressing and mobilizing the masses; the West addresses only governments, only the ruling classes. This is the West's most important built-in handicap. If ours is a Marxist age, it is for that reason the age of the masses. The category of quantity today predominates, not that of quality. The principle of the materialists is matter, and matter acts only by mass and weight. The only way to meet quantity is to develop the qualitative edge to the utmost.

That wherein the West is in principle strongest, I mean, freedom, mind, spirit, values, ideas, the continuity of tradition, it

in fact is weakest, so far as the image it projects of itself abroad is concerned. It projects the image for the most part of having only money and machines to give. Those whose first principle is matter care more for penetrating the mind and spirit of the world than those whose first principle is mind and ideas. Matter cares more for mind, mind more for matter. This is the supreme paradox of our age.

To confine the universe of discourse between Washington and Moscow only to matters political, economic and social, and only to considerations of defense and security, is to fall into the trap of Marx, who understands history and the world only in these terms. The values of freedom and man should be vigorously thrust to the foreground. Those who only think of political, economic, social and security values have already become Marxist, perhaps without their knowing it. To that extent our age is a Marxist age. It is on spiritual, human and freedom questions that the West is strongest, if only it knew itself and its cumulative tradition.

Under conditions of no war, which are likely to remain prevailing as a result of the balance of terror, who is changing more and more in the image of the other, the West or the Marxist world? This is the crucial question. Again, if you think only in economic, social and political terms, you are already overwhelmed. You should think in terms of spirit, and mind, and man, and faith, and the interpretation of history and human destiny, to be able to answer this question correctly. And I find clear signs of the West turning more and more in the image of the communist world. For instance, who among the youth of America really believe? Who among the great scientists and professors and scholars really believe? The spread of atheism and materialism and uncritical rationalism, or at least of indifferentism, is most alarming.

It is true there are signs of a stirring of the spirit in America and the West, just as there are among the Russians. But the anti-spiritual, anti-intellectual, anti-Christian, anti-freedom, even anti-human, forces continue to preponderate.

CHINA

One of the basic long-range problems of history is China. Chou-en-lai told us publicly in 1955 in Bandung, with evident pride, if not also defiance, that he was an atheist. He told me privately that the one formidable problem they face was how to control the birthrate, and while they were doing the best they could toward that end, he was not sure they would succeed. Could the population of China be stabilized at one billion only?

During the nineteenth century and up to the middle of the twentieth, China opened up considerably to Western influence. However, Marx, who is a special version of the West, stole the show and beat the other version a generation or so ago in the race for the soul of China. How and why this happened is a searching question that only history and philosophy can determine. How much the many signs of liberation from Marx we read about today are authentic and lasting, I do not know. But full advantage must be taken of them. Freedom to criticize Marx and Mao-tse-tung appears possible. The educational system is in process of being liberalized—how far, again I do not know. But what I do know on authoritative grounds is that the United Bible Societies signed two months ago an agreement with the churches of China, with the ap-

proval of the Government, to provide those churches with millions of copies of the Bible. I do not know that this has happened with respect to the Soviet Union.

People refer to China, with euphoric expectation, that it is the world's greatest market. Is that all that China means to them? They have nothing to give China save to sell and buy from it? If this generation misses the opportunity of penetrating the heart and soul and mind of China, now that the door appears to be slightly ajar, then I dread to think of the judgment of history 200 years from now on this generation. This process of penetration requires the most responsible study and thinking. It requires more; it requires conviction and daring, and an exuberant faith in your deepest values.

The Chinese are a people of genius, and not only in their cuisine. Don't only sell them goods and provide them with machines. Don't only "use" them to balance the Soviet Union. Develop a real interest in their culture for its own sake: in their literature, in their art, in their history, in their philosophy, in their way of life, in their ideas about man and his destiny. And not only that, but humbly ask yourselves the question: do we have in our great tradition (I hope you still believe it is great) something spiritual, intellectual, moral, human, that the Chinese do not have, that we feel we must share with them? In the deeper things that last longest among peoples, it is always true that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

(3) THE THIRD WORLD

The Third World is "third" because there are two other worlds with which it is contrasted. Therefore the very naming of it is derivative from the two other worlds.

It is also dignified by the term "developing" rather than, as used to be the case, the term "underdeveloped," which would not be very dignifying; although the two other worlds are "developing" too, and in some instances and in certain respects faster than it.

The basic problem of the Third World is that it lacks uninterrupted political traditions and stable political institutions.

Three things can be predicted about Asia, Africa and the Middle East, and to some extent about Latin America: (1) We can expect coups, upheavals and revolutions in these countries, not for years, but for generations and perhaps centuries to come. (2) Although freed from classical colonialism, these peoples cannot stand on their own feet, but must depend for the indefinite future on the more advanced countries for their development and stability. (3) Japan, China, the Soviet Union, Europe and America shall for the foreseeable future always find themselves competing with one another for political, economic, ideological and strategic influence in these countries. Thus America cannot disengage itself from now on from almost any part of the Third World.

Without the great universities, the Freiburgs, the Sorbonnes, the Oxfords, the Harvards, the West could never have developed itself. Can you imagine an Oxford or a Harvard arising in Africa, Asia and the Middle East before hundreds of years from now, I mean a university to which a German, or Frenchman, or Englishman, or American would go to specialize in his own culture, just as Asians, Africans and Middle Easterners can go now to German, French, British and American universities to learn about

and specialize in their own cultures? And even then the cultures of the Third World will have been incorporated into the 4000-year old culture of Europe and America, without which Europe and America would never have produced their great civilizations.

Therefore, the dependency of the Third World is of its very essence. This fact bears in itself immense world-historical and world-cultural implications.

THE NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

The Gulf war is but the latest recurrence of the age-old Persian reaction to the influences impinging upon that country from the West. In olden times there was first the dualism of Zoroastrianism against the rigid monism of the Eastern Mediterranean; then the Persian Empire which we read about in the Bible; then the Graeco-Persian wars; then Alexander; then the Parthian resistance to Roman expansion; then we have Manichaeism which vigorously competed with Christianity up to the early fifth century when Augustine gave it the coup de grace; and even Shi'ism, originally and today, is a Persian reaction from within Islam against the Arab version of Islam. Persia has always been a breeding ground of all sorts of esoteric mystical movements. No wonder, then, the Khomeinism of our times.

The Cosmos Club is full of Persian presence. Witness the magnificent Persian rugs all over the place, especially the one with Persian writings in the inner office on the first floor. That one is worth several hundred thousand dollars. You do not find a single Arab presence in the Cosmos Club, save perhaps the electric light and the hot water, which may be fueled by Arab oil. But Arab oil is not the creation of Arab genius but of geology. We have also in Washington the concrete blocks in front of the White House and the State Department, which proclaim loudly the presence, at least potentially, of Khomeini.

Vishinsky turned once to Henry Cabot Lodge at the United Nations and said something to this effect: What has the Middle East to do with South Dakota or with American security in general? We are a Middle Eastern country ourselves, which you are not, and the Middle East is of vital importance to our security, which it is not to yours. Add to this observation of Vishinsky the following three facts: first, the fact that the Soviet Union contains more than fifty million Moslems; second, the fact that the Russians interacted with the Turks and fought them for three or four centuries (witness the marvelous little story "Hadj Murad" by Tolstoy); and third, the fact that Byzantium is the cultural mother of Russia, and therefore Istanbul holds a spiritual-mystical significance to the Russian soul beyond any considerations of strategy.

Whatever the outcome of the Iraqi-Iranian war, I doubt that the West can recover its past presence in Persia. It appears to me that all realistic, long-range, strategic calculations must reckon with the distinct possibility, not quite to say certainty, that Iran will one day fall under Soviet influence. Your abiding zone of influence, all down the ages, is not the Gulf, but, especially now with the almost organic relationship that has been built up between you and Israel, the Eastern Mediterranean. Concentrate first on this, and be prepared to cut your losses there.

All the regimes of the Middle East without exception are wobbly. There is an essential reason why this is the case. You cannot afford to forget the grand reception accord-

ed the Shah of Iran at the beginning of 1978 by President Carter, and what happened to that man at the end of the same year. Similar surprises are almost certain to recur.

Last week's King Hussein initiative is significant: it should be followed up assiduously. Its basic flaw, however, is twofold: it does not include Syria, and it conceives of an international conference comprising, in addition to the parties directly concerned, the permanent members of the Security Council of the United Nations as an "umbrella". The word "umbrella" has suddenly crept into the diplomatic jargon. No resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict is possible with Syria and the Soviet Union being excluded from the peace process. Syria has announced its determination to wreck the Hussein initiative as it succeeded in causing the May 17, 1983 agreement between Israel and Lebanon, which was midwived by the United States, to be abrogated. And to suppose that the Soviet Union will allow itself to be used as an "umbrella" without itself also wrecking whatever the use of the "umbrella" is going to yield, is naive in the extreme.

Lebanon is a very sick country. It desperately needs doctors to tend and cure it. Doctors do not care about the shabbiness of the patient: they just go ahead and treat him with a view to restoring him to health. Lebanon is so shabby within that I am ashamed of it. But it is has wonderful reserves of health and strength. Its shabbiness has been analyzed ad nauseam, but the importance of saving it, even if necessary against itself, has not been brought out.

Three things are at stake in the agony of Lebanon: whether it is inevitable that the free, sovereign and independent state of Lebanon be incorporated into another state or be divided up between its neighbors; whether it is inevitable that the free, open, democratic, and pluralist society of Lebanon be assimilated into the kind of societies prevailing in the Middle East, which are neither free, nor open, nor democratic, nor pluralist; and whether it is inevitable that the free and secure Christian community of Lebanon, the only such community in the Middle East, (and we must keep in mind that all fundamental distinctions in the Middle East are religious), lost its freedom and security. I believe that none of these three possibilities is inevitable, and that high and daring diplomacy can avert them.

The widespread disgust at Lebanon among the thoughtful and deciding circles of America today is, humanly speaking, perfectly understandable. But what if this disgust should help in bringing about the destruction of the only free, open, democratic and pluralist society, and the only 2000-year-old free and secure Christian community in the entire Arabic-speaking and Moslem worlds? This is the question: disgust leading to indifference, and indifference leading to perishing. Those who are overcome by disgust do not know the world-historical significance of what they are thereby helping to cause happen.

There is a blackout in the media of this country about the communist presence in the Middle East. The cause of this blackout baffles me. A brilliant writer published last week two columns on the Middle East; he mentioned the United States, Israel, Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, the Palestinians, Iraq, Iran, and the names of leaders; I could not take exception to almost anything he said; but not a word hinted that the Soviet Union or the communists exist; while they are as present on the scene as, and in certain re-

spects more present than, you are. And even the leaders of America hardly ever mention the Soviet Union in connection with the Middle East: they talk for the most part as though the Middle East were an exclusive preserve of their own. The truth is that the Soviet Union and its friends in the Near and Middle East have it in their power to frustrate any development they wish to frustrate, and to initiate independent developments favorable to their aims. You are not acting alone, nor is anybody in the Middle East acting in the absence of the decisive presence of the Soviet Union.

There is a fateful competition in the concept of the state between Israel and Lebanon. Israel declares itself a Jewish state; Lebanon wants itself to be a pluralist state. I must repeat here, unfortunately to the dismay or even the incomprehension of the secularists of the West, that all fundamental distinctions in the Middle East are religious. And so, by a pluralist state is meant one where religious communities feel perfectly at home in it, each being free and master of its own values and destiny. There are Moslems who openly want Lebanon to be a Moslem state or an Islamic republic. The Christians want Lebanon to be neither a Moslem nor a Christian state, but a pluralist one. While this competition between the two concepts of state has not been resolved, and while only the concrete developments of history can resolve it, the Christians do not accept any kind of state in which they are not guaranteed that they will never become second-class citizens. This, in a nutshell, is what the whole drama of Lebanon is really about.

(5) THE TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION AND THE STATE OF THE MIND AND SPIRIT

The technological revolution is just beginning. Nor can it be stopped. We are going to see wonders upon wonders in every field—in space, in sending human settlements to Mars, in transportation and communication, in instruments of war, in medicine, in what is called genetic engineering, in the endless proliferation of gadgets and creature comforts, in the adaptation of the computer to every conceivable need. Technology enhances life, but it can also detract from it. Turning the good of technology against the evil effects of technology—this is the supreme desideratum of the technological revolution.

Technology is the realm of means and not of ends. Depending on the heart and will of man, every means can be turned to bad use. Therefore, make sure of your heart and will first, and then you can set the right ends and choose the right means.

The most nagging question is: in whose light are we to seek the ends and according to what criterion are we to make sure of our heart and will? When you track down the values of our age to their deepest depths, you will find that the light and the criterion are chance and chaos.

In cocktail parties you sometimes overhear the ladies present, even more than the men, exchanging such remarks as: "My analyst told me this, and my analyst told me that." Urban neurosis lives these days by standards set by analysts. Analysts have replaced priests and Freudian lore the Bible. Where do analysts get their norms from? Again, in the final analysis, from chance and chaos. The whole atmosphere of urban existence hardly ever permits you to say, the Bible says this and the Bible says that.

Now the Bible repeatedly warns against idolatry, namely, admiring, or, to use the

Biblical term, worshipping, the works of our own hands—and we many add “of our own heads—” because no hand ever worked without the direction of the head. The idolatry of our times is to get lost in the wonders of the endless gadgets created by technology. We end up in worshipping man and his creations, namely, in worshipping ourselves, rather than the creator both of ourselves and our creations.

Give glory to something other than yourself—this is a basic maxim. What is this “other”—this is the question.

Carl Sagan's 13-part television series entitled “Cosmos” in which he speaks of the wonders of cosmology is itself one way of getting lost in the material world, and therefore one from of idolatry. Much of what he says is true and he is to be thanked for every truth he brought out. But as an exulting, self-proclaimed atheist, may he not have other motives than truth for truth's sake? And why fasten on the truths of the material universe in such a way as to derive from them the far more glorious truths of culture and the great intellectual and spiritual traditions of mankind? Even truth may be used to befuddle man in his simple, happy faith.

And Helen Caldwell wrote a book called “Missile Envy.” My only comment here is that the title is Freudian. One of the spiritual wonders of this age is how Freud has invaded the mind, and not only Marx. Who is not Freudian today, who indeed is not Marxist?

Such books as John Naisbitt's “Megatrends” and Alvin Toffler's earlier “Future Shock,” though futurist, are all purely economic-social-political-psychological, with hardly any reference to matters human, moral, personal, spiritual. Such matters are only “subjective forms,” as Whitehead would say, and yet they are the most decisive, and without them human life would not be worth much.

The thinkers who thought through the technological revolution in metaphysical depth are all European. They include Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Heidegger, Jaspers, Gabriel Marcel, Ortega Y Gasset, Berdyaev, Archbishop Temple, C. S. Lewis, G. K. Chesterton. If you read these men passionately, you will receive an intellectual and spiritual enlightening the like of which can be gotten in no other way. This 50-page essay by Kierkegaard, written in 1846, 139 years ago, entitled “The Present Age,” is absolutely prophetic so far as the moral and personal phenomena of our time are concerned.

Of the possible deleterious effects of technology I mention only five: (1) The possible destruction of community life: no sooner do people know each other than they part from each other. But man is created for fellowship, friendship, love, community. (2) Movement for its own sake. But man is created for quiet, stillness, peace, thought, contemplation. (3) The breakdown of the family. The Census Bureau reported a couple of weeks ago that “Of all United States families with children, more than one quarter have only one parent present.” I am sure other startling statistics can be cited about divorce. But character, moral stability, contentment, joy, self-confidence are all the product of the happy, united and loving family. Disturbing statistics about the breakdown of family life in Europe and America under the trying tensions of technological existence could be misleading; there are wonderful, happy, God-fearing families all over Europe and America, perhaps more than anywhere else in the world.

(4) The urban neurosis has almost become the norm. But the norm is health, nature, wholeness, serenity, integrity of being. (5) The fad of violence and sex. But the joy and power consequent upon self-control exceeds by far every other joy and power.

Far from helping to overcome these deleterious effects, television, itself the greatest character- and mind-forming invention of technology, is accentuating them. Let there be one T.V. channel wholly dedicated to the blessings of community life, to stillness and rest, to great poetry, music and art, to happy family existence, to the natural and normal, to self-control and the sense of honor, to the great heroes of the spirit in history, and you will wipe out most of the evil effects of technology. This is an example of the good use of technology counteracting its bad effects.

(6) A SUMMING UP

The caldron that is the Near and Middle East is boiling, both in the Gulf and in the Eastern Mediterranean. It could erupt any minute. I am not an alarmist, and while it may erupt, I do not believe it need erupt: the likelihood is that it will be contained. The fundamental element in the situation is neither political, nor social, nor economic, nor material, nor international: it is spiritual and religious. This is what the West does not understand. The West has become so politicized, socialized and economicized, in short so secularized, and so determined by world tensions of power, material deprivation and development alone. This is one of the principal fallacies of this age. Men are actuated and moved by spirit and mind and fundamental convictions and attitudes and conflicting wills to power more than by anything else. Even if you guarantee them all the wealth and comforts in the world, the men and women who are fighting and dying in the Eastern Mediterranean and in the Gulf will keep on fighting and dying all the same. Fundamental differences in culture, in outlook, in values, in the interpretation of freedom and history and society and government and human destiny, are potentially at work. And the day shall come when the radical religious fanaticism now gathering momentum in the Near and Middle East will spill over into Europe and America. The spilling over has already begun (not to mention the concrete blocks in front of the White House and the State Department in Washington) with the chasing out of Americans and Europeans from Lebanon, a land once celebrated precisely for its climate of freedom in which Europeans and Americans felt more at home than anywhere else outside the borders of their own countries. And the West meets this relentless onslaught only with money and machines, never with its own ideas of fairness and justice and tolerance and peace and government and history and freedom and destiny and mutual respect and the highest values that man has known, all integral to its own heritage. Is there a more culpable exploitation than to care only for people's raw materials and never for their soul—in fact to take pride in the escapist doctrine that each one of us is entitled to his own independent soul? Nothing to share with others, except one side offering raw materials including outstanding strategic locations in return for money and machines from the other side?

Mind can only be met by mind, spirit by spirit, fundamental attitude by fundamental attitude, or else Western civilization is doomed. Whether this civilization can wake up from its own materialist miasma and shake off its own moral and spiritual indif-

ference, is the question facing not only that civilization but the world.

The tragedy today is that the civilization of the West, extending cumulatively without interruption for five to six thousand years, possesses creative values, ideals and practices that no other civilization has ever possessed; and yet it is not activating these values and practices, whether for defense or for offense. It just lets itself be subverted and overwhelmed, both from inside and from outside. What is fatefully called for is a mighty spiritual awakening emanating from the churches, the universities and the media. Thus means and sources of inspiration are all there; what is wanting is conviction, will and leadership. History itself awaits the initiative of the West on the deepest level more than ever before. And the thirst of the souls of men everywhere for that initiative is simply indescribable.

PORCHLIGHT CAMPAIGN

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I rise today in support of legislation recently introduced by my good friend from Illinois, Senator SIMON, that is aimed at lighting porches and windows across America in the name of peace. This bill, Senate Concurrent Resolution 88, underscores the danger that nuclear weapons hold for all life and urges citizens everywhere to light porchlits, candles, and other lights on November 19 and 20, the days of the summit as on open display of desire for world peace.

The “porchlight campaign” was first envisioned by a coalition of religious groups consisting of the National Council of Churches, the World Council of Churches, the United States Catholic Conference, the Rabbinical Assembly of America and the Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon. It was their intent to show both governments the importance that Americans attach to the rare opportunity for peace offered by the summit meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev. This resolution, also introduced in the House of Representatives by our colleagues Representatives AUCOIN and CONTE, is just a part of a broad global effort to urge citizens everywhere to join together in showing their hope for world peace.

This week we all have heard the almost deafening media blitz surrounding the summit meeting. As I have read newspaper and magazine articles and watched television reports concerning this historic event, I have been struck not by opinions expressed, but by the commentators. Instead of the ordinary citizens that have the greatest interest in seeing tangible results, we are bombarded by various experts and politicians who all have certain angles and opinions on what they believe will influence the summit meeting. While these professionals, who often represent different ideological factions, have offered many constructive insights concerning the summit, I see a distinct lack of cover-

age on the underlying facets that demand arms control—the devastating economic tradeoffs, the overwhelming fear of a nuclear holocaust. Our desire to avoid these perils must be expressed in a way that will catch the attention of world leaders.

I believe that the porchlight campaign offers a rallying point for all America to show a united desire for peace. It is important that both nations realize the sense of urgency that its citizens hold toward achieving meaningful arms control. Lighting a light for peace is a small but significant way to get the message through. I would encourage all my colleagues to support this resolution by adding their names as cosponsors and, of course, by voting for it. More important, I would ask all Members of Congress to urge both the citizens and the businesses of their States and districts to participate in this cause by lighting a light for peace on November 19 and 20.

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

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I understand that it is alright with the leadership on the other side if I speak longer during the period for the transaction of morning business than the 5 minutes which has been a part of the order thus far. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that I may speak beyond the 5-minute limitation.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may I say also that if any Senator wishes to have the floor while I am speaking I will be happy to yield it, in which case I ask unanimous consent that if there is such an interruption in my statement that the Record show no such interruption when I resume the speech later.

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

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

THE UNITED STATES SENATE

ROBERT A. TAFT'S SENATE, 1945-53

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in several previous addresses on the Senate's history I have spoken of those crucial years following the end of the Second World War in 1945. I have discussed the landmark Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 that provided the base

of support on which the modern Senate operates. Recently, I spoke of the post-war conditions that gave rise to the era of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. Finally, I devoted an address to the topic of the Senate and foreign policy during the eight years of the Truman presidency. Today, I shall turn my attention to the major domestic policy issues that the Senate confronted between 1945 and 1953, the year in which it first came to the House of Representatives.

In any survey of Senate life during that period there are a handful of Senators whose names immediately come to mind. They include Tennessee's Kenneth McKellar, Georgia's Walter George and Richard Russell, Arizona's Carl Hayden, Wyoming's Joseph O'Mahoney, Montana's James Murray, New Hampshire's Styles Bridges, and Alabama's Lister Hill. Each of these men left an impact on this institution and on the laws of our nation. There are other Senators, of course, who had a major impact on the institution and on the Nation's laws, but I have selected these in particular, it being obvious that one cannot in one dissertation—without making it overly long—go into the services that were performed by each and every Senator during that particular era.

There is one member, however, whose career reached its zenith during the Truman administration. A review of his activities will bring some focus to life in the Senate during those turbulent post-war years.

That Senator's memorials surround us today. Across Constitution Avenue there arises from the sloping plain of Capitol Hill a white marble bell tower bearing his name. At its base there stands guard his ten-foot-high bronze statue. Just outside this Senate Chamber there appears another notable memorial to the Senator, in the Senate Reception Room among the five medallion portraits honoring the elite among the Senate's most outstanding former members. Two of these Senators served in the twentieth century. One is Robert M. La Follette, Sr., of Wisconsin. The other, considered by historians to have been one of the most powerful senators in modern times, is the subject of my remarks today—Robert A. Taft, Sr., Republican of Ohio.

Born in Cincinnati in the waning years of the nineteenth century, Robert Taft descended from one of this nation's most illustrious political families. His grandfather had held positions as attorney general and secretary of war in Ulysses Grant's administration. His father, William Howard Taft, served as civil governor of the Philippines, as Secretary of War under Theodore Roosevelt, as President of the United States from 1909 to 1913,

and as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court from 1921 to 1930.¹

Robert Taft came to the Senate in 1939 at the age of 49, following a successful career in Ohio law and politics. At first appearance he seemed somewhat out of place in the political arena. A dry and uninspiring speaker, Robert Taft lacked the natural gregariousness found in many of his Senate colleagues. Yet, as his biographer James Patterson notes, he made up for his reserved and professorial manner through "a limitless capacity for work, careful attention to organization, candor in discussing issues, and—above all—command of factual information."²

The freshman Ohio senator quickly established himself as a forceful critic of President Roosevelt's economic policies. He attacked deficit spending, high farm subsidies, the federal bureaucracy, federal aid to education, and government-subsidized health insurance. Taft viewed the New Deal as an unfortunate adventure in socialism. In foreign policy, he stoutly opposed American involvement in allied efforts to resist Germany's aggressive aims under Hitler. He argued that Germany posed no threat to the western hemisphere and that involvement with Europe's problems would only promote socialism in this country. These isolationist views caused this prominent freshman Senator to lose the 1940 Republican presidential nomination, on the sixth ballot, to internationalist Wendell Willkie. From 1941 to 1945, Taft steadfastly opposed the Roosevelt administration's major foreign and domestic policies.

This opposition nearly proved fatal to Taft's ability to continue his Senate career. In a hotly contested 1944 campaign, Taft won reelection by less than one percentage point. With the security of a fresh six-year term ahead, he returned to Washington in 1945 as the Senate's leading Republican and as a principal spokesman for the bipartisan conservative block that then dominated both houses of Congress. For the next eight years, until his untimely death in 1953, Robert A. Taft effectively exercised enormous power on Capitol Hill.

The major problem facing the Senate in 1945 was conversion from a wartime to a peacetime economy. The war had brought full employment and a dramatic increase in personal income. As Germany and Japan moved toward surrender, the nation found itself without adequate plans for sustaining its robust economy. Americans entered the postwar period with more money in the bank than ever before, along with the determination to enjoy the consumer goods that had been difficult to obtain during the wartime

¹ Footnotes at end of article.

emergency. Members of the Senate recognized that there existed a dangerous climate in which inflation was likely to develop as too much money chased too few goods across the economic landscape.³

President Truman set the tone for postwar reconversion efforts in an address to a joint session of Congress on September 6, 1945. Coming just four days after Japan's formal surrender, the president's remarks included twenty-one points he wished Congress to consider in reconstructing the nation's economy. His proposals included measures to encourage full employment, improve collective bargaining, promote unemployment compensation, continue authority for economic controls, increase the minimum wage, reduce taxes, and provide for an expanded public works program.⁴

The war and the new president's honeymoon with Congress ended at about the same time. When Franklin Roosevelt's death elevated Harry Truman to the White House in April 1945, Robert Taft expressed cautious optimism that his former Senate colleague would pursue a more conservative and less flamboyant course than his predecessor. Such optimism had vanished by the fall of the year, however, as Taft concluded that Truman would "be as much a New Dealer as Roosevelt." He could only hope that the president would "not acquire the popularity of Roosevelt for election purposes." The Ohio Republican complained to friends that the President "hasn't got the background or education to analyze complex economic problems for himself, so he takes what is handed to him by the bureaus which are full of New Dealers."

Taft and his Senate allies quickly capitalized on the nation's restlessness under governmental restrictions. Early in 1946, the Senate reduced corporate tax rates and killed the excess profits tax that had plagued American industry during the war. With minor exceptions, Taft held out for a balanced budget and stoutly opposed deficit spending proposals. He also fought vigorously against administration efforts to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission. Although he helped achieve cloture to end a southern filibuster on this bill, Taft substituted milder language that would give the commission merely powers of persuasion. Like other well-meaning legislators of his era, Taft believed that the government could not effectively legislate against racial discrimination. He argued that "it is just about as difficult to prevent discrimination among negroes as it is to prevent discrimination against Republicans."⁵

In the spring of 1946, Taft turned his attention to two increasingly troublesome issues: labor unrest and price control. With the war over, union lead-

ers began to push for significant wage increases. When management refused to go along with these demands, a series of nationwide strikes broke out in such vital industries as coal, steel, automobiles, and transportation. This unprecedented labor militance fueled determination of many powerful conservative members of Congress to place drastic new limits on unions. As the nation lay in the clutches of a paralyzing railroad strike in May 1946, the Senate accepted Taft-sponsored amendments to the 1935 National Labor Relations Act. This legislation sought to establish a Federal Mediation Board, largely independent of the Labor Department; to set a sixty-day cooling-off period before strikes could take place; to provide for employer involvement in the administration of union welfare funds; and to prohibit secondary boycotts. President Truman quickly vetoed this legislation on constitutional and practical grounds. The House failed to override the president's action, but Taft vowed to force the issue in the next Congress.

At the height of the rail strike, the president appeared before Congress and demanded authority to deal decisively with unions that acted against the national interest. Specifically, Truman wished to declare a state of emergency in cases where unions struck against vital industries or in the mines. This would allow him to assure government control of the industries involved, to punish defiant union leaders, and to draft strikers into the military. Within two hours of the president's request, the House of Representatives passed authorizing legislation by a 306-13 margin. Contrary to popular expectations, the Senate refused to go along with the hysteria that had propelled the measure in the House. This occurred because Taft, true to his consistent opposition to federal intervention in the lives of citizens—whether union members or corporate executives—joined forces with Senator Claude Pepper to engineer Senate defeat of the bill by a vote of 70 to 13. The Senate eventually passed a weakened version that Taft continued to oppose because he felt it violated workers' civil liberties.⁷

Taft also engaged the other great domestic issue of 1946—price control. By the end of the year, he had succeeded in his campaign to remove most controls. As his biographer has noted, "Few issues in his long career did more to stamp him in the eyes of his critics as a friend of business and an enemy of the poor man."⁸ As wages increased under steady union pressure, the administration fought the immediate removal of wartime price ceilings. This reduced profit margins and brought howls of protest from businessmen. Taft mistakenly believed that a removal of price controls would stimulate production which, in

turn, would satisfy demand, thus stabilizing prices. This view ignored the fact that most manufacturers were already producing close to capacity and that potential demand was much greater than expected. As it was, producers of abundant commodities such as lumber and meat were withholding their goods from the market in an effort to force the administration to remove controls. This resulted in severe shortages. Few Americans today who are old enough to remember 1946 can forget the frustration of empty meat cases and the emotion attached to the news that black market supplies had reached certain local stores.

As the Truman administration sought an extension of price controls beyond mid-1946, Taft used his position as second ranking minority member of the Banking and Currency Committee to oppose this action. One of his amendments outlawed price ceilings that failed to provide comfortable profit margins equal to those of October 1941. Truman vetoed the resulting legislation, after singling out Taft for particular criticism. This left the country without any price controls, triggering a rapid increase in prices and a resulting public outcry. Within a few weeks Congress passed and the president signed a slightly revised price control measure, but it was too late to check the inflationary impact of this fundamental dispute between Congress and the White House.

While many Americans blamed Taft for this situation, he was becoming recognized as the preeminent leader of Senate Republicans. As Congress adjourned at mid-summer, cover stories in both *Time* and *Newsweek* underscored Taft's increasing prominence. As the fall congressional election campaigns got underway, severe shortages of meat forced the president to remove price controls on that commodity. With Republicans resorting to slogans such as "To Err is Truman" and "Under Truman: Two Families in Every Garage," Taft noted happily, "If Truman wanted to elect a Republican Congress, he could not be doing a better job."⁹

Election day 1946 brought disaster to Democrats in Congress as Republicans took control of both Houses for the first time since 1930. Republicans increased their membership in the Senate from 38 to 51 while the Democrats dropped from 57 to 45. Among the casualties were four of the Senate's seven most senior members—Henrik Shipstead, Burton Wheeler, Robert La Follette, Jr., and David Walsh. The new Senate Class of 1946 included such conservative Republicans as William Jenner of Indiana, William Knowland of California, George Malone of Nevada, Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin, Arthur Wat-

kins of Utah, and John Williams of Delaware.

Robert Taft held many reins of power as the 80th Congress got underway on January 3, 1947. Although the title of majority leader was conferred on the amiable Wallace White of Maine, White himself candidly told reporters, "Taft is the man you want to see." On the Senate floor, White often turned to receive signals from Taft. This prompted reporters to jokingly offer the new Republican leader a rear-view mirror.¹⁰

Joseph R. McCarthy's defeat of Robert La Follette, Jr., had the effect of elevating Taft to the position of senior Republican on the new Labor and Public Welfare Committee as well as the Finance Committee. Under the recently passed Legislative Reorganization Act, senators could serve on only two major committees and chair only one. Taft reluctantly resigned from the Banking Committee and with equal reluctance accepted the helm of the Labor Committee. He would have preferred to chair the Finance Committee, but that would have opened the labor panel chairmanship to the next ranking Republican, Vermont's George Aiken. From his experience in labor matters during 1946, Taft wanted the Labor Committee to move against the growing power and militance of the unions. George Aiken seemed reluctant to do so, and Taft was unable to engineer an arrangement to bypass the independent Vermont senator. He also chaired the newly created Republican Policy Committee, a post that he inherited by virtue of having led the Republican Steering Committee since 1944. Elsewhere in the Senate, men who shared Taft's conservative philosophy were safely in command of the other major committees. They included New Hampshire's Styles Bridges at Appropriations and Colorado's Eugene Millikin on Finance.

Robert Taft quickly asserted his control over the Senate's 1947 legislative agenda. In expressing his goals for the new Congress, Taft proclaimed, "The main issue of the election was the restoration of freedom and the elimination or reduction of constantly increasing interference with family life and with business by autocratic government bureaus and autocratic labor leaders." Although Republicans held the Senate by a modest 51-45 margin, Senators Wayne Morse and William Langer could not be counted on to follow that party's lead. Nonetheless, Taft was able to rely on such conservative Southern Democrats as Richard Russell, Walter George, and Harry Byrd, Sr., to forge necessary coalitions. Certainly the closeness of the division between the two parties made members more receptive to party discipline than in earlier years when the Democrats had held lopsided majorities.

The *New Republic* grudgingly acknowledged Taft's preeminence in observing that "Congress now consists of the House, the Senate, and Bob Taft."¹¹

Within the Senate's Republican ranks, Taft experienced the difficulties of any party leader in trying to accommodate all factions. In particular, he faced considerable unrest from the more conservative Republican members of the "Class of 1946." Although Taft had strong foreign policy views, he reluctantly deferred to Foreign Relations Committee chairman Arthur Vandenberg to avoid a potentially crippling party split. This was particularly stressful for Taft. Believing that strong parties were the bedrock on which the American political system rested, he disliked Vandenberg's willingness to accommodate the Democrats through a bipartisan approach to foreign affairs.¹²

Taft's style of leadership found little room for personal warmth or conviviality. At times he conveyed a sense of intellectual arrogance that offended associates. His biographer, James Patterson, observes that Taft "struck many people as abrupt, cold, and inhumanly efficient. It did not occur to him to linger with colleagues, to swap stories, or to pause for a drink after work. Though he did his share of entertaining, he never grew very close personally to any of his colleagues." Professor Patterson concludes, "It was therefore not surprising that some of his peers in a body that treasured the conviviality of men like Alben Barkley of Kentucky and the courtly geniality of Richard Russell of Georgia found his often abrupt manners difficult to understand."¹³

Robert Taft's most enduring legislative monument and the major domestic policy accomplishment of the 80th Congress was that Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, more widely known as the "Taft-Hartley Act." A version of this measure, similar to the bill that the president vetoed the previous year, arrived in the Senate in April 1947 after the House had passed it by a decisive 308-107 margin. Through the first four months of 1947, the Labor Committee, under Taft's leadership, struggled to devise a bill that would mollify hard-line anti-unionists in the House, survive a presidential veto, and incorporate the chairman's support for labor's right to strike and to bargain collectively with management. As in 1946, Taft vigorously objected to federal government involvement, particularly its intervention in nationwide strikes. He opposed provisions to allow the president to seize industries and to draft strikers. He believed that government's only role was to protect individual workers from the excesses of their union leaders.

As finally passed in mid-1947, the Taft-Hartley Act outlawed the "closed shop" requiring new workers to join a union before they could be employed and declared illegal certain "unfair labor practices." These included strikes called over jurisdictional disputes between unions, secondary boycotts, and union contributions to political campaigns. The act required unions to file financial reports with the Labor Department and, most significantly, it allowed the president to seek court injunctions delaying strike action for an 80-day "cooling off" period. Union leaders called the act a "slave labor law" because such injunctions forced men and women to work against their will. Union leaders also resented the insulting provision that required union officers to take an oath that they were not communists. Thus, rather than weakening the union movement, the Taft-Hartley Act served to unify organized labor.

Truman vetoed the Taft-Hartley Act, but the House quickly overrode the President's veto and, after a 28-hour filibuster led by Senators Wayne Morse and Claude Pepper, the Senate followed suit by a vote of 68-25. Union leader Philip Murry expressed labor's reaction by calling the sponsors of this measure "diabolical men who, seething with hatred, designed this ugly measure for the purpose of imposing their wrath upon the millions of organized and unorganized workers throughout the United States."¹⁴ More than 200,000 soft-coal workers immediately went on strike to protest the Taft-Hartley Act. Senator Taft had handed the Democrats a ready-made campaign issue for the 1948 elections.

Beyond labor issues, Taft also concerned himself with broad economic policy during the 80th Congress. In addition to his other heavy responsibilities, Taft took on the chairmanship of the newly created Joint Economic Committee. In this capacity, he promoted efforts to reduce federal spending, especially military spending. He opposed efforts to raise the minimum hourly wage from sixty-five cents to seventy-five cents. He also led the campaign for federal tax reduction that resulted in Congress sending the President, on July 1, 1947, an act designed to save taxpayers \$4 billion. President Truman vetoed this measure arguing that it would contribute to inflation and undercut his efforts to reduce the government's indebtedness. Although his veto was barely sustained, both houses in the following year passed similar legislation and, in the face of forthcoming congressional elections, managed to override the resulting second presidential veto.

Conservative House Republicans undermined Taft's most positive accomplishment of the 1948 session. Largely as a result of his leadership, the

Senate passed, on April 1, 1948, the first general aid-to-education bill in more than a half century. He obtained support from 27 of the 44 Senate Republicans who voted on this \$300 million measure. The House failed to go along, however, with many of its members decrying this legislation as a sure road to socialism.

A coalition of moderate Republicans and moderate Southern, Southwestern, and border-state Democrats was largely responsible for enacting the Senate's domestic program during the 80th Congress. Robert Taft managed this coalition to produce labor, tax-reduction, and social security legislation that he hoped would bolster his party's prospects for the 1948 elections. At the same time, this coalition blocked administration initiatives in universal military training, civil rights, public housing, aid to education, and higher minimum wages. By mid-1947, the president concluded that the makeup of the Republican Congress rendered futile any vigorous campaign on his part to move key legislation, and conclude that the veto would be his most effective weapon. This encouraged Republican Senate leaders to modify the most objectionable portions of their legislative packages as a means of securing enough Democratic votes to override Truman's inevitable vetoes.¹⁵

Mr. President, it was also at this time, late in 1947, that the Senate career of one of our most beloved colleagues had its beginning. Upon the death of Mississippi Senator Theodore G. Bilbo, five men announced their candidacies for his vacant seat. They included two members of the House of Representatives, and three other prominent Mississippians. Among the later group was a man whom the local press described as an "able DeKalb jurist."¹⁶ That gentleman was Judge John C. Stennis, who demonstrated his popularity with a broad cross section of his state's population by winning that race with 27 percent of the total vote. His closest rival, Representative William Colmer, polled 24 percent.¹⁶

Mr. President, Senator Stennis' term began on November 5, 1947. Last week, on November 15, 1985, he achieved yet another distinction in a career filled with honors and accomplishments. On that day, he became the second longest serving member in the history of the Senate, surpassing Richard Russell's record of 38 years and 9 days. Only Arizona's Carl Hayden, among the 1,767 men and women who have sat in this body, exceeds that milestone with his record of 41 years and 10 months.

I am sure that Senator Stennis remembers well those emotion-filled days leading to the presidential election of 1948. President Truman believed that full public exposure to the

escapades of what he labeled as the "Do-Nothing" 80th Congress would result in identifying the Republican Party, as a whole, with the most reactionary members of that Congress. This was effective campaign rhetoric, even though the record of that Congress was not as barren as the president would have liked the voters to believe. Nor had that conservative Congress succeeded in dismantling broad New Deal-era reforms. As Professor Susan Hartmann has pointed out in her excellent study of this Congress, "Given the inhospitable atmosphere for reform and Truman's limitations as a legislative leader, the record of the Eightieth Congress testified remarkably to the acceptance of a large role for the Federal Government in the promotion of economic stability and social welfare." She continues:

The successful attacks on New Deal programs represented a limited curtailment of some programs, not a wholesale dismantling of reform legislation. Although important restrictions were placed upon organized labor, the Taft-Hartley act did not destroy government protection of collective bargaining. While tax relief was granted in larger measure to higher income groups, the principle of progressive taxation prevailed. The Eightieth Congress overruled judicial interpretations expanding social security but made no cutbacks in current coverage and took a modest step toward expanding benefits. And, although budget requests were cut for a variety of programs, the substance of each was left intact.¹⁷

Taft's prominent leadership role during the 80th Congress elevated him to the front rank of Republican presidential hopefuls by the spring of 1948. His major apparent rivals were New York Governor Thomas E. Dewey, who had lost to Roosevelt in 1944, and Minnesota Governor Harold Stassen. Unfortunately for Taft, his aloof manner, terrible press relations, and a poor campaign organization doomed his chances. In the April Nebraska primary he ran an unconvincing third to Dewey and Stassen. In his home State of Ohio he managed to turn back a Stassen challenge, but only at great physical and financial cost. Taft went into the 1948 Republican convention at a tactical disadvantage, for the 80th Congress had remained in session until 7:15 a.m. on Sunday, the day before the convention was to open. As the proceedings unfolded, it became apparent to Taft that his organization simply lacked the strength and efficiency of Dewey's campaign machinery. Trailing in the first two ballots, he conceded to Dewey. Ostensibly united under Dewey's banner, Republicans left the convention confident of victory in November.

Three weeks later, as Taft prepared to relax for the remainder of the summer, President Truman startled the Nation by announcing at the Democratic convention that he was calling the Republican-controlled Con-

gress back into a special session "to get the laws the people need." The President shrewdly placed the Republicans on the defensive by demanding that their congressional members increase the minimum wage, control high prices, and pass legislation for public housing and aid to education. If Republican leaders failed to follow Truman's direction, he would charge them with neglecting issues vital to the national interest.

While some Republican congressional leaders believed the best tactic would be to adjourn the session as soon as it met, Taft refused to fall into the President's trap. He successfully counseled other members of his party's high command to allow both Houses to meet briefly, pass some minor legislation, and then adjourn. Consequently, Congress met for two weeks and adjourned on August 7. That short session aggravated tensions between Republican factions in the Senate. Liberal Republicans succeeded in reporting for floor action the public housing bill that Taft had supported earlier in the session. Taft opposed these tactics and ended up engineering defeat of his own measure. This prompted Democratic leader and vice presidential candidate Alben Barkley to observe that "the Senator from Ohio apparently has surrendered his position." It also gave Truman the opportunity to chide the Republican leader by charging that after losing his party's nomination, "Taft didn't have to carry on his pretense of caring about the needs of the people. He could act," the President continued, "in his real character—as a cold-hearted, cruel aristocrat."¹⁸

During the fall campaign Taft and Dewey quickly parted company, splitting, as in the 1940 contest, into two ideological and geographical camps. Dewey rallied his party's eastern, liberal-internationalist wing while Taft consolidated the traditionalist midwestern-isolationist bloc. Dewey's campaign and his party's confidence about victory caused many Republican voters to stay at home on election day. The result, as we know, was Truman's surprising victory.

Earlier in the year, Senate Democratic Secretary Leslie Biffle, fearing the consequences for his party in the Senate of a Truman loss, worked diligently to assemble a strong slate of prominent Democratic challengers that would ensure return of Democratic control. Biffle's strategy paid off handsomely as the Democrats gained nine seats and thus recaptured the Senate by a 54 to 42 margin.

The Senate Class of 1948, by any measure, came to be regarded as one of the most remarkable freshman classes in modern times. Its Democratic members included our distinguished colleague from Louisiana, thirty-year-

old Russell Long; former Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson of New Mexico; the crusading mayor of Minneapolis, Hubert Humphrey; Paul Douglas, the liberal economist from the University of Chicago; Robert Kerr, the millionaire former Governor of Oklahoma; Tennessee-progressive Estes Kefauver; and former Texas Congressman Lyndon B. Johnson, whose 87-vote margin earned for him the nickname "Landslide Lyndon."

Most of the fourteen Democrats among the Senate's eighteen new members had significantly outpolled the President in their respective States. Columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak later observed that this class, "perhaps the most publicized band of freshmen in Senate history, consisted of/independent personalities whose ambitions, idiosyncracies, and rivalries were to shape the history of the Senate and the nation for the next decade."¹⁹

As the new Senate convened on January 3, 1949, the Republicans found themselves back in their accustomed role as the minority party. Republican Senators Henry Cabot Lodge, William Knowland, and Irving Ives blamed Dewey's defeat on the negative record of the 80th Congress and they called for fresh Senate party leadership. With the retirement of Wallace White, the party's nominal Majority leader, the Lodge faction sought to oust Taft as chairman of the Republican Policy Committee and to prevent the election of Nebraska's Kenneth Wherry as floor leader. The dissidents proposed a slate that included Lodge as chairman of the Policy Committee, Knowland as floor leader, and Lodge's Massachusetts colleague Leverett Saltonstall as party whip. When the votes were counted, however, Taft and Wherry won easily. To mollify the dissidents, they allowed Saltonstall to become whip and they placed him and Irving Ives on the Policy Committee.²⁰

The newly victorious Democrats, for their part, selected Scott Lucas of Illinois as floor leader to replace Alben Barkley who had been elected Vice President. Lucas had served as Democratic Whip in the previous Congress, but he lacked the finesse and experience of Barkley, who had been floor leader since 1937. Lucas faced a difficult task, for only forty of the Senate's fifty-four Democrats regularly voted for administration programs. In spite of his robust build and great stamina, Lucas began to show signs of strain under the pressures of his new position. In 1949, after an exhausting filibuster over civil rights legislation, the 57-year-old senator was hospitalized for three weeks suffering from a stomach ulcer.²¹

Despite the factionalism among Republicans and their return to minority status, Taft maintained his effectiveness and balance. Campaign rhetoric

aside, President Truman confided to a friend that he believed Taft was "a high class man. He is honest, intelligent, and extremely capable . . ."²² A poll of 200 Washington newsmen awarded Taft the designation of "best" Senator. (William Jenner of Indiana was voted the "worst.")

Fresh from his surprise election victory, President Truman had come to Capitol Hill in January 1949 to enunciate a program that consolidated the domestic initiatives that he had been seeking since becoming chief executive in 1945. Declaring that "every segment of our population and every individual has a right to expect from our government a fair deal," Mr. Truman outlined his plan to spur economic growth, restrain inflation, reduce the national debt, streamline the executive branch, and improve the quality of social services.²³

The President assigned a high priority to civil rights legislation within his "Fair Deal" proposals. Although he was able to take limited executive action in this direction, such as ending racial segregation at Washington's National Airport and at his own inauguration, he realized that Congress held the key to reform. In the Senate, interpretation of the cloture rule would determine whether civil rights legislation stood a chance of success. During the previous year, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, as president pro tempore, had ruled that cloture could not be invoked on motions to consider legislation. This destroyed cloture, as a debate limiting device, for the remainder of the 80th Congress. In 1949, however, Senate Republican leaders offered to allow cloture on any motion or measure. Senator Majority Leader Lucas failed to capitalize on this offer, thus permitting those Senators who opposed cloture to preserve Vandenberg's earlier interpretation.²⁴

Subsequently, both floor leaders presented a cloture motion, signed by thirty-three Senators, to shut off debate on the motion to overturn Vandenberg's ruling. Vice President Barkley ruled favorably on the motion, but, on appeal from his decision, the Senate immediately reversed the ruling. This action, engineered by Senators Vandenberg and Richard Russell, led to a further restriction on the Senate's ability to obtain cloture. On March 17, 1949, the Senate adopted a resolution that required a constitutional two-thirds of all Senators, rather than two-thirds of those present and voting, to invoke cloture. This doomed the portion of the administration's civil rights program that required congressional approval.

In the area of public housing, the President looked to Robert Taft and to southern conservatives for support. He sought to strengthen and extend rent controls and to add more than 800,000 public housing units to the na-

tion's inventory. The President's aides needlessly antagonized Taft by giving him only an hour to study the administration bill before it was introduced. Although Taft retaliated by introducing his own bill, he eventually reconciled his differences with the administration. Despite the efforts of the real estate lobby to kill the legislation by inserting a provision to prevent racial discrimination in public housing, their efforts were turned aside and the President signed the Housing Act in mid-summer.

Most of the President's other domestic policy initiatives ran into fatal opposition in the Senate or House. Only four months into the 1949 congressional session, Mr. Truman reluctantly agreed to cut back on his legislative agenda. When Democratic Leader Scott Lucas leaked that news to the press, the President exploded with anger. At one point, with characteristic sarcasm, he charged that the Senate's Democratic leaders did "not have the guts of a gnat."²⁵ The President's anger flared again when the Senate Armed Services Committee voted to table the nomination of his close friend, former Senator and Washington state governor Monrad Wallgren, as chairman of the National Security Resources Board. The committee's majority argued that this was too important a post to treat as a patronage plum for a recently defeated Democratic governor. Senator Harry Byrd, Sr., expressed frustration that Wallgren had already arranged to have several of his key lieutenants appointed to positions on the board before the Senate had worked its will in the matter.

This followed an earlier series of disputes during which Senators accused the President of appointing cronies to key government posts. In 1946, his nominees to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Federal Reserve Board were confirmed only after much difficulty. During that same year, the Senate, detecting possible influence peddling, forced the President to withdraw the nomination of California oil man Edwin Pauley to be Under Secretary of the Navy. A year later, the President waged a difficult, but ultimately successful, campaign to obtain confirmation for his appointees to head the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority. Finally, in 1949, the Senate rejected two major presidential appointments. The first was Leland Olds. Oil and gas interests, with the assistance of Lyndon Johnson, vigorously opposed his nomination to a third term on the Federal Power Commission. The other was Carl Ilgenfritz, who refused to take the chairmanship of the Munitions Board, at an annual salary of \$14,000, unless he could retain his \$70,000 salary as a steel ex-

ecutive. At that time, Members of Congress earned only \$12,500 per year!²⁶

The President also ran into congressional resistance on his efforts to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. The likelihood of repeal dropped from slim to none in June 1949 when United Mine Workers President John L. Lewis declared a series of week-long vacations for coal miners. This came in retaliation against mine owners' efforts to reduce employee benefits to compensate for the financial reverses brought on by a decline in the market for coal. Robert Taft could not have been happier, for this action demonstrated to him and to many of his Senate colleagues the value of the Taft-Hartley Act's controls on organized labor. A major coal strike lasted from late September until mid-November 1949. Early in 1950, a series of wildcat strikes forced the President to resort to the machinery provided by Taft-Hartley. When the miners refused to obey Lewis' order to return to work, the President sought a contempt citation against Lewis and the United Mine Workers. On the grounds that it lacked evidence, the court refused to issue the citation. When Truman then asked Congress for authority to seize the mines, the miners and owners quickly agreed on a new contract.

Labor unrest dominated relations between the Senate and the President for the remainder of his term in office, as trouble flared in the steel, telephone, aluminum, and railway industries. Nonetheless, the Senate agreed to several measures improving the lot of the nation's workers. These included an increase in the minimum wage and legislation to expand Social Security benefits.

Truman and the Senate quickly locked horns over the rapidly growing government deficit. A tax cut in 1948 had produced a deficit of \$1.8 billion for fiscal 1949. This was three times greater than the President's own economic advisors had earlier estimated. The prediction of \$5.5 billion for the coming year was even more alarming. Yet, the onset of a recession in mid-1949 destroyed the President's efforts for a tax increase to offset this deficit. As the gross national product fell and unemployment rose, Members of Congress were in no mood to support increased taxation. Neither was the President willing to call for a reduction in federal expenditures. This impasse guaranteed that the deficit would continue to expand.²⁷

Robert Taft and Harry Truman worked with the Senate's Democratic leadership to pass major legislation providing federal aid to elementary and secondary education. The bill died in the House, however, victim of a dispute over allocation of funds to parochial and racially segregated schools. The fate of this legislation seemed

typical of that awaiting other domestic policy measures. Powerful coalitions assembled to block presidential initiatives, resulting in a relatively unimpressive record for the administration. Few members of the Senate saw any strong reason to give the president their complete and unwavering support. Many felt that his agenda was simply too full to permit establishment of clear priorities and goals. Most Democratic Members who won election in 1948 correctly believed that their victories were achieved without much assistance from the President's coattails.

Mr. Truman gave vent to his growing frustration with Congress on numerous occasions. He argued that the Twenty-second Amendment to the Constitution, limiting presidential terms, should have placed a twelve-year restriction on congressional service to prevent, in his words, the "fossilization of key committees." He added that "there are old time Senators who even Louis XIV of France and George I of England look like shining liberals." And he forecast that a limit on congressional service would "help cure senility and seniority—both terrible legislative diseases."²⁸

Actually, compared to his record with the previous and subsequent Congress, Mr. Truman's record with the 81st Congress was relatively impressive. Together they had achieved notable advances in the fields of housing, Social Security, government efficiency, and minimum wage legislation. His agenda remained unachieved, however, in the areas of education, civil rights, agriculture, labor, health care, and taxation.

Professor Donald McCoy, in his recent biography of Harry Truman, provides a useful summary of the relations between Congress and the White House during the 1949-1950 sessions.

Congress was beyond the control of the White House. There were usually enough Democratic and Republican conservatives, as well as recalcitrants, in Congress to block administration proposals on domestic affairs and to cause major battles occasionally even on foreign policy. And this coalition was well organized, especially in the Senate. Senator Paul H. Douglas wrote: "Its members always showed up for roll calls, and its power was occasionally flaunted, as when Harry F. Byrd and Robert A. Taft sat together on the floor checking the list of senators and sending out for the absent or the few recalcitrants." Whatever Truman and his allies in Congress did was usually deemed to be wrong. When they were moderate, it was usually taken as a sign of weakness; when they were bold, it was taken as an attack. They had neither the weapons nor the ability to turn the president's narrow 1948 election victory into substantial legislative success. The congressional Democrats were at least as badly split as they had been in the 80th Congress, and the most conservative of them usually were in control of committees. The Republicans would prove to be less amenable to agreeing with the administration than they had been

before; they may have lost in 1948, but they were planning to win again soon.²⁹

By the summer of 1950, the outbreak of hostilities in Korea and the forthcoming congressional elections put an end to Senate action on domestic policy matters. In November, Robert Taft easily turned back a Democratic challenger to win a third Senate term. Achieving a margin of victory larger than that of any other Republican Senator that year, Taft once again moved to the forefront of his party's presidential hopefuls. He had taken a prominent position of national party leadership during the campaign, charging the Truman administration with responsibility for "losing" China to the communists, for high prices, for the conflict in Korea, and for government corruption. Other Republican candidates fared equally well as that party gained five Senate seats. This brought the margin to 49 Democrats and 47 Republicans.

Among Democrats, the most prominent fatality was majority leader Scott Lucas. Absorbed by his duties in Washington, he failed to invest the necessary time and energy in his own reelection campaign. Consequently the voters of Illinois retired him in favor of former Pekin Congressman Everett McKinley Dirksen. Certainly, Lucas was caught in a difficult position. As writers Roland Evans and Robert Novak later observed, "The job of Senate Majority Leader in that era was a misery without splendor. While Russell and Taft pulled the strings from the cloakroom, the 'leader' was out there on the floor trying to keep the Senate's creaky machinery in operation. While Truman hurled his legislative thunderbolts from the White House—and conveniently all but forgot them—Lucas was required to make a nominal effort to catch and pass them."³⁰ Lucas subsequently acknowledged that his 2 years as floor leader were the worst of his entire life.

There were other prominent Democratic casualties in the 1950 election. One was majority whip Francis Myers, who lost his seat to Pennsylvania's Republican Governor, James Duff. Armed Services Committee chairman Millard Tydings was beaten by John Marshall Butler, a protégé of Joseph R. McCarthy. On the Republican side, Representative Richard Nixon won a bitter Senate campaign against Democratic congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas.

At the start of the 82nd Congress in 1951, with Lucas and Myers gone, Richard Russell and other Senate party elders looked for replacements who would be willing to take on the headaches that were certain to come to floor leaders in dealing with an increasingly unpopular administration. For majority leader, they recruited Arizona's affable Ernest McFarland, who

was facing a difficult race in 1952. To fill the post of majority whip, the Democratic high command, at the urging of Oklahoma's Robert Kerr, settled on a member who had been in this body for only 2 years—the junior Senator from Texas, Lyndon B. Johnson, about whom I shall have more to say in my next address in this series.

The Senate of the 82nd Congress, preoccupied with the Korean Conflict, foreign policy, and the 1952 Presidential elections, accomplished little in the domestic field. Robert Taft, seeking the Republican Presidential nomination, worked hard to avoid unnecessary criticism as an obstructionist in domestic issues and he took on an attitude of accommodation that led Democratic Senator Paul Douglas to label him "the uncrowned leader of the Senate." He joined with Hubert Humphrey to modify the Taft-Hartley Act's provisions regarding union shop elections. He supported legislation that provided a more favorable tax treatment for farm cooperatives, and he temporarily dropped his objections to deficit financing under the pressure of the wartime emergency. Taft also sought to protect himself from his own party's eastern wing that had denied him the nomination in 1948.

These latter efforts ultimately failed for Taft, as his party, meeting in Chicago in July 1952 gave the nomination to General Dwight Eisenhower by a first ballot vote of 595 to 500. Shortly thereafter, the Democrats nominated Adlai Stevenson to carry their Presidential standard. After a long and difficult campaign, the Republicans captured the White House for the first time since the election of 1928. Winning more than 55 percent of the popular vote—the largest such margin since Franklin Roosevelt's 1936 victory—Eisenhower also brought in sufficient margins to return both the Senate and the House to Republican control.

After the convention, Taft tried to overcome his disappointment at losing what he recognized was his last chance to gain the White House. He advised General Eisenhower on prospective Cabinet nominees, but the President-elect seemed to take his counsel from other sources. Taft was particularly disheartened that Eisenhower ignored his suggestion that Senator Harry Byrd, Sr., become Secretary of the Treasury. He believed that Byrd would have been able to construct a powerful alliance between Republicans and conservative Democrats in Congress. The Ohio Senator's irritation with Eisenhower intensified when he learned that the President-elect had named an Ohio steel executive, George Humphrey, to that post without bothering to ask his opinion.³¹

The supreme insult to Taft, universally regarded as "Mr. Republican", came when Eisenhower selected, as

Labor Secretary, Martin Durkin, a plumber's union president, a Democrat, and an avowed foe of the Taft-Hartley Act. News of the appointment reached Taft while he was at lunch in the Senators' Dining Room. Senator Prescott Bush, the father of our distinguished Vice President, later recounted that Taft "nearly exploded." As the senior Republican on the Labor Committee and author of the Taft-Hartley legislation, Taft could not understand Eisenhower's decision. According to Senator Bush, Taft said, "This is incomprehensible! It is incredible that this appointment could have been made without consulting any of us."³² The Republican leader told an associate that this "was the first repudiation by the General of the position he took in the campaign and in my conference with him. I don't know whether he realizes that, but if he doesn't he is very stupid indeed."³³ Meanwhile, Democrats joked that Eisenhower's rather conservative, business-oriented Cabinet included "eight millionaires and a plumber."

Before the Durkin appointment, Taft had seriously considered accepting the post of majority leader in the 1953 session. That incident caused him to hesitate. As he did so, Eisenhower supporters suggested that New Hampshire Senator Styles Bridges would be an excellent floor leader. Senator Bridges had served briefly as minority leader following the death of Kenneth Wherry in 1951. Bridges preferred, however, to take on the chairmanship of the Appropriations Committee as well as to become the Senate's President pro tempore. Speculation then centered on California's William Knowland. At that point, Taft made up his mind to become floor leader. With the president's endorsement, he was unanimously elected to that post at the start of the 83rd Congress.³⁴

Clearly, Eisenhower's landslide victory in 1952 reflected his enormous personal popularity, but his popularity failed to transfer directly to that year's congressional races. In the House, Republicans picked up only 22 seats giving them a bare three-vote majority. In the Senate the margin of Republican control was equally slim with 48 Republicans, 47 Democrats and one Independent—Oregon's Wayne Morse.

Disaffected with Eisenhower and his platform, Morse had resigned from the Republican party in September 1952, noting, "I didn't leave the Republican Party. The Republican Party left me." When Morse arrived in the Senate Chamber on opening day in 1953, he carried a metal folding chair that he was prepared to place in the center aisle. Party leaders persuaded him to take a seat in the front row on the Republican side, but they proceeded to oust him from the Armed Services and Labor committees. After

much dispute, Morse ended up on the District of Columbia and Public Works committees. Two years later he joined the Democratic Party.³⁵

Among the sixteen members of the incoming Senate freshmen class of 1952 were 35-year-old former Representative John F. Kennedy; former Air Force Secretary Stuart Symington; Montana's Mike Mansfield; Washington's Henry Jackson; Tennessee's Albert Gore, Sr.; and our distinguished colleague from Arizona, Barry Goldwater, fresh from his victory over former Democratic Leader, Ernest McFarland.

As the 83rd Congress got underway, Robert Taft settled into a smooth working relationship with President Eisenhower and the new Democratic leader, Lyndon Johnson. Due in part to the closeness of the majority party's margin of control and in part to Taft's skillful leadership, the Republicans maintained an unusually high degree of party unity on key votes. Taft effectively restrained disruptive elements within his party and within the administration. Those who had observed him over the years noted a decided change in his demeanor. As one journalist wrote, he seemed "relaxed and genial. He moves about the floor wreathed in smiles, a friend of all men, almost a gladhandler." For the first time in his Senate career he was the official leader of this body's majority party, with a president of his own party in the White House. As one historian explained it, Taft was "at last freed from his heritage. Trained to serve, he had entered public life. Raised to excel, he had aimed for the top. Now at the age of sixty-three, he knew he could do no more than he was doing; he had found his station in life, perhaps his place in history."³⁶

Mr. President, at the very moment that Robert Taft seemed to be on top of the world, tragedy struck. Late in April, an ache in his hip spread to his thighs and then to most of his joints. Increasingly, he had trouble walking and he suffered a persistent fever. His physicians were initially unable to diagnose his illness. After weeks of tests, however, they discovered that he had cancer. With great courage and determination, Taft tried to maintain his taxing daily pace. He insisted on keeping the nature of his illness from the public. As the weeks passed, however, and as his physical appearance revealed the disease's ravages, he realized that his days were numbered. Bypassing party whip Leverett Saltonstall, he asked William Knowland to take over the leadership for the remaining weeks of session. Soon the Senate and the country learned the distressing news and reacted with shock and dismay. After conducting an extended series of tests and exploratory surgery, his doctors discovered that

cancer had spread throughout his body. By then it was only a matter of time.

Inspector Leonard Ballard of the U.S. Capitol Police, a West Virginian, recently recalled Taft's final days.

Senator Bob Taft—now he would walk down the corridor and he never spoke to you. He never spoke to another senator. He was always preoccupied. But when he got on crutches, you remember he got cancer, he would come down to the door and wait for his car—he would sit there at the desk—I'd be there. And he said to me, "It's a shame that I didn't get on these things a long time ago. I'm seeing so many nice people that I never recognized before." I liked Taft, his office was awful nice—a good staff.²⁷

The end came for Taft on the morning of July 31, 1953. Two days later, his body lay in state in the Capitol Rotunda, just as his father's had twenty-three years earlier. He was then returned to his native Cincinnati and laid to rest in a gentle slope behind the Presbyterian Church. A small marker reads simply, "Robert A. Taft: United States Senator, 1889-1953."

Mr. President, I believe that Robert Taft's biographer, James Patterson, has written a most fitting epitaph to this illustrious Senator, noting that Senator Taft's triumphs far outnumbered his disappointments, Patterson observes:

He enjoyed power in the Senate matched by few men; and he ordinarily wielded it responsibly. Above all his stature depended on personal qualities: honesty, conscientiousness, courage, dignity, and intelligence. These attributes were counter-balanced by a partisan combativeness which made him as feared as he was respected, and by a refusal—usually to depart from principles, leaving him vulnerable to the charge that he was stubborn and reactionary. But they also gave him the strength to rise above personal defeats and to maintain his commitment to serve. It was given to him as it is to few men: to embark on a career he had been trained to follow and to pursue it effectively until the day he died.²⁸

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD footnotes to Robert A. Taft's Senate, 1945-1953.

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

FOOTNOTES TO "ROBERT A. TAFT'S SENATE, 1945-1953"

¹James T. Patterson, *Mr. Republican: A Biography of Robert A. Taft* (Boston, 1972), parts I and II. For an insightful account of Taft's life by a friendly journalist, see William White, *The Taft Story* (New York, 1954).

²James T. Patterson, "Robert Alphonso Taft," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, Supplement 5 (New York, 1977), 673-7.

³Donald R. McCoy, *The Presidency of Harry S. Truman* (Lawrence, KS, 1984), 49-50.

⁴*New York Times*, September 8, 1945.

⁵Patterson, *Mr. Republican*, 302-4.

⁶*Ibid.*, 304.

⁷*Congressional Record*, May 25, 1946, 5714.

⁸Patterson, *Mr. Republican*, 308.

⁹Quoted in *Ibid.*, 313.

¹⁰"Old Guard Supreme," *New Republic*, January 13, 1947, 116.

¹¹"TRB," *New Republic*, May 3, 1947, 11.

¹²Patterson, *Mr. Republican*, 338-41.

¹³*Ibid.*, 341.

¹⁴Joseph G. Rayback, *A History of American Labor* (New York, 1959), 400; Robert J. Donovan, *Conflict and Crisis: The Presidency of Harry S. Truman, 1945-1948* (New York, 1977), 298-304.

¹⁵Susan M. Hartmann, *Truman and the 80th Congress* (Columbia, MO, 1971), 213-4.

¹⁶*Meridian Star*, August 22, 1947; Billy Weeks, "The 1947 Senatorial Campaign of John C. Stennis," (May 1973), typescript copy in files of the United States Senate Historical Office.

¹⁷Hartmann, *Truman and the 80th Congress*, 213-4.

¹⁸Patterson, *Mr. Republican*, 420-1; Richard O. Davies, *Housing Reform During the Truman Administration* (Columbia, MO, 1966), 54-7.

¹⁹Roland Evans and Robert Novak, *Lyndon B. Johnson: The Exercise of Power* (New York, 1966), 26-31.

²⁰Patterson, *Mr. Republican*, 427; Harold F. Gosnell, *Truman Crises: A Political Biography of Harry S. Truman* (Westport, CT, 1980), 439-42.

²¹Edward L. Schapsmeier and Frederick H. Schapsmeier, "Scott W. Lucas of Havana: His Rise and Fall as Majority Leader in the United States Senate," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* 70 (November, 1977), 302-20.

²²Patterson, *Mr. Republican*, 440.

²³McCoy, *The Presidency of Harry S. Truman*, 166.

²⁴Clinton P. Anderson, *Outsider in the Senate* (New York, 1970), 95-6; Robert C. Byrd, "The United States Senate: Limited Debate, 1789-1981. The Cloture Rule," *Congressional Record*, March 10, 1981, S1931-2 (Daily Edition).

²⁵McCoy, *The Presidency of Harry S. Truman*, 185-6.

²⁶*Congressional Quarterly, Guide to Congress*, 3rd edition (Washington, 1982), 202-3.

²⁷McCoy, *The Presidency of Harry S. Truman*, 178-9.

²⁸*Ibid.*

²⁹*Ibid.*, 165.

³⁰Evans and Novak, *Lyndon B. Johnson*, 40.

³¹Patterson, *Mr. Republican*, 582-5.

³²Prescott Bush, Oral History Interview, Columbia University, July 7, 1966.

³³Patterson, *Mr. Republican*, 585.

³⁴*Ibid.*, 585-7.

³⁵Lee Wilkins, *Wayne Morse: A Bio-Bibliography* (Westport, CT, 1985), 28-9; Samuel Shaffer, *On and Off the Floor: Thirty Years as a Correspondent on Capitol Hill* (New York, 1980), 138-9.

³⁶Patterson, *Mr. Republican*, 598; Richard Langham Riedel, *Halls of the Mighty: My 47 Years at the Senate* (Washington, 1969), 148-52; Gary W. Reichard, *The Reaffirmation of Republicanism: Eisenhower and the Eighty-Third Congress* (Knoxville, TN, 1975), 3-15, 22-6, 39-40.

³⁷Leonard H. Ballard, Oral History Interview, U.S. Senate Historical Office, August 18, 1983.

³⁸Patterson, *Mr. Republican*, 617.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. GORTON]. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

AGRICULTURE, FOOD, TRADE, AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 1985

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume consideration of S. 1714, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1714) to expand export markets for United States agricultural commodities,

provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, continue food assistance to low-income households, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Dole motion to recommit the bill, with instructions to report back forthwith, with Dole Amendment No. 939, dealing with intermediate export credits.

Dole Amendment No. 940 (to Amendment No. 939), of a perfecting nature.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, will the Chair state the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is amendment No. 940, offered by the majority leader.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair. 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. MELCHER. 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. MELCHER. Mr. President, the lament of those who make their living from crops or livestock is heard across the land:

The times are tough, the prices are rough; But save us our pride, while we fight the tide.

Today, the crumbling status of rural America provides a backdrop of ironic parallel and paradoxes for President Reagan's summit meeting with Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev. The failure of Russian agriculture to meet production goals forces the Soviets to import large quantities of food. Because of this, their Secretary of Agriculture is rumored to be on his way out. The situation in our country is reversed. Our Secretary of Agriculture is rumored to be on his way out because he has failed to export enough of the farm commodity surplus that presents such a problem here. Thus, the two countries at the summit provide a sharp contrast—the Soviets showing weakness in agricultural production and the United States showing great strength in production while seemingly unable to put the strength of abundant food supplies to most effective use.

The land and those who work the land are bonded by an understanding that the good earth will sustain those who work and care for it. All life starts and renews itself with a fertile seed. Between the seed and the soil, life is sustained, and an annual promise renewed.

That separates Earth—in the cosmos that we know—from the other planets which, as far as we have been able to observe, do not provide such life-sustaining properties.

For the people of the world there is a universal common need—the producing of life-sustaining amounts of food. Fortunate regions of the world—the United States, for example—have an abundance of food, much more than is required for our people. And, surely, it is one of the great marvels of the world that here in the United States so few produce so much.

Developed countries produce the world's surplus of foods, and of these countries we outproduce all others both in per capita food for ourselves and in an abundance of food surplus supplies that can be made available for others.

The World Food Organization tabulates total world need for food; and, according to the WFO, all of the food needs of people around the world would be barely met if all of the surplus food were distributed to those regions where people hunger. There is not too much food in the world; there is only a seemingly perverse reluctance to do what must be done in order to get it to those in need. Those basic needs are dramatically evident for millions in Africa and Asia. In addition, however, upgrading nutritional levels will require that more and more grain be used for dairy, poultry, and livestock production. In short, food production will have to be increased if we hope to meet the needs of a burgeoning world population and improve their nutritional levels.

Food is the oldest and most vital medium of exchange between people. Thus, food production is the basis of all societies in all countries.

Here in the United States, we have succeeded so well we have become blasé about food abundance and pay little heed to the mounting problems of those who produce it. Our basic commodities of grains and cereals, cotton and wool, milk, sugar, and soybeans have price support programs, but prices have been so low for several years—both here and abroad—that Federal price support programs are costing the Treasury much more than ever before. Three years of low world prices and the resulting buildup of unsold commodities in Federal granaries and warehouses have triggered demands to reduce supply and further reduce the prices that farmers receive in order to discourage production. The administration's request for new legislation this year is built on that premise—reduce supply by reducing the price and thus eliminate the production of a significant number of farmers. Today there are approximately 2.4 million U.S. farm or ranch operators, but of that number, at least a third earn most of their income from another business or a job separate from farming or ranching. In other words, agriculture is a sideline for them, and the low commodity prices, while unwelcome, do not force them

into bankruptcy. These part-time farmers are financially more secure. What is more, their total production is insignificant compared to the production of the other two-thirds of farmers and ranchers.

So, it is the approximately 1½ million full-time farm and ranch operators who produce approximately 90 percent of the food and fiber that concern us in our battle to prevent the administration from forcing, through lower prices, the liquidation of many of these producers. They are vulnerable. They have large investments in land and machinery which have generally declined in value. Their credit is stretched now and, if their cash flow is further reduced in the coming years, their survival will become more and more questionable. Of the 1½ million farm and ranch operators producing 85 to 90 percent of the food and fiber commodities, it appears that fully 20 percent now have their loans classified and another 20 percent are borderline. After the cumulative effect of the past 3 years of sagging farm prices, 3 more years of declining prices, coupled with a cut in target prices, would force liquidation of nearly half of them.

The Senate Agriculture Committee has reported a farm bill that provides only the minimum safety net. There is not much in this bill to stop the downward slide in farm prices, so what there is must be preserved to save as many agricultural producers as possible.

The bill allows the market-oriented lowering of market prices for grain, cotton, milk, and cereal, an action the administration considers essential to increasing foreign exports. What the bill does not allow—and on which the administration must not prevail—is lowering the safety net of target price deficiency payments. These are frozen at present levels for the 4-year life of the bill. Holding prices at the current levels is the minimum safety net that Congress can provide, and administration efforts to lower the amounts or reduce the number of years of safety net protection must be met with all-out resistance.

It is, after all, target prices that provide a measure of farmers' cash flow. Moreover, for those whose credit line is now critical, the target price may be their only lifeline. Creditors, be they bankers, production credit associations, or the Department of Agriculture's own Farmers Home Administration, can only calculate cash flow from the stability of the target price deficiency payments over the next 4 years and in this way determine the survivability of these farmers and ranchers.

And that process of calculation of cash flow is critical, too, for those operators who, while solvent now, will slide lower in credit rating if commodity prices continue to decline and target prices are lowered.

The administration is wrong in its attitude about this feature of the farm bill. It is wrong to try to reduce the number of farmers by lowering the target price safety net and forcing liquidations. The Secretary of Agriculture, the Office of Management and Budget, and the White House cite the need to reduce Federal costs as the reason for opposing this feature of the farm bill. They are also wrong to make target prices their target.

The farm bill is a 4-year bill and the projected cost of the target prices freeze for those 4 years is approximately \$4 billion. However, there are other places to reduce the costs of farm programs without tearing up this safety net.

When we are allowed the opportunity to offer an amendment—and this is not the case now because the majority leader's combination of pending amendments prevents that—we shall present a budget-cutting amendment calling for an \$8 billion reduction in costs during the 3-year budget cycle, thus bringing the farm bill under budget and providing an additional \$2 billion cost reduction for the fourth year of the bill.

We meet our responsibility to be within the budget by this amendment to reduce the farm bill's costs. Yet a deep sense of responsibility admonishes us not to reduce the target prices.

But this savings does not satisfy those who do the bidding of the administration, echoing the administration's farm policy are statements that a market-oriented policy requires lower target prices. However, that is not the case. The market-oriented lower grain, rice, and cotton prices that the administration seeks are not affected by target prices. Deficiency payments are separate. They do not prevent the lower market prices. Rather, target prices only provide a buffer for producers while the market-oriented policies are tested to increase exports and thus, in theory, to stabilize prices.

Increasing exports to stabilize prices is sound, but I have strong objection to the administration's deliberate muddling of immediate opportunities to increase exports to countries that are consistent customers.

To correct these misguided policies of both the State Department and the Department of Agriculture, the export title of the farm bill mandates change. Amendments are necessary to strengthen it further, and I urge the Senate to support them when we have the opportunity to consider them.

Mr. President, there are other amendments, many other amendments, that will be offered to the farm bill when the opportunity for amendments is available. There will be, undoubtedly, Senators who have been waiting to offer cuts in the Dairy Pro-

gram to reduce the support price of the milk; the same, I am led to believe, is true of the Sugar Program and the Peanut Program. Senators are certainly entitled to offer these amendments. I hope they are defeated. The farm bill comes to us after many months of deliberation in the Senate Agriculture Committee. It comes to us with the opportunity for members of the committee and for all others to consider both the administration program and the various programs and proposals offered by the 17 Members among those of us who serve on the Agriculture Committee.

It is my considered judgment that what we have before us, while not a particularly good bill, is probably the best bill that could be enacted at this time. We have what is known as a farm coalition, those commodity groups and people who produce those commodities on the farms and ranches of this country, who attempt to generate the thought and the momentum to carry through a farm bill every time it comes up for reenactment. It is not that there has not been enough thought or enough discussion put into this bill. There has been.

It is not that there is not a desire to do much more in this bill to correct the programs or to help the producers provide the investment and the work and the dedication, most generally their lifelong dedication, to producing these crops.

But the situation is one where the condition of low prices for these commodities has created not only a mountain of problems for the producers, it has also created a mountain of surplus commodities.

There is another amendment that could be offered. It deals with payment limitations. For 10 years and longer we have had payment limitations on the basic commodities of wheat, corn, feed grains, rice and cotton. It is a \$50,000 payment limitation per farm operator. It has stood in that amount since the last farm bill was enacted in 1981 and since the farm bill that was enacted previous to that, the 1977 farm bill. I do not believe that the \$50,000 payment limitation should be tinkered with on the floor of the Senate in this particular bill, and I will tell you why, Mr. President.

If there was great interest by the administration or others to change the payment limitation figure, there was plenty of time to give it adequate consideration in the committee while we had the bill before us. If an amendment is now offered on that here on the Senate floor, I am sure we would want to take adequate time to consider it and to debate it, and when would that be? First of all, the payment limitation of \$50,000 is one that was carved out so many years ago, as I have previously mentioned, for wheat,

feedgrains, corn, cotton and rice. Payment limitation does not apply to other commodities. But if the thought is, by a payment limitation amendment now offered, to reduce the cost of the bill, we would certainly want the opportunity to consider payment limitations for other commodities that are not covered under present law. There is no payment limitation on tobacco. There is no payment limitation on peanuts. There is no payment limitation on milk. We have in this bill a modest payment limitation on wool. And there is no payment limitation on sugar. Granted, these are different types of programs but in the understanding and knowledge of the various programs, whether it is dairy, sugar, peanuts, wool or tobacco, there are plenty of ideas I suppose that would be speculated about on the Senate floor.

For example, how would you apply it to peanuts, since that is a crop that is entirely different? Some people have been heard to remark they did not want to understand any more than they had already misunderstood about the Peanut Program. They apply that to a great number of programs. A lot of people who do not want to understand any more than they have already misunderstood about these programs, because they are difficult and involved, think they should be properly unraveled so you can get a thorough understanding. But nevertheless, an amendment to reduce payment limitations, could have been thoroughly discussed, adequately debated, the language reviewed from all directions and provided to the public, particularly to these commodity groups, these producers and warehouses and all that are involved in agribusiness—cooperatives also—all that are involved in the production and marketing chain of these particular commodity groups could have looked at the language to see what was workable and not workable.

Now, that type of draftsmanship on the Senate floor I strongly recommend against. I hope the payment limitation amendment is not even offered because the 5 days of this week, when it is thought we might stay on this bill and vote on these amendments and finally enact a bill before the week is out, would be taken up principally just talking about payment limitations.

I do not think there is anything perfect in the mass of farm law that we have in the United States. I do not think there is anything perfect in that whole mass that could not be improved upon, and I am certain, as surely as I am standing here, that payment limitation law could be improved upon. But I do not believe the outcome on this Senate floor would be good.

I hope I am not wrong on this, but I will make this statement and some-

body who is now on the floor or perhaps listening somewhere else can correct me. I would be honored if they would correct me—it is my understanding that the administration has not, during this whole year, recommended any serious changes in the payment limitation on these four basic commodities, nor applying payment limitations to these other commodities that are not now covered. They may have had some changes in the bill sent up by the administration—but we all recognize that that bill was stillborn. It never was considered serious.

So I do not believe this is really the time to tie up this floor with endless discussion on the pros and cons of payment limitations. I certainly want it clearly understood that any Senator, of course, surely has the right—and I would advocate protection of that right—to offer any amendment that he or she might care to offer regarding payment limitations.

I just express the hope and the recommendation that unless we want to spend a long period of time in discussion consideration of all the various aspects of payment limitations on those commodities that are now covered and on those commodities which are not covered, it might be a very long, tedious job. I doubt the language that would be drafted on the Senate floor would be all that erudite or satisfactory.

Mr. President, I believe basically there is a rather broad coalition of commodity groups and farm organizations that are in favor of the passage of this act. I know it requires time to go to conference with the House. If my memory is correct, I believe most conference committees on farm bills require 2 to 3 weeks before conferees agree on the final package. That requires the completion of this bill by the Senate to allow at least 2 or 3 weeks for conferees to meet.

The completion of this bill in the Senate would have to come by the end of the week or very early next week. Even then, it would probably entail conferees meeting rather assiduously, with diligent effort, for another 2 weeks after that, which would put us very close to the middle of December. I believe it can be done, but it is going to take more of a concerted effort here on this floor than we have addressed to this bill over the past several weeks.

References were made to me as delaying the bill in committee. I do not believe that is accurate. Over the many weeks—more accurately, over the many months—that this bill was before the committee for markup, I attended the meetings and attempted to have some input into the decisions that were made on various sections of the bill and the various titles of the bill.

I was very interested in making sure that a 4-year target price freeze would be the final outcome of the bill that was reported to the Senate. That happened to be the case, but it was by a very narrow margin—9 votes to 8. It was either in by a vote margin of 9 to 8 or it was taken out by a vote margin of 9 to 8. If my memory is correct, we put it in once, it was taken out, and then put back in again. That would be 3 votes, by 9 to 8. So that particular provision in this bill comes to the floor on a very narrow margin vote in the Senate committee.

Perhaps a major reason for the 165-page amendment that is now pending before us, which was offered by the majority leader, is a test vote as to whether or not the 4-year target price freeze will remain in the bill. In 165 pages of amendments, there is a great deal of other language. Only one feature in that amendment addresses that particular issue.

The amendment would freeze the target prices for the 1986 crop but not for the 1987, 1988, and 1989 crops. They would be reduced by 5 percent per year.

Much of the amendment deals with the different approach to wheat, the so-called flexible parity formula for wheat producers. A portion of the amendment deals with the phasing out of the Acreage Reduction Program and removing that discretionary authority from the Secretary of Agriculture at the end of 3 years. These points need to be debated, and I am sure will be.

If the amendment should carry, and I hope it does not—I hope the amendment fails—but if it should carry, we would seek to do two things. We would like to have the opportunity—and this would be true if the amendment carried or failed—to offer an amendment to reduce the cost of the bill by \$8 billion for the 3 budget years of this budget cycle, and that would carry along with it some saving for the fourth year of the bill, some additional savings, about \$2 billion. We would like to offer the amendment and have it voted upon, and I believe it would be a satisfactory proposal to the Senate, because it carries in it many of the savings of the majority leader's amendment. This is a reduction in cost of \$7.6 billion; and \$5.3 billion of that \$7.6 billion is very similar to provisions in our budget-reduction, cost-cutting amendment.

The other \$2.3 billion of savings in the amendment offered by the majority leader, of course, could be credited to the reduction in the target prices over the 1987 and 1988 crop, which is all that would be counted in the budget cycle; but of course it would carry over into the 1989 crop, and the target price reductions would go into effect for that crop. So there would be

additional savings in his amendment over and above the \$7.6 billion.

Second, if the majority leader's amendment prevails, we would still, of course, appreciate and expect to have the opportunity, and I am sure the opportunity would be afforded at some point in the debate, to offer a 4-year target price freeze separate from his amendment. That is one feature we would like to have cranked into his amendment.

Mr. President, we would like to get on with this process. We understand the circumstances that confront the Senate this afternoon, with numerous Senators, out and with the funeral of a former colleague, Senator John Sparkman of Alabama; and I can readily understand why there would not be votes of consequence this afternoon.

However, I understand that perhaps amendments that would not be controversial and would not require a vote might be offered if unanimous consent is asked to set aside the pending amendment, so that other amendments can be considered. I believe that is expeditious and worthwhile, and I should like to cooperate in that endeavor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURENBERGER). The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, here we are on November 18, many, many months after deliberation began on this farm bill.

While the distinguished Senator from Montana was speaking, I reflected upon what has gone on in the period from when we began to this date.

I recall the seemingly endless days when I sat—sometimes alone, sometimes with a few others—waiting for a quorum. The distinguished Senator from Montana was almost always there, as was the distinguished ranking minority member of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. ZORINSKY.

But somewhere along the line early in the game, I had the staff begin to make a note of how long it required us to get a quorum. And 2 or 3 days after the bill was reported, the staff informed me that I had sat more than 40 hours total waiting for a quorum. On top of that, day after day objections were raised to the committee even meeting after the Senate had been in session 2 hours. As the distinguished occupant of the Chair knows, the Senate rules on that are quite clear and precise. But objection after objection was raised to our even meeting. So that meant we could meet only on very few afternoons. We could have, and we would have, completed action in September except for the inordinate delays that occurred in this way during the markup.

In any case, over a period of 4 months we muddled through as best we could and we now have a bill with, as I recall, 19 titles and some 2,200 provisions.

Just examining the report, it is almost as thick as the "Tale of Two Cities." It is 914 pages long, which is a measurement of the enormity of the piece of legislation.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska and I have been doing a little wishful thinking here and we engaged in the fantasy of waiting a little while for Senators to appear and offer their amendments and if no Senator appears moving that we go to third reading. Of course, we will not do that. But the thought is enticing.

In any case, if we buckle down here and move along and restrain the inclination that is so prevalent among Senators to go on and on like Tennyson's brook, we could finish this bill this week and we could go to conference the week after Thanksgiving. Whether we will do that remains to be seen.

Mr. President, I am not going to take very much time, but let me review the situation from my own standpoint as just one Senator who happens to be chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Way back when, early this year when we began deliberations on the farm bill, I did my best to urge the committee to report a bill that would correct the mistakes in current farm policy and to set our sights toward bringing about a recovery in the agricultural economy.

From what developed thereafter, largely as a result of very close votes in the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, that did not happen. It was with considerable regret and absolutely no satisfaction that I felt obliged to become the first chairman of the Agriculture Committee in history to vote against reporting a farm bill. I did not like to do that and I wish I had not felt obligated to do it, but I was convinced that the bill as it was reported by the committee is not sound farm policy and it offers scant hope for recovery in the agriculture sector.

There is a lot good about this bill in terms of policy and I do hope that we can remedy the other parts so that we can pass a bill that has a chance of not being vetoed. This means that we have to decide this week, and pretty quickly now, whether we want a bill reflecting our political desires or whether we want a bill that will be enacted into law, not vetoed.

Why did I vote against reporting this particular bill? There is an easy answer to that. This bill exceeds the budget resolution by \$9.2 billion. That is the calculation of the Congressional Budget Office. Senators may argue about the conclusions of CBO, but

that happens to be the organization that we use in the Senate for our budget figures. The USDA, which has a later estimate of the budget-busting aspects of this bill, says that it will exceed the budget by \$25 billion.

Obviously, this bill in its present form is not satisfactory to anyone believing, as this Senator does, that Congress had a duty to restore fiscal sanity to the cost of operating the Federal Government.

While my greatest objection is, first, failure of the policy instruments and, second, the counterproductive impact they will have on the agricultural sector, it will be perilous to the Nation if we ignore the damage that will be done to the entire economy if the Senate does not agree to make this farm bill conform to the budget resolution.

Every authorizing committee reports bills. I have to look at it from the standpoint of my own stewardship, of what would happen to the entire budget process if every committee were to exceed the budget by \$25 billion, of what would happen to the general economy if Federal deficits are permitted to grow by such breathtaking amounts.

Moreover, I think it needs to be borne in mind that less than 20 percent of the \$54 billion in benefits and subsidies provided in this farm bill are directed to farmers who are experiencing financial distress. Yet, it is the relatively high degree of financial distress that is the only justification offered by the proponents of these tremendous outlays for farm subsidies. With all due respect to them, and I do respect them, such justification borders on falling into the category of false pretense.

So the point, Mr. President, is that the Senate can, if it will and should approve a farm bill that is sound farm policy, one that does conform to the budget resolution. And as we proceed, when we proceed, it is my hope that Senators will consider carefully various amendments that will be offered to attempt to correct the mistakes in this bill. If efforts to reform the failed policies of the past, and to conform the bill to the budget resolution, are successful, the recovery that is so desperately needed by farmers can get underway. If we fail to do our duty, and if the 1985 farm bill ends up continuing the mistakes of the past, then the farm economy is certain to continue a downward spiral.

Mr. President, I ran across just a few minutes ago two columns which, it seems to me, pretty well analyze the situation we are in. The first one was written by Robert J. Samuelson, in *Newsweek*, of November 18, the latest issue, and it is entitled "The Farm Mess Forever." The other written by Jonathan Rauch, of the *National*

Journal of November 16, and it is entitled "Agriculture Focus."

I ask unanimous consent that each of these columns be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

THE FARM MESS FOREVER

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

Anyone who doesn't feel the pain of American farmers must have a soul of stone. For more than a year, the images have floated from television, magazines and newspapers: of foreclosures, shattered lives and families losing their land. Their anguish affects us, because our romance with the land remains strong. Farmers do honest work and produce something of value. These emotions are powerful. They're part of our Jeffersonian heritage. We may always have a "farm problem" simply because we think about farming with our hearts, not our heads.

Otherwise, you must conclude that something is drastically wrong. For half a century we have subsidized and pampered farming. By any test, these policies have failed. They have not saved "family farmers"; since 1940, the number of farms has dropped by roughly two-thirds. They have not stabilized farm incomes. And they have not expanded food exports; indeed, in recent years, they've done the opposite. Yet our farm policies survive as if none of this mattered. The versions of the new farm bill being debated in Congress would be enormously expensive; rough estimates put the costs through fiscal 1988 between \$40 billion and \$60 billion.

We recoil from the basic questions. Do farm programs serve any public purpose? Since 1979 the government has spent more than \$11 billion to buy surplus dairy products. If we stockpiled beer or toothpaste, people would be outraged. But somehow, mounds of excess cheese, butter and powdered milk are considered normal and acceptable. Farming inspires a lot of sentimental nonsense. In the Farm Aid concert's theme song, singer Merle Haggard asks: "If the amber waves of grain should disappear . . . would we buy our bread and butter from the Toyota man?" Hold it, Merle. Even if all distressed farmers went bankrupt, the land wouldn't disappear. Most of it would be bought at lower prices and farmed by others. And Japan's wheat production is about a hundredth of ours.

Inflation's Backlash: True, many distressed farmers are victims—some of their own mistakes, others of erratic economic policies. In the 1970s farmers borrowed against land values, as they always have (land constitutes about three-quarters of farm assets). Farmers' debt-to-asset ratio was 16 percent throughout the 1970s. But the debt became excessive when the inflationary policies of the '70s—which tripled land values—were reversed. Farmers with big debts got caught in the downdraft of global recession. Interest rates rose, crop prices dropped and land values plunged. Economist Emanuel Melichar of the Federal Reserve estimates about a fifth of commercial farmers are in financial trouble; others put the proportion somewhat higher.

But farmers aren't alone in being victims. The basic premise of farm policy—that farmers are more economically vulnerable than others—is increasingly untenable. A world of large trade flows and wild swings of interest rates and exchange rates makes in-

stability the rule, not the exception. Try telling auto or textile workers that they're snug and secure. Farm programs don't even rescue farmers in trouble. A large part of the subsidies (which also cover wheat, corn, soybeans and cotton) go to healthy farmers. Consequently, the financial strains on rural bankers or the federally sponsored Farm Credit System won't be significantly eased. The Farm Credit System says it may face losses up to \$6 billion on its \$73 billion loan portfolio.

Government's proper role in agriculture is limited: it is to ensure adequate food supplies, not to prop up farmers' incomes. As the world's largest food exporter, we need to maintain some grain reserves to guard against bad harvests. Government should also support soil conservation, agricultural research and data collection. Otherwise, farming should be treated like any other business because, in fact, most commercial farms are sizable businesses. In 1980 the 287,000 farms with more than \$100,000 in annual sales accounted for about two-thirds of the nation's total agricultural output.

The abiding lesson of farm policy is that government can't easily anticipate or override basic changes in economic conditions or technology. For example, in 1981 when the last farm bill was passed, everyone wrongly assumed that the trends of the 1970s—rising exports, high prices—would continue. The mistake left crop support prices too high. Consequently, our farm policies have hurt our exports. Our overseas competitors can win sales by pricing their exports near American crop support levels. At those levels, our farmers effectively sell their grain into the government's bloated reserves. By setting subsidies too high, we stimulate excess production here and abroad. The oversupply then prolongs the depression in farmers' incomes or requires even greater subsidies.

Imperfect Solutions: Getting out of this mess is tougher than getting into it. A sensible case can be made for a gradual end to subsidies. After all, farmers are addicted to them. A case can even be made for debt relief—a simple bailout—because inflationary government policies fostered farmers' excessive debt. At the end of 1984, farm debt totaled \$212 billion. Suppose the government bought or canceled (if the debt is owed to the government) about a fifth of that, or \$42 billion. The initial cost would be huge, but, if it were tied to a rapid end to annual subsidies, this solution would be relatively cheap and efficient. Any transition is bound to be imperfect. If we help farmers in trouble, we aid the most inefficient or the biggest risk takers. If we help everyone, many prosperous farmers get undeserved windfalls.

But the worst choice is what Congress is doing: continuing current policies, which create windfalls without providing relief. The details, not the philosophy, of farm policy are being changed. You can blame Congress or farm groups for this, but the real reason lies in all of us. The status quo survives because it reflects popular attitudes. Our images of farming remain fixed, even though farming is forever changing. We share farmers' distress because they represent values that, as a nation, we prize. Our nostalgic sympathy is understandable, but its practical consequence is expensive foolishness.

AGRICULTURE FOCUS
(By Jonathan Rauch)

Consider a couple of propositions. One, the government's farm subsidy program is first and foremost income maintenance—welfare for farmers. Two, as such, it is among the most brutally inefficient welfare programs in the government—welfare, in many cases, for the wealthy.

Although the first statement is somewhat controversial politically, it seems to have become noticeably less so during the course of this year's debate on the 1985 farm bill. When you grant the first statement, the second becomes difficult to deny.

"Maintain farmers' income." That has emerged this year as the battle cry for many Members of Congress in both political parties. From an economist's point of view, maintaining farmers' income may not be such a good idea, any more than maintaining auto workers' income or textile workers' income or anyone else's is a good idea.

But the drumbeat of farm disaster stories has created a political imperative: Save the family farmer. "They're trying to make it [the farm bill] into a program that maintains a social structure," Gene Moos, an aide to House Majority Whip Thomas S. Foley, D-Wash., said of many Members, "I guess it's all a social program."

It may be that farm programs have always been intended, underneath the rhetoric, as income maintenance programs. During the current debate, however, the welfare goal of farm programs has become explicit. For many years, the programs were primarily thought of as market regulators. Because farmers were selling to a domestic market, the government could set minimum prices and make adjustments in supply to reduce the riskiness inherent in farming, and it could do it without spending vast sums of money. Government programs' explicit aim—although perhaps not their implicit one—was to give farmers a stable market rather than government-guaranteed incomes.

Today's world is very different. U.S. farmers are competing in an international marketplace over which any single government can exert only marginal control. The U.S. government can throw vast sums of money into the domestic agricultural market and do little more than spit into the wind. So the old rationale that pegged farm subsidies to market forces looks to economists more and more anachronistic.

Most income-support programs work by providing income based on need. That's the one thing that farm programs do not do; instead, they are based on production—a simple dollars-per-bushel formula. The more you produce, the more you get. Necessarily, big producers get more than little producers. The farmers under financial stress are a minority—20-30 percent of the total—and they much more often run small farms than large ones.

According to the Agriculture Department, the 80 percent of farmers with sales of less than \$100,000 a year—the class in which financial stress is the most serious—receive less than a third of government payments. The 99,000 farms with sales of more than \$250,000 a year, which account for almost half of all production but only about 5 percent of all farms, got almost a third of government payments. Those farmers aren't poor: Their average annual family income is \$97,000 and their average equity, \$900,000. Half of all farmers are getting payments of less than \$1,000 a year; only about 10 percent get more than \$10,000 a year.

In short, a small proportion of the nation's farmers—many of them demonstrably the least needy—are getting the great bulk of cash supports. Farming today is big business, and it is big businesses that are raking in the most money. "This is a continuing source of frustration to me—we never seem to be able to get through with that message," Robert L. Thompson, assistant Agriculture secretary for economics, said: "What they [farm income subsidies] are really doing is transferring significant amounts of income to larger growers."

And they are doing it, many farm economists say, counterproductively: Pegging income aid to production inevitably encourages production, they say, driving prices down and ultimately worsening the farm income problem.

If the goal is to help needy farmers survive, clearly the current program leaves a lot to be desired. This year's farm debate seems to be making that somewhat clearer to people on Capitol Hill. Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., and Senate Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry Committee chairman Jesse A. Helms, R-N.C., have been pounding away at the point that aid is not going where it is needed.

Helms' committee took a baby step toward change by approving income support levels for wheat that are lower per bushel for production in excess of 20,000 bushels. Taking more than a baby step toward focusing aid on the farmers who need it requires decoupling income supports from production levels. Sen. Rudy Boschwitz, R-Minn., proposed that, but his plan was rejected.

In any case, the Boschwitz plan was expensive. The only cheap way to aim aid to the needy is to do what is today the politically unthinkable: link farm income supports directly to need—which is to say, turn an implicit welfare program into an explicit one.

"If what we're really concerned with is low income, I'm convinced it [a means test for farm aid] could be done," Thompson said. "But farmers don't want to be on the dole. They don't want it to be perceived that they're on welfare."

No one in Congress has proposed a means test for farm subsidies this year; the idea has yet to appear over the horizon of political practicability. But people are beginning to talk about farm income aid as it relates to need. "Those who produce the most . . . get the most, and they need it least," Rep. Byron L. Dorgan, D-N.D., complained in House debate; Rep. Dan Glickman, D-Kan., said of federal aid, "More of it ought to be targeted to those farmers who are in trouble, small and medium-sized farmers."

That kind of talk wasn't much in evidence during the 1981 farm debate; look for more of it as current policy piles up the bills.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. ZORINSKY. Mr. President, the pending amendment, the one offered by Senators DOLE and LUGAR, is well intentioned—it would reduce the costs of the committee-reported farm bill. However, there is more than one method of balancing budgets and reducing the costs of legislation.

The historic debate on the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit reduction and balanced budget amendment illustrates that point.

In my judgment, there are three ways to balance the budget or reduce

deficits: No. 1, increase taxes; No. 2, reduce spending; and, No. 3, increase the number of taxpayers who pay into the taxing system, which would in turn increase the amount of taxes paid to the Treasury of the United States.

Now there are many ways to reduce spending. Having been a businessman for 35 years, I could lay off people. I could go to a shorter work week. I could reduce benefits. I could reduce inventory. I could reduce credit terms. I could use many methods to reduce costs and balance a budget, and so can the Federal Government.

The Senator from Montana, myself, and other Senators have drafted an amendment that would reduce the cost of the committee-reported farm bill in a responsible manner. However, the authors of the pending amendment have created a mechanism for reducing net farm income, thereby compounding the economic chaos that presently exists in agriculture.

We would like the opportunity—and eventually we will—to offer an amendment that would reduce the costs of the committee-reported bill, while retaining the 4-year freeze on target prices for wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, and rice.

The Dole-Lugar amendment freezes feed grain, cotton, and rice target prices for 1 year and then reduces them 5 percent annually for the next 3 years. The amendment attempts to achieve a 1-year freeze for wheat through a "flexible parity" approach. A 1-year target price freeze would be devastating to the "safety net" concept of income protection for farmers and lead to increased farm failures.

Let me point out that perception plays a great role in the economics and the future of farming in this country, as does the participation of the two leaders of the superpowers at the current summit meeting in Geneva. The perception, the psychological effect of the occurrence itself, may be as important as the outcome of that meeting.

The Dole-Lugar amendment would inevitably increase the amount of Federal assistance that would be required for farm credit assistance. Furthermore, the Senate has already rejected the 1-year freeze aspect of the amendment. The flexible parity portion of the amendment would result in reduced cash flow as acreage reduction increases. And this would bestow the least benefit on those farmers who are suffering financial hardship. This is inconsistent with statements by many critics of the committee-reported bill that target prices should benefit those producers who need them most.

Just let me point this out as to the perception of a farm bill. If we freeze target prices for 4 years—as proposed in the bill reported from the Senate Agriculture Committee—and we adopt the Melcher amendment reducing the

cost of the bill to the Treasury to bring it within the budget—we would doubtlessly revisit this farm bill after 2 years in any event, as we did in the case of the 1981 farm bill. But the perception in 1981 was we had a long-range farm bill and this helped stabilize the economy. Once again, we have to look at passing a farm bill in this body, independent of the administration's wishes.

Now we are past wishing things to happen around here. We are just going to have to make them happen. The bottomline of any farm bill coming out of here—the bottomline has to be whether it strengthens the economy of agriculture to the extent farmers have a better opportunity to make a profit above their cost of production.

Ideologically and philosophically, a farm bill should pass the test of transferring the responsibility of cost to the consumers in eliminating the cheap food mentality that several administrations have fostered. Representatives of the farm credit system have told me that their No. 1 priority is to pass a farm bill that will help stabilize the economy of agriculture. The alternative to that will be the continuance of eroding land values, and the continued failure of small, rural, independent banks.

I supported the flexible parity proposal when it was introduced in 1978. However, the flexible parity proposal offered here differs markedly from the original. For example, the 1978 plan achieved full parity at the maximum acreage reduction level. For the current proposal to reach a comparable level, a target price of around \$7 would be required.

In other words, the target price levels provided in the current proposal are insufficient to induce the cutbacks in production that were contemplated under the 1978 version.

This has led to the uncertainty and confusion among wheat farmers as they attempt to assess this proposal in the short period of time since it was offered.

In addition, no national standard for the production adjustment of wheat would be established by the flexible parity proposal. If it was enacted, depending upon the participation levels chosen by individual producers, we could experience great surpluses or, conceivably, shortages. The Secretary of Agriculture would have a difficult time in anticipating participation and production levels as well as its budget effect on the Treasury.

It is apparent from the amendment that the distinguished Senators from Kansas and Indiana intend to eliminate the authority in the committee-reported bill for mandatory production controls on wheat, subject to a producer referendum.

The flexible parity provisions of this amendment, if agreed to, should—I think—be submitted to producers for their approval or disapproval as well.

In addition, the amendment requires the Secretary of Agriculture to make advance deficiency payments for the 1986 crop with 15 percent of the payments in the form of Commodity Credit Corporation commodities. PIK payments of this magnitude with no concurrent decrease in production would further depress market prices.

The amendment further provides for the total elimination of acreage limitations or set-asides beginning with the 1989 crop year for wheat, feed grains, cotton, and rice.

This could stimulate production and increase surpluses, placing more downward pressure on market prices. The combined effect would be to increase both loan forfeitures and deficiency payments.

Mr. President, nothing in this amendment would increase net farm income. That is the important factor; that is, in order for any farm bill to help the economy of agriculture, it has to help stabilize net farm income. And this amendment is deficient in that regard.

Mr. President we should not strive to construct a farm bill that will be acceptable only to the administration. We have to have a farm bill that is acceptable to the farmers of America, to the agricultural industry, and a bill that will strengthen the Nation's ability to feed its own people at reasonable prices.

Our Constitution provides for the balance of powers. In this body, we are going to have to set aside any partisanship that exists. We are going to have to work together to pass a farm bill that does not penalize the farmer, so that the consumer of America will continue to have a reliable supply of food at reasonable costs. Nor is it in the best interests of the Nation to fashion a bill predicated on being its veto proof.

The threat of a veto has hung over the farm bill ever since we started talking about it. As a matter of fact, I believe it was the third day of markup when we were threatened in the Agriculture Committee with a veto by a representative of the administration.

I say this: Republicans, Democrats, Farm Belt Senators or urban Senators—the one common denominator that we have is that all citizens of this Nation are going to have to eat in order to survive. That should be as high a priority as defense in this country.

We must set aside veto threats and devise a bill that is good for agriculture, then try to resolve it in conference because that is where a great deal of this bill is going to be resolved, and then present it to the administration for their approval or disapproval.

They are going to have to make that independent judgment, and this body I believe, according to our Constitution, is not only empowered but mandated to make an independent judgment on the merits of the farm bill.

When the time comes for the administration to make its judgment as to veto or not to veto, that is its right. But, as I stated earlier, we should pass a farm bill that will enable farmers to stay in business so that they can continue to produce commodities, and not end up like farmers in the Soviet Union. They have a lot of farmers but no profit motive, no incentive to produce more food. That is why historically they have been very dependent on importing their food.

I would hate to see the farmers of America drawn into the same economic circumstances as farmers in the Soviet Union, where there is no profit motive.

Mr. President, I submit that the disturbing record of last year and this year as to rural bank failures, as to chapter 11's, as to bankruptcies is not a figment of anybody's imagination; it is out there—there are crisis hot lines and suicide hot lines, with many radio stations broadcasting call ins. The incidents of suicide have increased in the rural farm belts. This is not imagination. It is historical fact.

I think we have the ability to take the "D" after our name or that "R" after our name and set them aside, and pass a farm bill that will be good for the Nation, good for farming, and good for agriculture in general.

I join with my colleague from North Carolina, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, in fantasizing about wanting to go to third reading if no Senators appear in this Chamber to offer amendments.

I just glanced at the amendments that the chairman has on his list. I think that there are approximating 90 amendments on his list. I have a list of about 80 amendments. With all these amendments you would think there would be lines forming at the doors to present those amendments.

I would say to my colleagues, I would appreciate it, as ranking minority member of this committee, if any of those within earshot of my voice, if you are a sponsor of one of those 90 amendments, listed as the author or cosponsor, I am sure the chairman and I would appreciate your coming to the floor. It is now after 3 o'clock in the afternoon. We are ready to do business. We want to do business. We want to have a farm program. Why wait until Thursday at 2 in the morning to start offering amendments? I think if we start doing this now, we can establish voting patterns.

That is another matter I would like to have resolved, too. I think we should have votes. We got here with

up and down votes. If you had enough votes to be elected to the Senate, you became a Senator. I think, likewise, that these amendments should be judged on the same basis.

We are not going to decide this by rhetoric and wishing it to happen. We are going to decide it by Senators coming to the floor and offering those amendments and then voting on them in an expeditious manner.

The chairman of the committee and I will most sincerely appreciate the appearance of our colleagues if, indeed, we are to finish this farm bill this week.

Mr. President, I suggest—

Mr. MELCHER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ZORINSKY. I yield the floor to my colleague.

Mr. MELCHER. Will the Senator yield just for a comment on his remarks?

First of all, I commend my colleague from Nebraska for his fine work on the committee. He has presented very profound and very correct statements regarding the situation on the farms and the need for bipartisan support for moving the farm bill to bring income stability to farm producers and better days for them.

It is my understanding, and I want to be sure that it is correct, that it would take unanimous consent to offer an amendment at this time.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MELCHER. It would take unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to offer another amendment, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MELCHER. If Senators are listening to us in their offices, if they have an amendment which could be accepted, which would not be controversial, perhaps the amendment of the majority leader could be set aside. We would have to have unanimous consent to set this amendment aside.

It that the understanding of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ZORINSKY. That is my understanding. Again, I will check that with the chairman of the committee. But the Senator is correct, it would take unanimous consent to set the pending amendment temporarily aside.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EXON. 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. EXON. Mr. President, in the coming days, we shall address an issue which is obviously very, very important to those of us who represent agricultural States. Likewise it is very, very important to those of us who represent agricultural States. Likewise it is very, very important to America as a whole. But in coming days, I hope that we shall think of this legislation not just as a farm bill but as a food bill. That name, I believe, puts this legislation into proper perspective for all of us to understand. I have a few items I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues.

First, I hope all of the Members have had an opportunity to read from last Saturday's Washington Post an op-ed letter written by my good friends from Arkansas and Oklahoma. Mr. BOREN and Mr. PRYOR, responding to previous statements made by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, discount several myths. Among them is the myth that farmers are unfairly subsidized. I quote, "the fact is that, in the larger sense, it is the farmer who is subsidizing the rest of the U.S. economy." The farmer is subsidizing the rest of us with cheap food.

I urge all my colleagues to read and maybe even to reread the entire piece if they have not done so already. I submit that article from the Washington Post by the two Senators I have just mentioned and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. EXON. We have been given immense public trust as U.S. Senators by the people of this country. I would hope that we can see beyond the inherent controversies of forming legislation. We must realize that we cannot allow our farmers to subsidize the rest of the country, indeed a good portion of the world, by producing food so cheaply that it drives our farmers out of business.

Second, I would like to talk about exports, which is the justification some Members use to promote "cheap food" and "farm failure" legislation. How many times have we heard on this floor that our price-support levels are putting us out of world markets?

I offer, instead, that there are other important reasons for our decline in export markets. If we want to blame the strong U.S. dollar for our lost exports, then we will be partly correct because certainly the high value of our dollar is causing interruption to the shipment of our grain overseas. If we blame our inferior commercial grain cleanliness, we are getting closer. If we want to admit that foreign policy has gotten in the way of agriculture exports which have resulted in ill will and reduced overseas sales, we will be more correct. However, we are a party

to a fraudulent hoax if we put undue blame on our price-support levels.

Those who attack price-support levels have transparent motives. If the truth were known, they actually favor letting America's farmers indirectly subsidize the rest of us with some of the cheapest food in the world. I would hope every other Member of those body with a sense of fairness would oppose efforts to weaken our price supports.

That is not often said, Mr. President, but it should be said more often. Those who are fighting the 4-year freeze of target prices are doing just that. I hope that every other Member of this body with an ounce of fairness would oppose every effort to weaken our price-support program.

Mr. President, there are negotiations going on all around the Senate but not on the Senate floor right now. There is meeting after meeting after meeting and there have been for the past 2 weeks, where deals are trying to be cut to eliminate the 4-year freeze of target prices as passed out by the Senate Agriculture Committee. Those who are seeking to do that simply do not have an understanding of the depressing, the calamity, that has hit the Farm Belt today.

Oh, I know of the good reports that flow out of Washington as if they came out of a computer daily, how wonderful things are. Things are not wonderful in Nebraska, Mr. President. Our economy is down. The tax receipts at all levels of government are a disaster. The legislature is in special session right at this time to meet a financial calamity in the State caused primarily by the depression in agriculture.

Mr. President, I do not use this word, "depression," lightly. I know what it means. I have been through a depression. We are having one right now again in Nebraska and the adjoining farm States that is going to come rippling and rumbling like a flood into the rest of the economy unless we have the courage to do something about it.

The administration's farm bill and efforts by some Senators on the floor of the Senate and in the secret rooms now, trying to make deals, show they do not understand that there is a calamity, that is there is a depression out there.

One thing above everything else we must have is a 4-year freeze in target prices for grains.

Mr. President, that is not going to solve the problem, but that is going to give the family farmers and their bankers an opportunity to plan to know that even the relatively low levels expressed in the present target and loan prices are not going to cure the ills, but at least, it is going to give them a chance to know what prices

will generally be for the next 4 years so they can plan their financing, they can plan their restructuring accordingly. Without something like that, all hope is lost. As I talk here this afternoon, there are those who are losing hope out there right now and who will never return to produce food for America and for the world.

My third and final topic relates more directly to the specific legislation that we are now talking about. There are those who attempt to make the Senate believe that farmers are with the administration on its antifarm legislation. This is not the case. There may be some farm organizations that, in my opinion, do not represent the grassroots family-size farmers, who sit around in board-like rooms and make pronouncements.

But the facts are that the family-sized farmers in America today are wondering whether or not we care about what we have done in the past 4 or 5 years and what we are planning or not planning to do in the next 4 or 5.

I would like to call attention to a family farm survey that was just recently published in the *Kansas Farmers* magazine. A few of the results of that survey were interesting. This was not a random pole. This was an in-depth sampling of farmers by a farming magazine that knows and cares about what is happening in the Farm Belt today. I hope that my colleagues become aware of it. Eighty-one percent of the farmers in that survey said that they should be allowed to vote on a referendum for or against a specific piece of farm legislation. As the Presiding Officer knows, there are all kinds of suggestions that have been made along this line in the House of Representatives and all kinds of referendum proposals made in the Senate, including the bill that came out of the Senate Agriculture Committee which is now before our body. Eighty-one percent of the Kansas farmers thought they should have the right to vote on some kind of a referendum. That is an interesting figure.

Sixty-seven percent would favor shifting production controls from acreage to bushel allotments. A farmer knows best about that, because for far too long, Mr. President, we have given bushel or hundredweight allotments for crops that are measured other than bushels and said, "Go out and produce but you can't produce more than so many bushels or so much per hundredweight," and the farmers know that full well. A farmer knows his land and he will put his least productive land out of production and fertilize, plant closer, and raise that much more on the remaining acreage. So farmers know and are ready to make the sacrifice to go to some kind of an acreage program that would begin to cut down on the oversupply

that they recognize is a major problem with which we are dealing now.

Sixty-two percent favored a Marketing Certificate Program. What is a Marketing Certificate Program? A Marketing Certificate Program is a Government program where you can only produce the amount granted you by the Government. Is that Government control of agriculture? Of course it is. But the farmers, who by and large have been those who want to plant and plant and plant, recognize that fencerow to fencerow production has been a major reason for getting them into the situation they face today, and they are saying, 62 percent of them in Kansas, that they favor a Marketing Certificate Program.

Mr. President, I suggest that that would not have been the case had those same farmers been surveyed a few years ago. But the farmers themselves recognize the depths of the problem.

Finally, I believe we have a survey result here which tells the story, the true story concerning so-called flexible parity plans that are being advanced. Seventy-eight percent of the responses said no, when asked the question: "Would you be willing to accept lower loan rates or target prices in exchange for lower setaside requirements?"

Farmers know overproduction is a problem and do not want to plant fencerow to fencerow. Let us not force them into overproduction. Let us not force them into subsidizing the rest of the country with food so cheap that it mandates their economic failure.

Mr. President, the 4-year freeze on target prices and the wheat referendum are essential parts of this 1985 farm bill. I urge this body in the strongest possible way not to change that.

I also urge this body, do not retreat behind closed doors with hours and hours of quorum calls where essentially nothing happens on the floor of the Senate. We should be out here voting on the bill that was duly sent to the floor by the Agriculture Committee. Now, if it is not the will of the Senate that that bill as reported should become law, then let us get on with the business of considering amendments, changes, hopefully improvements, to that bill by rollcall votes. I also hope that we untie the knot that the Senate has been tied into by the leadership that essentially prevents other pieces of legislation or other amendments being offered. I hope that we would turn the Senate free to work its will on the farm bill which is essential, a key responsibility that we hold.

I hope, Mr. President, that we could move forward during the daylight hours. I am continually frustrated by the fact that a productive afternoon like today has essentially up until now gone for naught, and I suspect that

maybe we will be here after 6 o'clock, 7, 8, or 9 or else we will adjourn early and start over again tomorrow with the laborious back-room bickering that unfortunately has taken the action away from where it should be, the floor of the Senate.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 16, 1985]

MYTHS ABOUT FARMERS FROM JESSE HELMS

(By David Pryor and David Boren)

Millions of Americans have been confused by a set of myths about farmers and farm programs. A well-written piece by Sen. Jesse Helms that appeared in *The Post* ("The Struggling Family Farmer Will Be the Victim," op-ed, Oct. 24) contributed even more to this confusion. It is now time to separate the myths and the facts.

First is the myth that what happens on the farm bill is not important to the 97 percent of Americans who don't live on farms. The fact is that \$133 billion of farm debt is held by farmers who have difficulty paying it on time. This figure approaches the \$166 billion owed to U.S. banks by developing nations.

All Americans recognize the threat posed to our whole economy by a possible default on the Third World debt. When will we wake up to the danger posed by a possible collapse of American agriculture?

The second myth is that farmers are being subsidized unfairly by the rest of us. The fact is that in the larger sense it is the farmer who is subsidizing the rest of the U.S. economy.

Americans today spend less than 15 percent of their disposable income on food, by far the lowest in the world. In Western Europe, the figure is well above 20 percent, and it is above 30 percent for most of the world. Government payments to farmers do not begin to equal the money that American consumers are able to keep in their pockets because of the food bargain they receive from American farmers.

The third myth is that farmers are somehow inefficient and poor managers who cannot compete in free world markets without government help. The fact is that our farmers are the most cost-effective and productive in the world. They want a chance to compete in the free market but in fact have to compete with the treasuries of other nations, which are subsidizing their farm exports. Our farmers must also overcome the negative effects of trade embargoes and overvalued dollars imposed upon them by our own government.

Fourth, the myth perpetuated by the Helms article is that most farmers are experiencing no financial trouble. The fact is that, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture itself, 58 percent of family farms are under serious financial stress. They hold 67 percent of all farm debt.

How could Helms assert that 72 percent of all farmers are not in trouble? It's easy, if you include "hobby farmers" in the average and count them as farmers. There are 634,000 hobby farmers who farm 50 acres or less and do not depend upon farming for a living. Family farmers are only 34 percent of all farmers, but they account for over 90 percent of all farm production. They are the ones who must be preserved, and not the hobby or weekend farmers.

Fifth, the myth is that if we lower the deficiency payment limit under current farm programs from \$50,000 to \$25,000 we would

help family farmers by targeting benefits away from the big farms. The fact is that a \$25,000 payment limit would exclude over half the family farms. A 539-acre wheat farm would bump up against the payment limitation, as would a 300-acre cotton farm.

Helms confuses deficiency payments with farm incomes. He makes it appear as if the government is providing guaranteed incomes to farmers of up to \$50,000 per year. Of course, if this were true, no family farmers would be in trouble. Deficiency payments make up some of the difference between the market price and the farmer's cost of production. They don't give the farm a profit or an income.

Using USDA figures and projecting the results under the bill now before the Senate, the average 600-acre family wheat farm would receive \$27,800 in deficiency payments but would average only \$7,646 in net income for the family. This represents the total payment for the labor of the entire family for a year and total return on an investment of an average of \$500,000.

There are better ways to target more of the help to the family-sized farms. The housewife in the largest city will wonder what happened to her food bargains once agriculture gets into the hands of only a few huge operators. We will all miss hard-working family farmers if we let them go out of business.

Mr. EXON. 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. HELMS. 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. HELMS. Mr. President, for the purpose of the record I inquire of the Chair what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the Dole amendment in the second degree.

Mr. HELMS. And behind that is the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Alaska; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is on his way to the Chamber to offer an amendment which is going to be accepted.

I ask unanimous consent upon the arrival of Mr. COCHRAN that the pending amendment be laid aside temporarily for consideration of the Cochran amendment alone, that no amendment to the Cochran amendment be in order, and that upon disposition of the Cochran amendment the Senate return to the present status in the legislation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. 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. HELMS. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Chair if I am correct that there is also a motion to recommit involved in the legislative process now extant?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HELMS. I ask the Chair if the unanimous consent request that I just propounded would cover also the motion to recommit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator wishes to add that.

Mr. HELMS. I do add that.

Let me ask the Chair if under the unanimous consent request just propounded, if agreed to, when the Cochran amendment has been disposed of one way or the other the legislative situation would be precisely then what it is now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HELMS. I propound the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 1056

(Purpose: To modify the loan program for extra long staple cotton)

Mr. COCHRAN. 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 Mississippi [Mr. Cochran], for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. DeCONCINI, proposes an amendment numbered 1056.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 158, after line 23, insert the following new section:

EXTRA LONG STAPLE COTTON

Sec. . Section 103(h) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1444(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking out "50 per centum in excess of the loan level established for each crop of strict Low Middling one and one-sixteenth inch upland cotton (micronaire 3.5 through 4.9) at average location in the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "85 percent of the simple average price received by producers of extra long staple cotton, as determined by the Secretary, during 3 years of the 5-year period ending July 31 in the year in which the loan level is announced, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest in such period.";

(B) by striking out "November" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "December"; and

(C) by striking out in the last sentence "or within 10 days after the loan level for the related crop of upland cotton is announced, whichever is later,"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(19) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, this subsection shall not be applicable to the 1990 and subsequent crops of extra long staple cotton."

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself and Senators DOMENICI, GRAMM, BENTSEN, and DeCONCINI.

Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to change the extra long cotton program.

Legislation now in effect requires the loan rate for ELS cotton to be at least 150 percent of the upland cotton loan rate. Since the upland cotton loan is determined by the moving average spot-market price, the ELS loan is affected by changes in upland cotton markets.

The Extra Long Staple Cotton Act of 1983, which I introduced, made significant changes in the ELS Cotton Price Support Program, primarily by lowering the average loan rate from 96.25 to 82.50 per pound and by providing for disposition of government stocks at prevailing market prices.

As a result, the ELS cotton situation has changed dramatically. ELS exports increased from 13,000 bales in the 1982-83 marketing year to 36,000 bales in the 1983-84 marketing year and to 90,000 bales in the 1984-85 marketing year. Exports are expected to exceed 90,000 bales in the marketing year ending July 31, 1986.

During the same period, surplus stocks have been reduced from 90,000 to 50,000 bales, despite an increase in production from 90,000 to 130,000 bales.

The ELS market outlook is positive. However, to ensure the continuity of this successful program, the loan support level must be determined by ELS cotton prices, not upland cotton prices.

My amendment would first, base the ELS loan rate for the 1986 and subsequent crops on 85 percent of the most recent 5 year moving average, excluding the highest and lowest years, of ELS market prices, second, change the ELS program announcement date from November 1 to December 1, and third, change the program from permanent legislation and cause it to expire after the 1989 crop.

The board of directors of the Supima Association of America met on December 8, 1985 and agreed to these program changes. The National Cotton Council and the American Cotton Shippers support this amendment.

I also have a letter, dated October 23, 1985, from Secretary of Agriculture John Block supporting these changes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to me from Secretary Block be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, DC, October 23, 1985.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COCHRAN: Thank you for your letter requesting the Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) position on the proposed legislation for extra long staple (ELS) cotton.

The Department supports this amendment. Legislation now in effect for ELS cotton is permanent legislation. Under the present statute, the ELS cotton loan rate must be at least 150 percent of the upland cotton loan rate and the ELS cotton target price is set at 120 percent of the ELS loan rate. Thus, both the loan rate and target price for ELS cotton would be affected by any revisions in the upland cotton loan rate. Because of the many changes being considered by the Congress with respect to the upland cotton loan rate, the ELS cotton industry is proposing to base the ELS loan rate on 85 percent of a 5-year moving average of ELS market prices, rather than on the loan rate for upland cotton. This formula would result in loan rates and target prices for ELS which are comparable to those applicable to the 1984 and 1985 crops.

In addition, the amendment would allow the ELS authority to expire after the 1989 crop along with the other commodity programs. This would give the Department and the Congress the opportunity to review the ELS program again at that time.

I hope this information will be helpful to you in considering changes to the legislation for ELS cotton.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. BLOCK, Secretary.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I believe this amendment has been reviewed by the managers of the legislation. We appreciate the support of the cosponsors and those who helped in the development of the amendment.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the able Senator from Mississippi is correct. We have examined the amendment and conferred with him on it. As he has said, it will keep extra long staple cotton competitive on a world market by tying the loan rate to an average price received by farmers in the immediately preceding 5 years excluding the high and low years.

In fact, I say to my friend from Mississippi, this is precisely the formula that some of us think ought to be applicable to all commodities. So I commend him on the amendment he is offering.

I might add, Mr. President, that recent history with the ELS Cotton Program provides an important lesson about market orientation, the lesson that market orientation and market-

ing in general produce favorable results.

In 1984 the ELS loan rate was dropped almost 15 percent. ELS cotton exports increased from 13,000 bales in the 1982-83 marketing year to 36,000 bales in the 1983-84 marketing year and to 90,000 bales in the 1984-85 marketing year. Exports are expected to exceed 90,000 bales again in the 1986-87 marketing year.

During the same period, surplus stocks have been reduced from 90,000 bales to 50,000 bales despite an increase in production from 99,000 to 130,000 bales.

The amendment is acceptable on this side.

Mr. ZORINSKY. Mr. President, we have examined the amendment and urge its adoption. The amendment is supported by the extra long staple cotton industry and the Department of Agriculture. In addition, the amendment would allow the ELS authority to expire after the 1989 crop, along with other commodity programs. This would give the Department and the Congress the opportunity to review the ELS program again at that time.

The amendment would not increase the cost of the committee-reported bill and we recommend its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCURE). Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi.

The amendment (No. 1056) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. 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. HELMS. 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. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the very same arrangement prevail in the case of an amendment to be called up by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, Mr. MATTINGLY, the same arrangement that prevailed with respect to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1057

(Purpose: To permit family farmers with FmHA or SBA loans who are subject to foreclosure, bankruptcy or liquidation proceedings stemming from such loans to occupy temporarily the principal residence and adjoining land that was pledged as collateral for such loans)

Mr. MATTINGLY. 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 Georgia [Mr. MATTINGLY] proposes an amendment numbered 1057.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 357 of the bill, strike out line 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND HOMESTEAD PROTECTION"

On page 357, line 17, strike out "Sec. 1707." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 1707. (a)"

On page 358, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following new subsection:

"(b)(1). As used in this subsection—

"(A) The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

"(B) The term 'farm program loan' means any loan made by the Administrator under the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) for any of the purposes authorized for loans under subtitle A or B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.)

"(C) The term 'homestead property' means the principal residence and adjoining property possessed and occupied by a borrower specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(D) The term 'secretary' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(2)(A) If the Secretary forecloses a loan made or insured under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.), the Administrator forecloses a farm program loan made under the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.), or a borrower of a loan made or insured by either agency declares bankruptcy or goes into voluntary liquidation to avoid foreclosure or bankruptcy, the Secretary or Administrator must, upon application by the borrower, permit the borrower to retain possession and occupancy of any principal residence of the borrower, and no more than ten acres of adjoining land (including any farm buildings located thereon), pledged as collateral for such loan.

"(B) The total value of the homestead property may not exceed \$250,000, as determined by an independent appraisal made within six months preceding a borrower's application to retain possession and occupancy of such homestead property.

"(C) The period of occupancy of such homestead property under this subsection may not exceed five years, but in no case shall the Secretary or the Administrator grant a period of occupancy less than 3 years, subject to compliance with the provisions of paragraph (3).

"(3) To be eligible to occupy homestead property under this subsection, a borrower of a loan made or insured by the Secretary or the Administrator must—

"(A) apply for such occupancy during the three-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act;

"(B) have exhausted all other remedies for the extension or restructuring of such loan, including all remedies authorized under subsection (d) of this section;

"(C) have made gross annual farm sales of at least \$40,000 in at least 2 calendar years during the 5 year period beginning on January 1, 1981, and ending on December 31, 1985 (or equivalent crop or fiscal years);

"(D) have received from farming operations at least 60 per centum of the gross annual income of the borrower and any spouse of the borrower during at least 2 years of such 5 year period;

"(E) have occupied the homestead property and engaged in farming or ranching operations on adjoining land, or other land controlled by such borrower, during such 5 year period;

"(F) during the period of occupancy of the homestead property, pay a reasonable sum as rent for such property to the Secretary or the Administrator in an amount substantially equivalent to rents charged for similar properties in the area in which the homestead property in good condition; and

"(G) during the period of occupancy of homestead property, maintain such property in good condition; and

"(H) agree to such other terms and conditions as are prescribed by the Secretary or the Administrator in order to facilitate the administration of this subsection.

"(4) Failure to make rental payments on the homestead property in a timely manner shall constitute cause for the termination of all rights of a borrower to possession and occupancy of such property under this subsection;

"(5) At the end of the period of occupancy described in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Secretary or the Administrator shall grant to the borrower a first right of refusal to reacquire the homestead property on such terms and conditions (which may include payment of principal in installments) as the Secretary or the Administrator shall determine: *Provided*, That at the time any reacquisition agreement is entered into, the Secretary or the Administrator may not demand a total payment of principal that is in excess of the total value of the homestead property as established under paragraph (2)(B) of this subsection."

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which will offer at least some relief for those farm families in this country who simply have no chance whatsoever of salvaging their farming operation. I earlier introduced this measure as the Family Farm Homestead Protection Act of 1985, S. 1196. I would like to discuss the provisions of the amendment and the rationale behind it for a few brief minutes.

I could stand here today and recite the well-known statistics about the current distressed economic situation which faces many of our agricultural producers in America, but that would only repeat what each of us already knows. Not long ago in a news story, Secretary of Agriculture Jack Block admitted that nearly 5 percent of our

2.3 million farmers will not survive the present crisis in agriculture. He freely acknowledged that nothing short of a massive, vastly expensive bailout would help save these earnest laborers who till the soil for the benefit of us all. Even without a \$200 billion deficit, a rescue mission of this magnitude would not likely gain political approval or public acceptance.

Present farm programs have a wealth of detractors and the media would have us believe that many farmers are nothing more than greedy, shiftless leeches sucking blood from the Federal Treasury. The rare news story which does not emphasize only the costs of the farm programs, goes to the other extreme in trying to pin the blame for current financial stress on the administration. Of course they generally fail to talk about the past mistakes in Government policy which have served to drive the costs of production sky high.

They do not tell the tale of the inflation during the last 3 years of the 1970's which pushed double-digit upper limits and interest rates in excess of 20 percent. Saddled with such tremendous increases in land and operating costs, it is no wonder that farming in this decade has become almost financially impossible. Add to these factors other policies which first encouraged expansion and production, then slammed shut the door on major export markets with ineffectual, selective embargoes. Considering these adverse economic elements, exacerbated by speculative lending binges in the commercial credit markets and fanned to an even hotter flame by misguided Government credit programs, one has to wonder that things are not even worse than they actually are.

Many now talk about making farm programs more market oriented. They insist that such changes in farm policy would allow American produced commodities and products to move in export trade more freely to the financial gain of the farmer. But this myopic view totally ignores the fact that our country has failed to formulate and implement a comprehensive, cohesive trade policy. We have failed to do those things necessary to ensure our own producers an opportunity to take advantage of their inherent competitive advantage in agricultural production.

For the past 5 years, Congress has been unable to summon the political courage necessary to forcefully address the predatory tactics of foreign competitors. We have been totally unwilling to say to our world trading partners that the day has come when their excessive production and export subsidies must end. We have waffled on the issue of demanding an end to their tariff and nontariff barriers which prevent the free flow of Ameri-

can goods and products into their countries.

So, Mr. President, I would urge my colleagues in the Senate to consider this modest proposal which I offer to help the most severely affected members of our farm population. Even more, I would also offer my sincere support of any and all efforts to strengthen the linkage between free and fair international trade rules and the orderly development of a long-term farm policy for this Nation's producers.

The Family Farm Homestead Protection amendment which I urge us to adopt today certainly is not intended to solve the serious, underlying problems facing American agriculture. Rather, it is a small—but meaningful—indication of the esteem in which the Congress holds those men and women of American agriculture who have devoted their time, talents, and energies to feed and clothe their fellow countrymen and women, and indeed much of the world.

This amendment is designed to help ease the pain currently experienced by those farm producers who simply will not survive the present crisis. Much of the personal and community shock which results from farm failures could be tempered if we could provide the farmer and his family some time to readjust their lives. What I am suggesting today for your consideration is a plan which would allow a bona fide family farmer to retain possession and occupancy of the family homestead for a reasonable amount of time so that he can make the financial, emotional, and perhaps job training adjustments necessary to carry on a normal lifestyle.

The legislation would provide that a farmer who had occupied the family homestead for at least 5 years and who had actually depended on farming for a livelihood could retain possession of the homestead residence and up to 10 acres of land for a period of 5 years following any bankruptcy, foreclosure or liquidation necessitated by his inability to pay farm indebtedness.

During this grace period he would pay Farmers Home Administration or the Small Business Administration, as the case may be, a portion of the family income as rent for the occupancy and use of the property. It will also help protect the land values which is a tremendous problem all across this country. If, by the end of the fifth year, the family could show repayment ability then they would be allowed to redeem the family homestead residence and the small amount of adjacent acreage.

Mr. President, this is such a reasonable approach to helping smooth the transition which some 120,000 farm producers will face if Secretary Block's estimates are correct. I think that we

in Congress would be callous and cruel if we did not at least offer some type of escape valve for those who have devoted their best efforts only to see hopes and dreams of a lifetime dashed upon the rocks of faulty Government policies and stranded upon the reefs of unfair foreign trade tactics. I would suggest that this is probably the least we should do for these who have given in good faith their productive talents to the benefit of our country.

Let me suggest, Mr. President, that there should be little or no cost to the Treasury as a result of this proposal. In all probability the properties we are talking about would bring only a very small fraction of their book value if placed on today's depressed farm real estate market under forced sale. If held for 5 years they will certainly not bring any less should the family still be unable to redeem the homestead. They might even bring more at that time due to stabilization and improved economic conditions in the agricultural sector. During the grace period the Government would be receiving payments in the form of rent, which would further lessen the Treasury's loss on the original loan.

I have a great deal of confidence in the Members of the Senate and their knowledge about and concern for farm producers in this land. I simply urge constructive consideration of this suggestion. I will work with all of my concerned colleagues in every way possible to see this small flame of hope and opportunity kept alive for those in this distressed sector of our economy. Thank you.

I ask my colleagues to accept this amendment to this very important bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this is a good amendment. I commend the able Senator from Georgia for offering it. In adopting such amendment, as he has indicated, the impact would be lessened on those Farmers Home Administration and Small Business Administration farm borrowers who find that continuation of their farming operation is not economically feasible. This measure would permit farm families who would lose their homes through foreclosure or liquidation, under certain circumstances, to remain living in their homes.

There is no doubt that the liquidation of a farming operation is a traumatic experience for the unfortunate farm family. Not only does the farmer lose his primary livelihood, but in many cases, he loses his residence if it was pledged as collateral for his farm indebtedness.

This amendment would enable significant numbers of farm families to continue living in their homes through the payment of reasonable rent to the Farmers Home Administration or the

SBA and, hopefully, regain ownership within 5 years.

The committee bill, S. 1714, contains a provision which allows the Secretary of Agriculture broad discretion to settle claims of hopelessly delinquent FmHA borrowers. The bill provides for negotiations between the borrower and FmHA prior to liquidation or foreclosure to settle indebtedness. Hopefully, through such negotiations borrowers can retain some assets, specifically their homes.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia would complement the "settlement of claims" provision in the committee bill. The language in this amendment requires the Secretary or the Small Business Administration to permit the borrower to rent back his residence and not more than 10 acres if the applicant is able to meet several eligibility requirements.

Under this proposal, the family will pay a fair and equitable rent to continue living in the residence for up to 5 years during which time he would be able to purchase it back if his financial situations improves to the point where this is possible.

Mr. President, I believe this is a reasonable proposal that shows compassion for farm families who will experience the stress of liquidation or foreclosure in the future. I urge its adoption.

Mr. President, it has been cleared on this side. I urge adoption.

Mr. ZORINSKY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. ZORINSKY. Mr. President, I support Senator MATTINGLY's amendment and congratulate him for its introduction.

The amendment provides that if a farmer loses his home because it has been used as collateral on an FmHA and SBA loan, the farmer would be allowed, under certain conditions, to rent the residence from the Government for no more than 5 years.

Senator MATTINGLY's amendment would not interfere with the action taken by the committee. The committee agreed that the Secretary of Agriculture needed broader authority to settle the debt obligations of Farmer's Home Administration borrowers. This action was taken because the committee believed it was in the best interest of both the borrower and the Government to have greater flexibility to compromise repayment obligations.

The committee intended for the Secretary to work with severely delinquent borrowers, especially those who have adequately maintained security property and made every effort in good faith to live up to the terms of their loan agreement. This action would be taken prior to liquidation so that agreements could be reached that would allow the borrower to retain his

home and some immediate real property thereby assisting the borrower in making a transition from agriculture to another livelihood.

I believe the Senator's amendment will help ease the trauma experienced by farmers and their families. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment (No. 1057) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO 1985 FARM LEGISLATION TO SAVE \$78.6 BILLION IN BUDGET OUTLAYS OVER THE NEXT 4 YEARS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in support of the so-called Lugar-Dole compromise amendment. This compromise amendment would achieve savings of \$7.6 billion in budget outlays over the next 4 years.

Mr. President, under this amendment, target prices for feed grains, cotton, and rice in 1986 would be held to 1985 levels. The Secretary of Agriculture would be given authority to reduce target prices by up to 5 percent in each of the next 3 years. The amendment would also provide for an Acreage Reduction Program [ARP] for wheat. Other cost savings would be achieved by altering provisions in the conservation, export, and credit sections of the farm bill.

Mr. President, I believe that adoption of this amendment is a crucial step in the right direction. The amendment would make necessary adjustments in farm programs and thereby bring the projected spending levels under the farm bill closer in line with the budget resolution.

I was pleased that the Senate Agriculture Committee reported a farm bill which would give the Secretary of Agriculture discretion to low loan rates on feed grains, cotton, and rice. Lower loan rates would enable our farmers to better compete with foreign agricultural concerns. Fewer farmers would have their commodities placed under Government loan, thus saving valuable tax dollars.

However, as loan rates drop, deficiency payments for some farmers would rise to meet the target price. Therefore, any budget savings realized by lowering loan rates will be nullified if target prices are not also lowered to more realistic market levels.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, \$83 out of every \$100 in direct payments last year went to

farmers who were not facing severe financial stress. While we may temporarily help some farmers through deficiency payments, the end result would be an increase in the budget deficit, which already seriously threatens the financial health of our Nation's agricultural industry.

On this point, Mr. President, I would like to share with my colleagues the comments of two noted South Carolina agricultural economists. Professors J. Edwin Faris and Harold M. Harris, Jr., of Clemson University had the following to say regarding the impact of our huge Federal budget deficit on the farmer:

The result has been a strong U.S. dollar and high real interest rates. High interest rates are most harmful to highly capitalized industries dependent on borrowing, such as agriculture. The high value of the dollar is most injurious to industries dependent on export sales, such as agriculture. Because South Carolina farm income comes chiefly from export crops like soybeans, wheat, corn, cotton, and tobacco, the situation has been magnified here. Unless the Federal budget deficit is cured or partially monetized, South Carolina agriculture faces a difficult adjustment process. Thousands of South Carolina farmers will be forced from the land, and hundreds of millions of dollars worth of farm assets will be erased from the State's wealth as farm land values plummet.

In my opinion, this same analysis applies nationwide. It is clear that our current farm crisis is a fiscal crisis, characterized by farm foreclosures and farmer bank failures across the country. It is a cruel irony that the 1985 bumper crop, which should be a boon to our farmers, will only depress prices and hurt American farmers who suffer not from bad harvests, but financial circumstances largely beyond their control.

Spending more money and increasing the budget deficit will not help the farmer. The Farm Bureau in my home State of South Carolina has stated that the budget deficit is the farmer's biggest enemy. We have spent months proclaiming the need to balance the budget and reduce the Federal deficit. We passed a budget resolution that would accomplish those goals. The farm bill as reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee, however, is projected to cost almost \$20 billion more than what is provided for in the budget resolution. We must act now to bring farm program spending closer to the figures provided for in that resolution.

I commend the majority leader, Senator DOLE, and Senator LUGAR for their efforts to hammer out this compromise amendment to the farm bill. I urge my colleagues to support the Lugar/Dole amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the managers of the bill are hoping that tomorrow morning we can lay down the dairy amendment and after the disposition of that amendment a number of

others where we can set aside the pending amendment. We have had meetings in our offices this afternoon with the managers of the bill, myself, and Senator MELCHER, and a series of other meetings today with farm representatives.

It seems to me that we have known all along the big issue is going to be commodity price-support levels. Perhaps we can dispose of a number of other amendments in the interim. I find a willingness on both sides to do that. I thank my colleagues.

As I understand, the process is going on now to get a number of amendments ready to start on in the morning. Is that correct?

Mr. HELMS. That is correct.

Mr. Leader, if the majority leader will yield, I hope before we depart the Chamber this evening, to give you a list of four or five amendments that we will endeavor to dispose of tomorrow. The first one will be, if our hopes are realized, the dairy amendments or a dairy amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Let me indicate that it is almost imperative that we pass the bill this week. We can work late tomorrow night and Wednesday. Of course, on Thursday night the President will be addressing a joint session of Congress, so we will be in very late that evening and then again on Friday. It would seem to me it would be necessary to complete action this week so that the conference can start immediately after the recess and give the staff some time during the recess to lay out the differences in the various bills. It is our hope, or at least there is some glimmer of hope, that we might be able to work that out.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, if the distinguished majority leader will yield, is it too early to have both sides explore the possibility of time agreements on these amendments?

Mr. DOLE. I do not believe so.

The question is whether it is too early to explore time agreements. I know you have disposed of two or three amendments in fairly quick order. That leaves only 87 pending. I would guess that a good two-thirds of those may never be offered. I understand there is a willingness on both sides to enter into time agreements on certain specified amendments.

Mr. ZORINSKY. That is correct. We certainly have no objection to taking up the dairy bill in the morning. However, there is one Senator arriving shortly after caucus time. But we will notify all Senators that the vote will be sometime after the caucus.

Mr. DOLE. That will be up to the managers.

If we can follow up the dairy debate with another amendment, maybe there can be a couple of votes after the policy luncheons.

I thank my colleagues.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, in order to facilitate plans that we hope will materialize, let me do again what I have previously done this afternoon. That is to ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes S. 1714 tomorrow the motion to recommit and amendments thereto and the Stevens amendment be temporarily laid aside.

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, for the purpose of which amendment? The dairy amendment?

Mr. HELMS. That is correct.

Mr. MELCHER. That is part of the request?

Mr. HELMS. Yes.

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

Mr. BYRD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I apologize for delaying the Senate and delaying the parties who are having a colloquy in regard to the legislation pending. I remove my reservation.

I just wanted to be doubly sure. I had not been in on any of the earlier conversations. That is nobody's fault, but I just wanted to be sure this was cleared with some of the Senators who are absent.

I remove my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we understand on this side that there may be some little problem with that specific hour, but I hope that Senators will make appropriate accommodations to be over here and on the amendment. It is an important amendment and probably will give some indication of what happens to later amendments.

I think there is a willingness, from what I can determine this afternoon, on all sides to try to do something this week to get the bill into conference. We are exploring a number of possibilities on both sides. I think as far as this Senator knows, having met with the wheat growers, the corn growers, the farm credit people, and OMB today, everybody had pretty much the same view, along with others of my colleagues.

Mr. President, let me add one item. I think I understand this. Obviously, when an amendment comes up on dairy, it could be amended with anything else. It is my understanding that we are operating in good faith on both sides trying to dispose of some amendments. We are not going to have every amendment amended with a 4-year freeze or a 1-year freeze or whatever. Is that the understanding of the other side?

Mr. HELMS. That is my understanding, Mr. President, and I believe it is of all those who are interested in this legislation.

Mr. ZORINSKY. That is my understanding, also, Mr. President.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 6 p.m., with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING THE ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1985, the Secretary of the Senate, on November 15, 1985, during the adjournment of the Senate, received messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received on November 15, 1985, are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING THE ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1985, the Secretary of the Senate, on November 13, 1985, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

H.R. 3447. An act to amend and extend the Congressional Award Act; and

H.J. Res. 449. Joint resolution to provide for the temporary extension of certain programs relating to housing and community development, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1985, the enrolled bill and joint resolution were signed on November 15, 1985, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

Pursuant to the provisions of section 2159(a) of title 42, United States Code, the Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from the further consideration of the following joint resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S.J. Res. 216. Joint resolution approving the proposed agreement for cooperation between the United States and the People's Republic of China.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-1991. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on 2 new deferrals and 2 revised deferrals for fiscal year 1985 and 23 new deferrals for fiscal year 1986; jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, to the Committees on Appropriations, the Budget, Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, Armed Services, Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, Energy and Natural Resources, Environment and Public Works, Foreign Relations, the Judiciary, and Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1992. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense transmitting, pursuant to law, certain selected acquisition reports including 13 exception reports on programs with schedule delays of 3 months or more or cost changes of 5 percent or more since the last report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1993. A communication from the Director of the Defense Security Assistance Agency transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the foreign military sales credit program and the military assistance program, and the guaranty reserve fund; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1994. A communication from the Secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the determination to extend time periods for action or certain appeals before the Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1995. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the relative cost of shipbuilding in the various coastal districts; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

EC-1996. A communication from the Secretary of Energy transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the Strategic Petroleum Reserve for the period June 1, 1985 to September 30, 1985; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1997. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director of the Minerals Management Service transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on 27 refunds of excess royalty payments to various oil and gas companies; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1998. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director of the Minerals Management Service transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on six refunds of excess royalty payments to various oil and gas companies; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1999. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of a leasing systems sale on the Outer Continental Shelf, eastern Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2000. A communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report on nondisclosure of safeguards information; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2001. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services trans-

mitting, pursuant to law, a report on children in foster care under voluntary placement agreements; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2002. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the impact of the Medicare Hospital Prospective Payment System; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2003. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States within the 60 days previous to November 15, 1985; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2004. A communication from the Chairman of the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Annual Government in the Sunshine Act report; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2005. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Credit Corporation transmitting, pursuant to law, Government in the Sunshine reports of the Corporation for 1983 and 1984; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2006. A communication from the Inspector General of Health and Human Services transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a new Privacy Act records matching program; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2007. A communication from the Special Counsel, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on allegations of violations of law and regulations, mismanagement, waste of funds, and abuse of authority by officials in the Atlanta, GA, office of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2008. A communication from the Special Counsel, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on allegations of a violation of law and regulations, waste of funds, and abuse of authority by an official of the Waltham, MA, Office of the Social Security Administration; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2009. A communication from the Attorney General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1984 Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2010. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Rehabilitation Act Interagency Coordinating Council; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2011. A communication from the Secretary of Education transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "The Equity and Choice Act of 1985"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2012. A communication from the Administrator of the Veterans Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Exchange of Medical Information for 1985; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

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-524. A resolution adopted by the California Federation of Republican Women, supporting President Reagan's strategic defense initiative; to the Committee on Armed Services.

POM-525. A resolution adopted by the City Council of San Mateo, CA, supporting the Legislature of the State of California in its request that deductibility of State and local taxes be retained in any revision of Federal income tax law; to the Committee on Finance.

POM-526. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 96

"Whereas, on July 27, 1953, an armistice was signed at Panmunjon, Korea, which created a cease fire that ended two years of agonizing deadlock in the truce talks and three years of conflict that brought more than one million American military personnel to Korea; and

"Whereas, in the Korean Conflict 54,000 Americans were killed and more than 103,000 were wounded; and

"Whereas, on the eve of the thirty-second anniversary of the armistice, a United States Congressional panel will conduct hearings on legislation calling for a memorial to honor veterans who served during the Korean Conflict, to be placed on federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs; and

"Whereas, there are more than five million living American veterans of the Korean Conflict, many of whom served during World War II or the Vietnam era; and

"Whereas, the deeds of these dedicated persons in Korea are often overshadowed by the world war that had not long been ended and by Vietnam, which still lies fresh on our minds; and

"Whereas, the Korean Conflict veterans are silent veterans, the veterans who served, and then slipped back into civilian life practically unnoticed, making this type of recognition long overdue; 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 we approve and endorse legislation by the United States Congress to create a memorial to the veterans of the Korean Conflict on federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs; and be it further

"Resolved, That a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be presented to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to the President of the United States Senate, and to each member of the Illinois Congressional Delegation."

POM-527. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 100

"Whereas, The Mississippi River is a tremendous asset in the cultural, ecological and economic development of our Country; and

"Whereas, As a favorite site for visitors, the Mississippi River has become a famous national as well as international attraction; and

"Whereas, The ten-state Mississippi River Parkway Commission has proposed the des-

ignation of the Mississippi River Corridor as a National Heritage; and

"Whereas, The proposed designation would recognize a vast array of diverse resources in the River Valley and promote economic development in the heartland of this Nation; and

"Whereas, Such a designation, which would be similar to the Illinois-Michigan Canal Corridor, is not expected to impose any new regulatory burdens on the citizens, or on local, regional or state governments; and

"Whereas, This proposed corridor would encourage the Department of Interior to provide coordinating and technical functions for the Mississippi Corridor; and

"Whereas, Participation by constituent groups, historians, sportsmen, industrialists, archeologists, conservationists, road-builders, and planners is anticipated for enhancement of the Corridor; 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 we approve the establishment of a Mississippi River National Heritage Corridor; and that we urge that the United States Congress proceed toward this designation; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Illinois Congressional Delegation."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1116. A bill to amend the Act of October 15, 1982, entitled "An Act to designate the Mary McLeod Bethune Council House in Washington, District of Columbia, as a national historic site, and for other purposes" (Rept. No. 99-181).

By Mr. McCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 1503. A bill to clear title to certain lands along the California-Nevada boundary (Rept. No. 99-182).

By Mr. McCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 187. Joint resolution designating Patrick Henry's last home and burial place, known as Red Hill, in the Commonwealth of Virginia, as a National Memorial to Patrick Henry (Rept. No. 99-183).

By Mr. McCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

H.R. 1185. A bill to amend the Act establishing the Petrified Forest National Park (Rept. No. 99-184).

By Mr. McCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendment:

H.R. 2776. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey title to the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium to the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 99-185).

By Mr. McCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 3003. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land

located in the State of Maryland to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (Rept. No. 99-186).

By Mr. DANFORTH, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

H.R. 3235. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to accept title to the Mississippi Technology Transfer Center to be constructed by the State of Mississippi at the National Space Technologies Laboratories in Hancock County, MS (Rept. No. 99-187).

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1684. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain Chillicothe Indian School lands in trust for the Kaw, Otoe-Missouria, Pawnee, Ponca, and Tonkawa Indian Tribes of Oklahoma (Rept. No. 99-188).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GARN, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

Robert Logan Clarke, of Texas, to be Comptroller of the Currency for a term of 5 years.

(The above nomination was reported from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs 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 on the Senate.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. QUAYLE (for himself, Mr. WEICKER and Mr. DURENBERGER):

S. 1855. A bill to revise the provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to health planning; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolution and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. DOLE (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. Res. 260. Resolution to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel and testimony of Senate employees; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. QUAYLE (for himself, Mr. WEICKER, and Mr. DURENBERGER):

S. 1855. A bill to revise the provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to health planning; to the

Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

HEALTH PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION ACT

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today with my distinguished colleague, Mr. WEICKER, to establish a block grant to the States to support health planning activities designed to meet the needs of a competitive health care market structure. This bill represents a compromise between separate proposals we had both introduced earlier this session. We hope to markup this compromise tomorrow during the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee's executive session.

The most recent authorization for the Federal health planning program expired at the end of fiscal year 1982. Since that time, the program has been funded under a continuing resolution despite the fact that it has not been reauthorized. I believe that outlays for a Federal program without appropriate authorizing legislation is an abdication of Congress' responsibility. When an authorization expires, Congress should evaluate the program and either give it renewed direction and funding or drop it from the books. This has not been done with the Federal health planning program.

Moreover, as a result of congressional inaction our health planning law has remained stagnant. Since the enactment of health planning legislation in the early 1970's, dramatic changes have taken place in the delivery of health care services because of the competitive effects of the prospective payment system and, more significantly because of initiatives the private sector has taken to contain costs; yet, our health planning law has not been updated to address these changes in any significant way. I believe our proposal achieves the reforms necessary to establish a health planning program that will help the competitive approach move forward by reversing the regulatory and bureaucratic burdens the existing law imposed on the States and providing sufficient flexibility for each State to carry out a health planning program to meet its own special needs.

I also believe that this legislation will complement the proposal put forth earlier this year by Senator DURENBERGER and myself to integrate capital costs for part A reimbursement into Medicare's prospective payment methodology. Together, these two proposals provide a comprehensive reform of our Federal policy of health facilities regulation.

This bill replaces our current health planning law with a block grant to the States that choose to participate in this program. The bill provides for a 3-year reauthorization and requires that at least 90 percent of the appropriated funds must be utilized for grants to

the States in order to minimize the amount of funds that can be spent on Federal administrative costs. States choosing to participate in this program may use the funds to design their own health planning programs. The bill requires that the States use their allotment to undertake one or more of the following activities: Data collection and research; the development of local health plans; the collection and dissemination of purchaser information; assessments of access to health care services for individuals living in rural areas and for those who have no medical insurance or insufficient medical insurance; and for certificate of need programs. However, those States that choose to use these funds for certificate of need reviews will be required to establish this program in accord with a number of requirements outlined in S. 1855.

In addition, the States will be required to undertake a limited number of activities in order to be eligible to receive these funds. Each State will be required to: Designate a State agency as the State health services and resource allocation agency; develop a State plan; develop a State administrative program; appoint a State advisory board; and develop an annual report. The bill also requires that the State make grants to local agencies and that 30 percent of appropriated funds be used for this purpose. However, the bill provides that the Secretary must grant a waiver for any State that does not wish to make such grants. In addition, the bill provides that the funding levels for the 10 States which currently have a section 1536 exemption from the local planning requirements of present law must be held harmless at their fiscal year 1985 level. Finally, in terms of Federal activity the bill requires the establishment of two health planning centers and a National Health Planning and Resource Control Council.

As I stated previously, this bill represents a compromise. Thus, there are elements of this bill that I disagree with just as there are elements of it that Mr. WEICKER does not favor. I would prefer that the use of the funds be far more discretionary and that the bill include a sunset provision. I would certainly prefer fewer reports and councils. However, I feel that this is a small price to pay in order to rid our States of the enormous burdens of our current health planning laws, most particularly the mandatory certificate of need program, and to establish a planning program that will help and not hinder our competitive health care delivery system.

As I have noted I would have preferred a bill with a sunset provision. However, I must emphasize such a provision is purely symbolic. It is impossible for one Congress to bind the hands of a future Congress in such a

fashion. In 1988 when this law expires the next Congress will decide whether or not to continue this program regardless of whether or not it includes a sunset provision. A careful review of the history of the Economic Opportunity Act clearly demonstrates that the option of continuing unauthorized programs under a continuing resolution is available regardless of whether the authorizing statute includes a sunset provision.

Mr. President, I believe that this bill represents a compromise that will prove to be acceptable to all the Members of the Senate and to the administration. I urge my colleagues to support it when it reaches the Senate floor. I also wish to thank my distinguished colleague from Connecticut and his staff for all their hard work and cooperation in crafting this compromise.●

● Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, the rapid spiraling of health care costs continues to be of major national concern. Congress has responded to this concern in several ways: It has enacted a new prospective payment system for Medicare; it has placed some controls on medicare reimbursement rates; and it has supported the Government's efforts to assess medical technology and practice patterns.

At the heart of any effective system of cost control must be some mechanism that will control the excessive growth of capital expenditures, equipment, and services, while preserving for our citizens their current reasonable access to health care. Senator QUAYLE and I believe that a system of health planning continues to be an indispensable part of that mechanism.

Senator QUAYLE and I are introducing a health planning bill that is designed to support current State efforts in health planning while providing a good deal of flexibility to the States that wish to develop new and different programs.

In order to be eligible for funds, States will be required to designate a State health services and resource allocation agency, develop a State plan, appoint a State advisory board, and produce an annual evaluation of the planning program.

In addition, the States may use the health planning allotment to support certificates of need programs, collect data and conduct evaluation, and to support local planning.

A modest attempt is made in this legislation to encourage the strengthening of market forces within the health care system. Advisory councils, dominated by employers and other purchasers who actually pay the major portion of the health care bill, are established. These councils will ensure that those who have a vested interest in controlling costs have a say in the way it is done.

Matching grant funds are also incorporated as a further incentive for local planning organizations to involve major purchasers of health care in the planning process.

Mr. President, in the present regulatory climate where each major payer of health services, including the Federal and State governments, is aggressively pursuing cost control, it is essential that the distribution of health services not become a function of formula regulation. The explosion in total revenues spent for health care has not resulted in equal availability. Medically underserved areas continue to exist in our cities and rural communities.

We have witnessed the effects of this maldistribution, be it increased infant mortality in a segment of our society, or the misery of living with an ailment for which there is no available, or affordable, cure.

Health planning has two major purposes: To prevent unnecessary and duplicative expansion of health services and facilities and to encourage the availability of these services and facilities in areas lacking them. Thoughtful prospective planning based on need is absolutely necessary to achieve these ends.

Mr. President, we are presently spending almost 12 percent of our gross national product on health care while millions of Americans are still underserved. Health planning is one of the necessary tools to ensure that this expenditure is made most wisely and for the benefit of all our citizens.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 8

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the names of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. EAGLETON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ZORINSKY] were added as cosponsors of S. 8, a bill to grant a Federal charter to the Vietnam Veterans of America, Inc.

S. 850

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] 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. 1039

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1039, a bill entitled the "Ocean Incineration Research Act of 1985."

S. 1250

At the request of Mr. HEINZ, the names of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CHILES] and the Senator from

California [Mr. CRANSTON] were added as cosponsors of S. 1250, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the targeted jobs tax credit for 5 years, and for other purposes.

S. 1305

At the request of Mr. TRIBLE, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1305, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish criminal penalties for the transmission by computer of obscene matter, or by computer or other means, of matter pertaining to the sexual exploitation of children, and for other purposes.

S. 1360

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] were added as cosponsors of S. 1360, a bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to improve the administration of the Federal energy conservation program for consumer products, to enhance consumer information programs, to encourage the purchase of more energy-efficient appliances, to implement efficiency standards for certain appliances and to improve environmental quality by reducing acid-producing emissions threatening public health and safety, and for other purposes.

S. 1362

At the request of Mr. EVANS, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] were added as cosponsors of S. 1362, a bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide for a study of quality control standards and procedures under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program, to provide for a moratorium on the imposition of penalties for erroneous payments, and for other purposes.

S. 1640

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. EAST], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] were added as cosponsors of S. 1640, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare Program of services performed by a physician assistant.

S. 1734

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. RUDMAN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. DENTON] were added as cosponsors of S. 1734, a bill to prevent distortions in the reapportionment of the House of Representatives caused by the use of census population figures which include illegal aliens.

S. 1817

At the request of Mr. TRIBLE, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1817, a bill to suspend temporarily most-favored-nation treatment to Romania.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 202

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CHILES], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 202, a joint resolution designating November 1985 as "American Liver Foundation National Liver Awareness Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 229

At the request of Mr. NUNN, the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. GARN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 229, a joint resolution designating the week of January 13 through January 19, 1986, as "National Productivity Improvement Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 232

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], was added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 232, a joint resolution to designate October 6, 1986, through October 10, 1986, as "National Social Studies Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 236

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 236, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating April 20, through April 26, 1986, as "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 69

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the names of the Senator from California [Mr. WILSON], and the Senator from Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. TRIBLE] were added as cosponsors of Senate concurrent Resolution 69, a concurrent resolution to recognize the National Camp Fire Organization for seventy-five years of service.

SENATE RESOLUTION 260—RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING REPRESENTATION BY THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. DOLE (for himself and Mr. BYRD) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. Res. 260

Whereas, in the case of *United States v. David Allen Anderson, et al.*, Criminal No. 85-00089-L, pending in the United States

District Court for the Western District of Kentucky, the defendants have obtained subpoenas for the appearances of Senator Wendell H. Ford and Senator Mitch McConnell, as well as Blanche R. Mahoney, Carolyn Duffin, Ann Woods, and Cynthia Heckmann, employees in Senator Ford's Louisville office, and Larry E. Cox and Cynthia Paschall, employees in Senator McConnell's Louisville office;

Whereas, in the same case the United States has requested the testimony of Blanche R. Mahoney and Larry E. Cox;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate can, by the judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a) (2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§ 288b(a) and 288c(a)(2)(1982), the Senate may direct the Senate Legal Counsel to defend Senators and Senate employees in any proceeding with respect to any subpoena or order directed to them in their official capacity;

Whereas, when it appears that the testimony of an employee of the Senate is needed for use in any court for the promotion of justice, the Senate will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges and rights of the Senate: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is directed to represent Senator Ford, Senator McConnell, and their staff assistants with respect to the subpoenas to them.

Sec. 2. That Blanche R. Mahoney, Carolyn Duffin, Ann Woods, Cynthia Heckmann, Larry E. Cox, Cynthia Paschall, and any other employees of Senator Ford or Senator McConnell who may have testimony relevant to this proceeding are authorized to appear and testify in the case of *United States v. David Allen Anderson, et al.*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

AGRICULTURE, FOOD, TRADE, AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 1985

COCHRAN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1056

Mr. COCHRAN (for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. DECONCINI) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1714) to expand export markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, continue food assistance to low-income households, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 158, after line 23, insert the following new section:

EXTRA LONG STAPLE COTTON

Sec. . Section 103(h) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1444(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—
(A) in the first sentence, by striking out "50 per centum in excess of the loan level

established for each crop of Strict Low Middling one and one-sixteenth inch upland cotton (micronaire 3.5 through 4.9) at average location in the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "85 percent of the simple average price received by producers of extra long staple cotton, as determined by the Secretary, during 3 years of the 5-year period ending July 31 in the year in which the loan level is announced, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest in such period.";

(B) by striking out "November" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "December"; and

(c) by striking out in the last sentence "or within 10 days after the loan level for the related crop of upland cotton is announced, whichever is later,"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(19) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, this subsection shall not be applicable to the 1990 and subsequent crops of extra long staple cotton."

MATTINGLY AMENDMENT NO. 1057

Mr. MATTINGLY proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1714, supra; as follows:

On page 357 of the bill, strike out line 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND HOMESTEAD PROTECTION"

On page 357, line 17, strike out "Sec. 1707," and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 1707. (a)"

On page 358, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following new subsection:

"(b)(1) As used in this subsection—

"(A) The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

"(B) The term 'farm program loan' means any loan made by the Administrator under the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) for any of the purposes authorized for loans under subtitles A or B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.)

"(C) The term 'homestead property' means the principal residence and adjoining property possessed and occupied by a borrower specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(D) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(2)(A) If the Secretary forecloses a loan made or insured under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.), the Administrator forecloses a farm program loan made under the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.), or a borrower of a loan made or insured by either agency declares bankruptcy or goes into voluntary liquidation to avoid foreclosure or bankruptcy, the Secretary or Administrator must, upon application by the borrower, permit the borrower to retain possession and occupancy of any principal residence of the borrower, and no more than ten acres of adjoining land (including any farm buildings located thereon), pledged as collateral for such loan.

"(B) The total value of the homestead property may not exceed \$250,000, as determined by an independent appraisal made within six months preceding a borrower's application to retain possession and occupancy of such homestead property.

"(C) The period of occupancy of such homestead property under this subsection may not exceed five years, but in no case shall the Secretary or the Administrator grant a period of occupancy less than 3 years, subject to compliance with the provisions of paragraph (3).

"(3) To be eligible to occupy homestead property under this subsection, a borrower of a loan made or insured by the Secretary or the Administrator must—

"(A) apply for such occupancy during the three-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act;

"(B) have exhausted all other remedies for the extension or restructuring of such loan, including all remedies authorized under subsection (d) of this section;

"(C) have made gross annual farm sales of at least \$40,000 in at least 2 calendar years during the 5 year period beginning on January 1, 1981, and ending on December 31, 1985 (or equivalent crop or fiscal years);

"(D) have received from farming operations at least 60 per centum of the gross annual income of the borrower and any spouse of the borrower during at least 2 years of such 5 year period;

"(E) have occupied the homestead property and engaged in farming or ranching operations on adjoining land, or other land controlled by such borrower, during such 5 year period;

"(F) during the period of occupancy of the homestead property, pay a reasonable sum as rent for such property to the Secretary or the Administrator in an amount substantially equivalent to rents charged for similar properties in the area in which the homestead property is located;

"(G) during the period of occupancy of homestead property, maintain such property in good condition; and

"(H) agree to such other terms and conditions as are prescribed by the Secretary or the Administrator in order to facilitate the administration of this subsection.

"(4) Failure to make rental payments on the homestead property in a timely manner shall constitute cause for the termination of all rights of a borrower to "possession and occupancy of such property under this subsection;

"(5) At the end of the period of occupancy described in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Secretary or the Administrator shall grant to the borrower a first right of refusal to reacquire the homestead property on such terms and conditions (which may include payment of principal in installments) as the Secretary or the Administrator shall determine: *Provided*, That at the time any reacquisition agreement is entered into, the Secretary or the Administrator may not demand a total payment of principal that is in excess of the total value of the homestead property as established under paragraph (2)(B) of this subsection."

DURENBERGER (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1058

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DURENBERGER (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. BOSCHWITZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill S. 1714, supra; as follows:

On page 459, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following new subtitle:

Subtitle D—National Advisory Commission on Rural America

SEC. 1930. Findings and Purposes.

(a) Congress finds that:

(1) The conditions which attend the farm crisis, including the decline in farm income, farm property values, and available credit, are having serious adverse effects on rural enterprises which derive their principal support from the farm industry;

(2) These enterprises together with the farm industry that supports them are the mainstay of the rural tax base;

(3) The farm crisis foreshadows an even larger crisis in rural America—a crisis of governance;

(4) Rural communities throughout the United States which rely primarily on a single form of economic activity—agriculture, forestry, mining, manufacturing or tourism—are part of this emerging crisis;

(5) If unabated, the rural crisis will undermine the fiscal capacity of rural government and the ability to provide basic public services including education, health, housing, police, and other emergency services;

(6) The relationship between the declining rural economy and the provision of basic public services in rural communities of the United States is not well understood or documented; and

(7) An independent analysis of the nature of the relationship is required in order to determine the appropriate roles and responsibilities of all levels of government in responding to this emerging problem.

(b) The purpose of this Subtitle is to create a National Advisory Commission on Rural America to conduct a study and report to Congress and the President on conditions in rural America and relate those trends and problems to the provision of public services by Federal, State and local governments.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SEC. 1931. (a) There is established a National Advisory Commission on Rural America (hereafter in this subtitle referred to as the "Commission") to study conditions in rural areas of the United States.

(b)(1) The Commission shall be composed of 21 members appointed as follows:

(A) Three members appointed by the President, from among representatives of Federal entities, in accordance with paragraph (2)(A).

(B) Twelve members appointed by the President, from among private citizens or elected officials or employees of State or local governments, in accordance with paragraph (2)(B).

(C) Three members appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate from members of the Senate in accordance with paragraph (2)(C), on the recommendation of the majority leader or the minority leader of the Senate, as the case may be, with respect to members appointed from the political party of that leader.

(D) Three Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives in accordance with paragraph (2)(C).

(2)(A) In carrying out paragraph (1)(A), the President shall appoint three members, from among representatives of Federal entities, with an expertise in conditions in rural areas of the United States, including—

(i) the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(ii) the Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs.

(B) In carrying out paragraph (1)(B), the President shall appoint 12 members, from among private citizens or elected officials or

employees of State or local governments, with an expertise in conditions in rural areas of the United States, including—

(i) four members appointed to represent various rural interests, including—

(I) one member appointed to represent economic interests;

(II) one member appointed to represent agricultural interests;

(III) one member appointed to represent small businesses; and

(IV) one member appointed to represent employees;

(ii) two members appointed to represent rural private sector service delivery interests; and

(iii) six members appointed to represent State, local, and regional governments, including—

(I) two members appointed to represent State governments;

(II) two members appointed to represent local governments; and

(III) two members appointed to represent State-recognized consortia of local governments.

(C)(i) In carrying out subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (1), the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall give special consideration to the appointment of members of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, who are members of the committees of their respective Houses that have legislative jurisdiction over, or special concerns with respect to, matters relating to conditions in rural areas of the United States and intergovernmental relations.

(ii) Not more than two members of the Commission appointed under paragraph (1)(C) shall be members of the same political party.

(iii) Not more than two members of the Commission appointed under paragraph (1)(D) shall be members of the same political party.

(c) A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) The Commission shall elect a Chairman from among the members of the Commission.

(e) The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman or a majority of the Commission.

STUDY

SEC. 1932. (a) The Commission shall conduct a study of conditions in rural areas of the United States and the manner in which such conditions relate to trends in and problems for the provision of public services by rural governments.

(b) The study shall include an analysis of—

(1) conditions that reflect the declining rural economy, including economic and demographic trends, rural and agricultural income and debt, and other appropriate social and economic indicators of such conditions;

(2) trends and fiscal conditions of rural local governments;

(3) trends and patterns in the delivery of rural public services;

(4) the impact of the deregulation of transportation, telecommunications and banking on the rural economy and delivery of public services; and

(5) trends and patterns of Federal, State, and local government financing, delivery, and regulation of public services in rural areas of the United States.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 1933. (a) The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this subtitle, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, administer oaths, take such testimony, and receive such evidence under subpoena or otherwise, as the Commission considers appropriate.

(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), members of the Commission shall serve without any additional compensation for work performed on the Commission.

(2) Such members who are private citizens of the United States may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons serving intermittently in the Federal Government service under sections 5701 through 5707 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) Subject to the availability of funds appropriated in advance and such rules as may be adopted by the Commission and without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service or the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, the Chairman of the Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of a director and such additional staff personnel as the Commission determines are necessary to carry out the duties and functions of the Commission.

(d)(1) On the request of the Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture shall furnish to the Commission such personnel and support services as are necessary to assist the Commission in carrying out the duties and functions of the Commission.

(2) On the request of the Commission, the heads of other executive agencies and the General Accounting Office may furnish the Commission with such personnel and support services as the head of the agency or office and the Chairman of the Commission agree are necessary to assist the Commission in carrying out the duties and functions of the Commission.

(3) The Commission shall not be required to pay or reimburse an agency or office for personnel and support services provided under this section.

(e)(1) In accordance with section 12 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App. 2), the Secretary of Agriculture shall maintain records of—

(A) the disposition of any funds that may be available to the Commission; and

(B) the nature and extent of activities of the Commission.

(2) The Comptroller General of the United States shall have access to such records for purposes of audit and examination.

(f) The Commission shall be exempt from sections 7(d), 10(e), 10(f), and 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and sections 4301 through 4308 of title 5, United States Code.

REPORT

SEC. 1934. (a) Not later than 1 year after the establishment of the Commission, the Commission shall submit a report to the President and Congress containing the findings and recommendations of the Commission with respect to the matters referred to in section 1931, including—

(1) an analysis of the manner in which changes in the rural economy affect rural local governments;

(2) a description of the measures of rural distress in rural communities that result from changes in the rural economy, includ-

ing an analysis of the regional and geographical distribution of such distress and a description of trends in the severity and changing nature of rural distress;

(3) a detailed analysis and description of the extent to which distress in rural communities affect the ability of such communities to raise revenues, sustain employment, maintain infrastructure, and deliver services adequate to meet current and anticipated public needs;

(4) a description of the programs and policy instruments available to Federal, State, and local governments to address distress in rural communities;

(5) the development of a framework within which to analyze such instruments;

(6) a comparative analysis of each of the instruments that utilizes such framework;

(7) an assessment of whether and in what ways Federal and State governments can mitigate the decline in economic conditions in rural America which, if unaltered, will erode the fiscal capacity of rural governments to finance such public services; and

(8) recommendations about the appropriate role of Federal and State governments in assuring the continued provision of basic public services, including education, health, housing, police, and other emergency services.

(b) The Commission may not comment on legislative pending before Congress unless specifically requested to do so by the chairman of a committee of Congress.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 1935. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this subtitle.

(b) To the maximum extent practicable, this subtitle shall be carried out using funds otherwise available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the expenses of advisory committees.

TERMINATIONS

SEC. 1936. The authority provided under this subtitle and the Commission shall terminate 60 days after the submission of the report required under section 1933(a).

● **Mr. DURENBERGER.** Mr. President, during consideration of the farm bill, this body has debated and will continue to debate what the appropriate steps should be to address the farm crisis—a crisis I consider to be one of the most grave domestic problems facing the country today. Up to now our focus has been on the most direct issues—what's happening to farmers, their credit and their commodities. We have heard reports, read statistics, and talked prices.

Mr. President, I rise today to submit that there is a broader crisis confronting rural America. What is happening to our farmers is of great concern but it is only part of the picture.

Mr. President, there is no question that the American farmer is in trouble. We have clear tangible evidence that farms are going under, that farmers have too much debt, and that the problem will get worse before it gets better.

We can see what is happening to farmers. They are on the front lines. But behind them is an entire rural economy that is totally dependent on them. There is a whole set of business-

es and financial institutions which depend on farmers for their livelihoods.

It is these groups in combination with farmers which form the economic base that supports local community services and activities—things like building roads, delivering education, ensuring police protection, and providing fire safety. It is also these groups who are suffering with farmers as the entire farm economy fails.

To bring the problem closer to home, I took a survey of 10 counties in my home State of Minnesota. These are counties in which at least 80 percent of the total market value of land in the county is farm property. I discovered that they receive between 30 and 50 percent of their revenues from property taxes. But, the property values in those counties have dropped tremendously—and they are not alone.

According to a report from the economic research service, farm market values in Minnesota counties have plummeted 24 percent between 1984 and 1985 alone. This decline follows on the heels of the previous year's 12 percent decline.

Not only have farm market values fallen, but property tax delinquency rates have risen. In 1984, delinquency rates rose an average of 56 percent in the counties I surveyed. What is even more alarming is that these delinquency rates include farm property as well as business and residential property in rural communities.

Businesses certainly are feeling the pinch. Their profits are under attack from both sides. On one hand, sales are down as farmers cut back on their discretionary purchases. On the other hand, more and more businesses receivables are becoming uncollectable, as formerly reliable customers are unable to make their payments.

The warning signs are there. J.C. Penney announced last month that it was pulling out of Redwood Falls, MN. Nearly every other store front in Fairmont is vacant. The list goes on.

Rural population, which experienced strong gains in the late 1970's and early 1980's is once again dropping. We will have to wait until the next census to get the exact numbers, but the direction is quite clear. People are migrating out of rural areas.

So towns are losing people, businesses and revenue. What does it mean for rural communities? It means they can no longer afford to provide basic services to their residents at precisely the time their citizens are most in need of those services. They cannot build roads, provide jails or maintain schools. Those who remain must watch the Government services which have nourished the country way of life steadily erode.

Mr. President, Minnesota localities are not alone in their problems. In fact, because of a healthy economy in

Minneapolis-St. Paul and higher-than-average levels of State aid to farmers and local governments, rural communities in Minnesota are better off than many of their neighbors.

For example, in some counties in Iowa, 15 to 24 cents of every tax dollar levied last year remained uncollected as of May 1. In Lebanon, KS, the drop in population has prompted education officials to close the local school. One need only pick up the paper to read about the impact the farm crisis is having on rural communities.

Not only is the future of the family farmer on the line, but whole rural communities, local governments and businesses, and a way of life we have known and celebrated as truly American are threatened.

Mr. President, throughout our history, we have made a conscientious commitment to agriculture and to rural America. In this debate, we cannot afford the mistake of assuming that if we address the farm income situation satisfactorily, we've taken care of rural America.

The question I ask is, "What is left for Main Street?" What is left when long-time residents move away? What is left to pay for the school and hospitals roads that are an essential part of rural life? These are questions which beg for answers—answers nobody seems to have.

Mr. President, today I am submitting on behalf of myself and Senators GRASSLEY and BOSCHWITZ, an amendment which I intend to offer later this week to the pending farm bill. The amendment will establish a National Advisory Commission on Rural America. The charge to the Commission will be that they undertake a comprehensive study of the problems which have already surfaced in rural areas across this country and to call attention to emerging crisis they foreshadow. In addition the Commission will report to the President and the Congress on proposed solutions and the responsibilities of Federal, State and local government in this regard.

Mr. President, rural America has made an incalculable contribution to the greatness of this Nation. It has produced an abundance of food to be sure, but it has also produced cherished American values, which are our greatest strength. I believe we owe it to future generations to protect this national asset. I urge my colleagues to support this initiative to focus the attention of the Nation of this problem now, in the hopes that we will be better prepared to address this looming crisis when the Commission completes its work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a factsheet on the amendment be printed in the Record.

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

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON RURAL AMERICA

An amendment to the Farm bill to create a National Advisory Commission on Rural America.

The Commission would be made up of 21 members representing the Administration, Congress, state, local and regional governments, farm groups, rural businesses, providers of services and related interests.

STUDY

The Commission will conduct a study, including holding public hearings, on the conditions in rural America and relate those conditions to trends in and problems for the provisions of public services by rural governments.

Specifically, the study shall include:

The conditions which reflect the declining rural economy including but not limited to, economic and demographic trends, rural and agricultural income and debt, the commission shall compile other appropriate social and economic indicators as necessary to accurately measure and describe these trends;

Trends in and current fiscal condition of rural local governments;

Trends and patterns in the delivery of rural public services;

Impact of the deregulations of transportation, telecommunications, and banking on the rural economy and delivery of rural public services; and

Trends in and current patterns of Federal, state, and local government financing, delivering and regulation of public services in rural America.

REPORT

One year after the establishment of the Commission, the Commission shall submit a report to the President and Congress containing the findings and recommendations of the Commission as outlined above, including:

An analysis of the ways in which changes in the rural economy affect rural local governments;

An identification of the measures of rural distress which affect the rural economy;

An identification of the measure of distress in rural communities which result from changes in the rural economy, including an analysis of the regional and geographical distribution of that distress and an identification of the trends relating to the severity and changing nature of rural distress;

A detailed analysis and description of the extent to which distress in rural communities affects the abilities of those communities to raise revenues, sustain employment, maintain infrastructure and provide and deliver services adequate to meet current and anticipated public needs;

An identification of the programs and policy instruments available to Federal, state and local governments to address distress in rural communities;

An identification of a framework in which to analyze those instruments;

A comparative analysis of each of the instruments which utilizes that framework;

Assessment of whether and in what ways state and Federal government can stem the decline in economic conditions in rural America which, if unaltered, will erode the fiscal capacity of rural governments to finance these public services; and

Make recommendations about the appropriate roles for state and Federal government in assuring the continued provisions of basic public services including, but not limited to, education, health, housing, police and other emergency services and infrastructure.

ADMINISTRATION

The Commission will have the authority to hire an executive director and staff. Commissioners will serve without compensation, but shall be eligible for per diem. The Commission will expire 60 days after submitting its report. Funds to carry out the activities of the Commission are authorized.●

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Small Business Committee will hold a full committee field hearing on December 2, 1985, on the implementation of the Prompt Payment Act of 1981, Public Law 97-177. The hearing will commence at 11 a.m. and will be held at the Norfolk City Council Chamber in Norfolk, VA. For further information, please call Bill Montalto, of the committee staff at 224-5175.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public the scheduling of a public hearing before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to consider the following nominations to the Department of Energy: Donna R. Fitzpatrick to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy, Conservation and Renewable Energy, and Mary L. Walker to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy, Environment, Safety, and Health.

The hearing will take place Thursday, December 5, 1985, 10 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building in Washington, DC.

Those wishing to testify or who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, room SD-358, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please contact Gerry Hardy at (202) 224-5304.

Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public the scheduling of a public hearing before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to consider the following nominations to the Department of the Interior: Ralph W. Tarr to be Solicitor; Gerald Ralph Riso to be Assistant Secretary for Policy, Budget and Administration; and J. Steven Griles to be Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management.

The hearing will take place Wednesday, December 4, 1985, 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building in Washington, DC.

Those wishing to testify or who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, room SD-358, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please contact Nan Morrison at (202) 224-7143.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs will hold a business meeting on Tuesday, November 19, at 10 a.m. in room SD-342. Under consideration will be the following:

S. 209. The Federal Debt Recovery Act of 1985;

S. 1134. The Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1985;

H.R. 3384. The Federal Employees Benefits Improvement Act of 1985;

S. 1440. The Non-Smokers Rights Act of 1985;

S. 1047. Titles II and III of the Former Presidents Facilities and Services Reform Act of 1985; and

S. 1734. A bill to prevent distortions in the reapportionment of the House of Representatives caused by the use of census population figures which include illegal aliens.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Environmental Pollution of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, November 18, to hold a hearing on S. 740, Emergency Wetlands Resources Act.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE 67TH ANNIVERSARY OF LATVIAN DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

● Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, today Latvians of American descent will mark the 67th anniversary of Latvia's Declaration of Independence. Like most Eastern European peoples, however, Latvians today are neither independent nor free. The Soviet Union has dominated and repressed all aspects of Latvian life.

Forty-five years ago, the Soviet Union forcibly annexed the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. What followed was the implementation of a ruthless policy of Russianization designed to eradicate the Baltic languages, cultures, religions, and all aspects of national identity.

That this brutal effort continues to this day is a testament to the strength and fortitude of the Baltic peoples in resisting Soviet repression. The U.S.S.R. cannot destroy the dream of

freedom and self-determination which continues to live on in the hearts of Latvian and other Baltic peoples, a dream shared by their relatives in the United States.

As a member of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I urge my colleagues not to forget the plight of these brave people striving to obtain their basic human rights. We all hope that one day, the Latvians' dreams of political freedom can become a reality. Until then, the free nations of the world must continue to condemn the repression and brutality which these Baltic nations are suffering at the hands of the Soviet Union. ●

WILLARD R. WOOD

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, to "pull one up by one's bootstraps" is a favorite American expression to describe a self-made person. It flows from the tongue so quickly that we hardly ever pause to consider all the time and toil involved. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the hard work of one great Idahoan who "pulled himself up by his bootstraps."

At age 3 Willard R. Wood of Idaho Falls lost his father; 11 years later his mother died. He worked his way through high school and college—business administration—by washing dishes and floors.

Through hard work and wise use of his limited resources Willard Wood today is a successful restaurant and hotel businessman and a leader in his community and in the State of Idaho.

Mr. President, I commend Willard Wood to my colleagues as one who has achieved success the old-fashioned way; he earned it. I ask that the following article from the Idaho Falls Post-Register about Willard Wood be printed into the RECORD.

[From the Post-Register (Idaho Falls) Oct. 13, 1985]

50 YEARS IN RESTAURANT BUSINESS, AND GOING STRONG

(By Joe L. Marker)

Willard R. Wood, who began his restaurant career at Wood's Cafe in Jerome in 1935, and has been owner-operator of Westbank Coffee Shop and Lounge in Idaho Falls since it opened in 1963, will reach his 50th milestone in the restaurant business Tuesday.

At 75, he still is very much a part of the restaurant business.

Born in Hickory County, Mo., Wood attended school at Walnut Grove, Mo. His father, W. Coy Wood, died when Willard was 3 years old, and his mother, Sina Mallcoat Wood, died when he was 14. "So I was pretty much on my own and I worked in restaurants, washing dishes, swamping the floor, and doing some cooking while going to high school and college."

He attended Drury College at Springfield, Mo., and attended the University of Missouri at Columbia for two years.

He taught school for a couple years back in the Ozark Hills of Missouri. Then he took the advice of Horace Greeley and came west, traveling with a school principal who

was going to Twin Falls to visit some relatives.

"I didn't have much money," Wood said. "So I hustled a job as cook in three days at Speer's Coffee Shop across from the Perrine Hotel."

He worked there for about a year and a half and then went back to the University of Missouri and graduated with a bachelor's degree in business administration.

After graduation, Wood was invited by the man he used to work for in Twin Falls to come back. Wood did. That was in 1934. Wood said he liked Idaho's cool nights and enjoyed trout fishing.

He was married to Donna Bowen of Spanish Fork, Utah, in 1937. They have two sons Coy Wood, who is in partnership with his father on some of the operations; and Dr. David Wood of Salt Lake City. The Woods have four grandchildren.

Wood worked for Speers until he moved to Jerome to open the cafe on Main Street in 1935, which he sold in 1953.

Wood said he had to borrow \$50 from the Jerome National Bank for cash register change when he opened the Wood's Cafe.

During a snow storm in January 1936, the cafe stayed open from 6 a.m. to midnight and took in \$28. In contrast, Wood said he can remember that while he operated the Roadway Inn in Boise its sales receipts on one day in 1977 totalled about \$33,000.

Wood also had the contract for operating the civilian cafeteria at Mountain Home Air Force Base during World War II.

He purchased the Oregon Trail Cafe on Main Street in Burley in 1938 and sold it in 1958. In 1939, he and a partner, Brick Thompson, bought the Hotel Whitman in Pocatello, and on Dec. 1, 1941, purchased Rogers Coffee Shop in Idaho Falls. A couple of years later they disposed of both of operations.

War broke out and Wood and Thompson were 1-A and after Brick was called into the service, they decided to split up.

He bid on a contract with the Army Corps of Engineers in 1951 and was successful bidder for operating the restaurant, mess hall, trailer court, recreation hall, grocery store, service station and theater at the Glen Canyon Dam project. He operated the barracks, the recreation hall and the trailer court until 1957. He also ran the civilian cafeteria.

When Wood went to Dugway in 1950 there were practically no roads, no water and no electricity. "We were feeding about 15-20 men a day, but as the project grew, at one time we were housing and feeding 1,100 men a day. This lasted for seven years," he said.

While there, Wood was invited to help serve meals for the National Junior Chamber of Commerce convention in Las Vegas. "We served over 4,500 people," he said.

"When that large operation at Glen Canyon Dam started to go down, I knew I had to look for something else. That was when I negotiated with Ferris H. Clark in Idaho Falls for operation of the Westbank Restaurant and Lounge. That was in 1957."

In 1970, Wood went into partnership with five others and built the Burley Inn, which is now the Best Western Burley Inn, of which he is president.

Also during the 1970s, Wood and his son, Coy, held the management contract for the Holiday Inn restaurant, lounge and convention facilities in Twin Falls.

Also in 1970, Wood opened and operated the restaurant, lounge, gift shop and convention facilities at the Roadway Inn in

Boise, until 1979, when he and his wife, Donna, moved to Idaho Falls to oversee the operation here. In September 1979, Wood and his son, Coy, negotiated with Clark and leased the Westbank Motel, which they continue to operate.

Two years ago, the Westbank Convention Center underwent a \$500,000 expansion and remodeling project.

In 1978, Wood, Coy and Wally Wright, built the Hilton Inn in Pocatello, which they now operate as the Quality Inn. The lounge, convention facilities and restaurant in this operation belong to Willard Wood.

Wood has been the recipient of numerous awards for public service and dedication to the restaurant and motel industry. One of these that he prizes highly was being honored as the Restaurant Operator of the Year by the Idaho State Restaurant Association, which also accorded him a Lifetime Honorary Membership.

"I learned how to work when I was 10 years old because my mother didn't have any money to support us. Work didn't hurt me. In fact, I think it is my best asset," Wood said.

"The thing that helped me most was good, reliable employees," he said. "I never expected anyone to do any kind of work I wouldn't try to do myself. That includes mopping the floors, washing pans and dishes, cooking and cleaning."

EXPANDED CAPITAL OWNERSHIP AND THE IDEOLOGICAL HIGH GROUND

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, today I am introducing the last of the statements on expanded capital ownership, part of a series started by Representative PHILIP M. CRANE on June 4, 1985. This series, introduced by several articles by Ronald Reagan, consists of three major divisions: one on the Marxist threat to justice, one on the moral dimensions of justice as seen by Christians, Jews, and Moslems, and one on the technology of expanded capital ownership.

In order to complete the insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the technology of expanded capital ownership, some guidelines are called for to build justice in the workplaces of the world. This is necessary to make employee stock ownership a reality in its most effective form. A valuable set of guidelines is introduced today in the article by Norman G. Kurland, entitled "Practical Guidelines for Building Justice in the Workplace." I ask that it be printed in full.

The article follows:

PRACTICAL GUIDELINES FOR BUILDING JUSTICE IN THE WORKPLACE

(By Norman G. Kurland)

In terms of saving jobs and demonstrating the power of leveraged ESOP financing, the story of South Bend Lathe remains a landmark. South Bend Lathe was the world's first 100% employee-owned company that was purchased by 100% of its employees on a 100% capital credit, no-down-payment loan. It showed how a dying company could be transformed into a dynamic success. The company has been profitable since 1975 when its 500 workers adopted their ESOP.

This model, however, also shows what can go wrong as long as management and workers cling to "wage system" thinking. In August 1980, the world was shocked to hear that union members had gone on strike against top management who controlled the voting power of the company.

What critics of this case have generally failed to recognize was that South Bend Lathe had the first ESOP in a large closely-held corporation which passed through the vote to all employees on the shares they earned. Yet, without objection from the United Steelworkers (either at the inception of the ESOP or during the strike), management assumed power over the control block of still-unearned shares in the ESOP. The union's failure to negotiate ownership issues was the hidden cause of the strike which erupted in 1980. Thus, South Bend Lathe also became a classic case of how worker ownership can generate new expectations and create a whole new set of problems for management, workers and labor unions.

Many critics have focused exclusively on the labor-management problems at South Bend Lathe. What they have downplayed or misunderstood is that South Bend Lathe proved the fundamental importance of capital credit, even under a "worst-case" example, for converting workers into owners. Despite its flaws, this "basket-case" company proved that even diluted ownership opportunities can save jobs, which, in the short-run, are more critical to workers' income security than participation through the vote.

But South Bend Lathe also demonstrated that a taste of justice only whets the appetite for more. In the long-run, management and the union in an ESOP company can ignore the ownership participation rights of worker-shareholders only at the expense of the company and everyone with a stake in its success.

For those of us searching for successful approaches for building more productive and people-oriented workplaces, the South Bend Lathe experience offers some valuable lessons:

Crisis may present opportunity. What appears to be a hopeless situation, may allow for a radical restructuring of a failing company within a more competitive ownership participation framework. Companies undergoing "Chapter XI" reorganizations may be prime candidates for a "new labor deal." This would "trade off" increases in fixed wage and pension costs for flexible but more unlimited ownership benefits linked to productivity and profits. A crisis situation may also provide workers greater leverage in helping to design the ESOP's ownership participation system.

Financing follows feasibility. If a company has a technically feasible strategy and an economically viable operation, leveraged financing can generally be obtained, even at today's outrageously high interest rates. Many people cannot find sufficient funding simply because they have not put together a package that can convince a lender that the loan can be repaid. As the South Bend Lathe experience suggests, four crucial elements should be present in any ESOP financing strategy:

(1) A management/entrepreneurial term capable of competing in the global marketplace and commanding respect from the banking community, organized labor, and suppliers and customers;

(2) A detailed feasibility study of the company and prospects for the future;

(3) A willingness on the part of organized labor to adopt an innovative productivity-

oriented labor contract, based on sharing the ownership risks and future gains from the "ownership system" while holding the line on inflationary or non-productive "wage system" gains; and

(4) Access to sufficient capital credit, at reasonable interest rates to meet up to 100 percent of the capitalization needs of the company as an independent operating unit.

Where you are forced to restructure a closely-held company, re-examine its existing pension plan. Most healthy companies keep their pension plans when they adopt an ESOP. In an emergency situation, however, consider trading in the "security" of job-destroying pension promises for the opportunities of growing co-ownership. Under the conventional "defined benefit" pension plan, the company becomes locked into a fixed and increasing liability, even when company profits and pension plan assets are shrinking. This may cause a potentially fatal cash drain from the company, none of which can be used to meet the company's own growth and modernization needs.

Many progressive companies have begun to shift away from the rigid and often uncontrollable old-style pension plans, to the more flexible "defined contribution" employee benefit plans like ESOPs and profit sharing plans. A "defined contribution" type of retirement plan might conceivably provide greater job security, while linking workers more realistically to the productivity and profits of their company. Workers could thus begin to control their own destinies, rather than be left vulnerable to expensive pension overhead and the whims of Wall Street speculators, large institutional investors and money managers.

Before designing the ownership and participatory machinery for a worker-owned company, there should be an understanding of and commitment to a basic set of core values and fundamental ownership rights, by all parties who will be involved—including legal and other professional consultants, top and middle management, workers and all levels of their bargaining units. Obviously, in a desperate situation such as in South Bend Lathe, survival is the first order of business. There may not be time to get complete consensus. But effective employee ownership participation will ultimately rest upon the careful structuring of principles which everyone perceives as fair. Since "rule by the majority" does not always insure justice, these fundamental ownership rights must be considered sacred and inalienable, and cannot be taken from an individual by the will of the majority.

While there are more immediate ways to motivate people on a material and emotional level, the most lasting way to reach them is through their minds. The process of educating workers to the ethics and mechanics of the ownership system, while difficult and slow, should be set into motion from the very first meeting, even in the tiniest of doses. The sooner all employees understand the superior logic and justice of the ownership system, and recognize their personal stake in it, the sooner the company will harness the fullest creative potential of each member of its team.

Negotiators should try to develop an ideal ownership blueprint from which to work. Bargain for the ideal. But be prepared to compromise if some of the elements are initially rejected. Keep the blueprint in a drawer to go back to for future reference, planning and bargaining.

To reinforce the gradual building of "ownership consciousness," the ESOP should

always be supplemented with frequent economic feedback in the form of cash productivity bonuses linked to a formula based on profits. Once-a-year ESOP statements are insufficient for communicating ownership. A more effective ownership sharing program can be found at Allied Plywood Corporation of Alexandria, Virginia, where the average employee often earns three times more of ownership than what he earns from wages. A truck driver earning a modest base salary of \$8,000 may earn an additional \$24,000 from monthly and annually-determined cash productivity bonuses and ESOP distributions. While providing an objective measure of company, team and individual performance on a monthly, quarterly and yearly basis, this feedback merges each worker's self-interest with the common good of the company.

Develop a just wage differential between the highest- and lowest-paid employee. In the Sony Corporation, for example, a chief executive officer's income is only 6 to 7 times that of a newly hired college graduate. When integrated with formula-based productivity bonuses, everyone's rewards rise and fall together. In some top-heavy American companies, where top corporate salaries run over \$1 million annually and only executives enjoy productivity bonuses and ownership opportunities, that ratio can exceed 50 to 1. (The Washington Post, April 12, 1983, p.G1.) Too wide a gap between the highest-paid and lowest-paid employees creates an unbridgeable barrier which divides rather than unites the members of a company. Some smaller ESOP companies operate with a 3:1 differential, with modest fixed wages supplemented with more flexible ownership gains in the same ratio.

Provide greater job security by maximizing rewards based on ownership sharing for every member of the corporate team. Fixed labor costs (or at least future increases) should be set at levels to insure survival of jobs under hardship conditions, with everyone receiving regular cash bonuses during normal conditions based on an agreed-upon gain sharing formula. In times of economic crisis, reduce hiring levels by attrition and avoid layoffs by across-the-board "hardship sharing," cuts in base compensation and work-sharing. Offer relocation assistance, compensatory ownership benefits, and sufficient severance payments to help those unable or unwilling to share in the burdens of corporate "belt-tightening."

Make sure there is a structure for following-up and continuing the dialogue on ownership issues. Unions or worker's organizations should insure that workers have continued access to and assistance from top-flight professional and legal consultants. However, to add to the dignity of ownership participation, like involvement in the political process, ownership meetings and discussions should be voluntary and generally held after working hours.

Clearly define the expanding role of the union within the new ownership framework. Where there is a union or a workers' organization involved, it should not wait for management to take the initiative for designing and overseeing any ownership participation strategies. When the initiative comes from the bottom-up, rather than from the top-down, the ESOP generally will be qualitatively better in its design and operation. The union should assume the responsibility to negotiate with management on the ownership incentive systems, participatory and self-management machinery, accountability systems, voting rights, allocation rights,

vesting schedules, mutual assessments systems, etc. While protecting the basic wage rights and working conditions of each worker, the union in an employee-owned company should also begin promoting and protecting its members' ownership interests. Union advocacy is vital in resolving such crucial issues as workers' voting rights on unallocated stock in a leveraged ESOP situation. To avoid weakening its specialized institutional role, and to avoid the danger of monopolizing power, the union should:

(1) Avoid any role in hiring and firing management. Instead the union should insure that its members, through their vote for board directors, can participate in the process of hiring and firing management;

(2) Avoid taking on a managerial role. Instead the union should encourage decentralized decision-making within all operational levels of a company;

(3) Avoid voting as a bloc (as in Pan Am) where the votes of dissenting individuals are not counted. Rather, the union should insure that each of its members has a vote, educate its members as to the rights and responsibilities of ownership, make sure that workers have access to vital financial information entitled to any shareholder, and trust that informed worker-owners will apply common sense in assessing the best alternatives.

Begin linking union revenues to the expanding ownership pie. The traditional checkoff on wage system benefits sends out all the wrong signals. The wage checkoff contradicts the union's interest in holding the line against inflationary increases in fixed labor costs. And it signals the union's reluctance toward enabling workers to gain significant private property ownership of corporate equity. To realize its own stake in the growth pie of expanding ownership, the union should explore ways to expand its checkoff system to cover new capital formation, and the worker's growing stake in cash bonuses, dividends and company stock. Potentially, a checkoff on ownership system benefits offers the union a much bigger revenue pie than the counterproductive checkoff on wage system benefits.

Determine management's "new" role vis-a-vis the employee-owners. Managers, to be effective in an employee-owned company, must begin to think more like teachers than bosses. They have to abandon "rule by the whip" methods and become genuine leaders who command the support of their co-workers by setting examples of excellence. And by sharing some of the "headaches" as well as the rewards of ownership, management can be freed of daily detail work, in order to concentrate on corporate strategy, research and development.

Balance continuity and efficiency of the firm with justice and accountability for the workers. Developing checks-and-balances is easier said than done. But the principle is clear enough. While professional managers are vital and must be free to make day-to-day operational decisions, they should not expect to be accountable only to themselves. They must be willing to make full disclosures and be accountable to a board of directors elected by the employees themselves. To achieve a reasonable degree of continuity and security for top executives, board directors should serve on a staggered-term basis and top executives should protect themselves with carefully-drafted long-term employment contracts.

To sustain the union's effectiveness as a tool for protecting the rights of individual workers against arbitrary management or

even majority actions, and to minimize possible conflicts-of-interest, try to maintain a "wall of separation" between the institutional roles of management and the union.

Deal with the one-person, one-vote vs. the one-share, one-vote issue, but realize that the issue of "control" in an ownership framework can become very complex. Discuss the pros and cons and comparative democratic impact of both alternatives. In a small company, direct or "democratic" participation in policy and daily operational decision-making may be appropriate. And it makes good sense from a management and motivational standpoint to allow each person a meaningful degree of control over his or her immediate area of responsibility. In a corporation with thousands of employees, however, constant voting by all company members on all management decisions would become unwieldy. A corporate "republic" demands a new type of corporate "constitution," so that the major functional branches of corporate government can serve as a check on one another, while remaining responsive to the immediate and long-term interests of the new worker-stockholders.

Develop strategies and programs for helping workers to adapt to and welcome new technology and the "Age of the Robot." Provide a special stock and profit sharing pool and job retraining programs for technologically displaced workers. Diversify the company's products and services to afford more job security and career transfers among employees. Begin redefining the concepts of "work" and "the workplace" in the context of the expanding ownership system. Create systems for encouraging individual creativity, initiative and responsibility within the framework of a self-sustaining, more humanistic and mutually profitable business organization. Combining efficiency with justice is a never ending challenge.

CONCLUSION

People want justice. Around the world, workers are demanding livable wages and greater participation in decision-making. However, these demands alone are insufficient and merely mask the fundamental injustice of the wage system. And alone, they fail to add constituents for an expanding system of private property ownership, the basis of a more just, global free enterprise system, which in turn is the economic foundation for world-wide political democracy. Since power and property go hand-in-hand, "participation" can only be short-lived among people without effective, personal access to property. Participation without power is a cruel hoax.

Perhaps the meaning of ownership may not become clear to a worker until he perceives he has some property of his own to lose. But once that threshold is reached, only force can keep that worker from exercising his full rights as an owner. The human right of access to property must therefore precede participation, not as an ultimate goal but as an essential foundation for effective participation. Without this foundation, economic justice will remain an empty dream. Unless we begin connecting workers to property and power, we can only deal with the symptoms, not the causes, of economic injustice in the world. This is the most important lesson we can learn from South Bend Lathe.●

THE FARM CREDIT PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1985

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the Farm Credit Partnership Act of 1985. This legislation is a good starting point for the debate on Federal assistance to the farm credit system. The bill targets aid to the American farmer, not to the professional managers of the system or the bondholders.

Unlike some of the other proposals which have been suggested, this legislation will help farmers first and then the benefits will spread to the rest of the farm economy. The benefits trickle up rather than down. A farmer's need for financial assistance determines where the government aid goes, no matter who that farmer's lender is.

The legislation calls for a partnership between the Federal Government and State governments to reduce interest rates and loan principal for eligible farmers. It is geared toward full-time family farmers who need a chance to work out of their problems.

The Farm Credit Partnership Act requires the farm credit system to pool its reserves before going to the Treasury for assistance. This requirement is entirely proper, but I think that the legislation should include additional reforms in the management and structure of the farm credit system.

Our first priority must be to ensure that the system does not go ahead with its plans for a wave of foreclosures and liquidations in the Omaha district. These unfair and devastating policies were described at a field hearing I held in September. If these policies are enacted the entire farm economy will be jeopardized. One of the strong points of the Farm Credit Partnership Act is that the Government aid is conditioned on the lenders working with their borrowers to restructure loans rather than foreclosing.

Control of the system must remain in the hands of the farmer/stockholders. The system was established by Congress to be owned and operated by farmers. Today it appears to be controlled by professional managers more interested in preserving their jobs. This must be corrected.

The farm credit system must be supervised by a tough regulatory agency with a board of directors that is totally separate from the system. In this way, local control can be maintained while ensuring the financial safety and soundness of the system. The cozy relationship which exists today between the Farm Credit Administration and the system bears part of the blame for the current financial distress in the system.

As we debate these complicated issues, we must keep in mind that the mission of the farm credit system is to serve the family farmer. If the system strays from that mission, there is no

point in saving it. We should reaffirm the original mission of the system and make clear the congressional intent that the system exists to lend to agriculture.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to craft a constructive solution to the financial crisis in the farm credit system and I would urge that we move forward as quickly as possible.●

ADVANCE NOTIFICATION— PROPOSED ARMS SALES

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive advance notification of proposed arms sales under that act in excess of \$50 million or, in the case of major defense equipment as defined in the act, those in excess of \$14 million. Upon receipt of such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Pursuant to an informal understanding, the Department of Defense has agreed to provide the committee with a preliminary notification 20 days before transmittal of the official notification. The official notification will be printed in the RECORD in accordance with previous practice.

I wish to inform Members of the Senate that 2 such notifications have been received.

Interested Senators may inquire as to the details of these advance notifications at the office of the Committee on Foreign Relations, room SD-423.

The notifications follow:

DEFENSE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, November 15, 1985.

DR. M. GRAEME BANNERMAN,
Deputy Staff Director, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR DR. BANNERMAN: By letter dated 18 February 1976, the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, indicated that you would be advised of possible transmittals to Congress of information as required by Section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act. At the instruction of the Department of State, I wish to provide the following advance notification.

The Department of State is considering an offer to a Southeast Asian country for major defense equipment tentatively estimated to cost \$14 million or more.

Sincerely,

PHILIP C GAST,
Director.

DEFENSE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, November 15, 1985.

DR. M. GRAEME BANNERMAN,
Deputy Staff Director, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR DR. BANNERMAN: By letter dated 18 February 1976, the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, indicated that you would be advised of possible transmittals to Congress of information as required by Sec-

tion 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act. At the instruction of the Department of State, I wish to provide the following advance notification.

The Department of State is considering an offer to a Northeast Asian country for major defense equipment tentatively estimated to cost \$50 million or more.

Sincerely,

PHILIP C GAST,
Director.

PROPOSED ARMS SALES

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive advance notification of proposed arms sales under that act in excess of \$50 million or, in the case of major defense equipment as defined in the act, those in excess of \$14 million. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that such information is immediately available to the full Senate, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point the notification which has been received. The classified annex referred to in the covering letter is available to Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

The notification follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, November 15, 1985.

In reply refer to: I-03483/85ct.

HON. RICHARD C. LUGAR,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 86-10 and under separate cover the classified annex thereto. This Transmittal concerns the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer to Bahrain for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$90 million. Shortly after this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to notify the news media of the unclassified portion of this Transmittal.

Sincerely,

PHILIP C. GAST,
Director.

[Transmittal No. 86-10]

NOTICE OF PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF LETTER OF
OFFER PURSUANT TO SECTION 36(b)(1) OF
THE ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT

(i) Prospective purchaser: Bahrain.
(ii) Total estimated value:

	Million
Major defense equipment ¹	\$65
Other	25
Total	90

¹ As defined in section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

(iii) Description of articles or services offered: Fifty-four M60A3 Tanks, concurrent spare parts, related communications equip-

ment, special tools, major assemblies, ammunition, and training.

(iv) Military department: Army (JDQ, JDZ, UAV, UAX, OAM, OAN, and OAO).

(v) Sales commission, fee, etc., paid, offered, or agreed to be paid: None.

(vi) Sensitivity of technology contained in the defense articles or defense services proposed to be sold: See annex under separate cover.

(vii) Section 28 report: Included in report for quarter ending June 30, 1985.

(viii) Date report delivered to Congress: November 15, 1985.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

BAHRAIN—M60A3 TANKS

The Government of Bahrain (GOB) has requested the purchase of fifty-four M60A3 Tanks, concurrent spare parts, related communications equipment, special tools, major assemblies, ammunition, and training. The estimated cost is \$90 million.

This sale is consistent with the U.S. policy of assisting other nations to provide for their own defense and security by the transfer of reasonable amounts and types of military equipment. Bahrain is a member of the recently created Gulf Cooperation Council and seeks a modest defense establishment within this context. A moderate voice in the region, Bahrain is a long-time friend of the United States and allows the U.S. Navy access to facilities in the country.

The Government of Bahrain plans to use these tanks for force modernization. This sale would provide the GOB with a modern armor capability which could serve the Gulf Cooperation Council as well as enhance Bahrain self-defense capabilities. Bahrain is capable of absorbing these tanks into its defense establishment on a phased schedule with an initial delivery of up to 35 tanks and upon absorption of these a subsequent delivery of 19 more. This will result in a marked improvement in its land defense capabilities.

The sale of this equipment and support will not affect the basic military balance in the region.

Implementation of this sale will not require the assignment of any contractor representatives; however, additional U.S. Government personnel will be required in Bahrain as follows: 21 personnel for 2 weeks, 26 personnel for 6 months and 3 U.S. Government personnel for 2 years.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as result of this sale.●

YESHIVA UNIVERSITY

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I take great pleasure in rising today to call the attention of my colleagues to the well-established excellence of Yeshiva University in the State of New York. Since 1886, Yeshiva has been on outstanding center for learning, crafting some of the finest minds our State—and the world—has to offer.

Under the guidance of Dr. Lamm, chancellor of Yeshiva University, this school has steered the course for the American Jewish community of this Nation—a course which has brought together the various segments of American Jewry to realize their leadership potential. Through Yeshiva University, the American Jewish community has accomplished much, but as

Dr. Lamm articulates in an address in celebration of Yeshiva's Centennial Year, American Jewry's theme song of old has been changed.

Mr. President, the last 100 years of our Nation has been filled with Jewish contributions, but this is only the tip of the iceberg. I therefore ask that Dr. Lamm's statement be printed in its entirety in the *RECORD* at the conclusion of my remarks so we may all bear witness to Yeshiva University's commitment to the next 100 years.

The statement follows:

AMERICAN JEWRY—THE NEXT 100 YEARS
(By Dr. Norman Lamm, President, Yeshiva University)

I am not a great believer in celebrating birthdays. Birthdays are anniversaries of birth, a passive act which signifies only potential and not achievement. One has no right to boast of his potential; that is natural and God-given. Hence, birthdays as such are insignificant. Why, then, am I so eager and hopeful about Yeshiva University's 100th birthday, its Centennial Year? Because far more than an opportunity for nostalgic reflection on the past, it can and must have a powerful and meaningful impact upon the present and the future.

I discern three major purposes for our Centennial Year observances.

First: Yeshiva University is, and ought to be appreciated as, a microcosm or paradigm of 100 years of American Jewish history. Our founding in 1886 took place during the first great wave of Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe to the United States. What this Jewish immigration has accomplished in the course of a century is truly mind-boggling. And this century of American Jewish history is symbolized by Yeshiva University. Together and coequally, we have experienced growth, influence, crisis, challenges, and opportunities. We have gone from an immigrant to an in-status.

How symbolically appropriate it is that Yeshiva University's Centennial come about at the same time, and is indeed tied in with, last year's Centennial celebration of Ellis Island, and this coming year's 100th birthday of the Statue of Liberty. Yeshiva University bridges the two: From New York as the harbor that received the bedraggled but hopeful immigrants from the shtetls and ghettos of Russia and Poland, to the unlimited opportunity in this land of liberty, cultural pluralism, democracy, and unparalleled hospitality.

This projection of Yeshiva as the symbol of a century of American Jewish history thus allows us to do two things: a) We thereby enhance as well as commemorate American Jewry vis-a-vis America in general. It is a fine way of telling the story of American Jewry in a manner that will make it palatable and inspiring to all of America. b) It positions Yeshiva University as a focus and fulcrum in the American Jewish community. For too long have we been overlooked as playing a major role in the destiny of American Jewry. The community has been so involved in fundraising and overseas crises, that no one has bothered to ask where the future enlightened and educated Jewish leadership of this country is going to come from, which institution can bridge the gap between the various centrifugal segments of American Jewry, and which institution has proven the capacity for the cultural, religious, and educational continuity of the Jewish people.

Included in this rubric is the role of American Jewry in the founding and support of the State of Israel. Clearly, Yeshiva here plays a preeminent role. Our students were amongst the first to fall in battle during the Israel War of Independence. At a time of diminished aliyah, we last year sent some 300-350 students to study in Israel. Most of our students spend at least a year in Israel. Some 1,500 of our undergraduate alumni have made aliyah, and settle in Israel with their families.

The second purpose of our commemoration is to reorient Yeshiva University to the second century of its existence. I divide this opportunity for reflection as to ultimate ends into two parts: That which we share with all American Jewry, and that which is germane only to us.

Along with all other American Jews, we of Yeshiva University must realize at this occasion that the theme song of both the American Jewish community and Yeshiva University can no longer be survival. First, survival for the sake of survival is simply inadequate. It is nothing more than the spelling out of animal instinct: the blind, imminent drive towards continuity for the sake of continuity. Cockroaches too reproduce in order to survive. Humans must do more. So, unless an institution or a community has a higher, transcendent goal, its survival should be of interest to no one.

Similarly, our goal must not be mere acceptance by the wider society. We American Jews have already been accepted, and the degree to which we are not yet accepted should be of no concern to us. The constant drive to break into new levels of the general society is really an affront to our own dignity as human beings and as Jews.

The theme of our efforts henceforth must be creative growth, new horizons, and the fulfillment of our own innate potential.

That holds true both for American Jewry and for Yeshiva University.

With a full heart we offer our thanks to the Almighty for having survived our first century, including especially some perilous crises, the last one no more than three or four years ago. Moreover, we have achieved acceptability and recognition. Now we must undertake the creative growth of which I spoke, and apply it to our University as such. In this sense, Yeshiva University can play a leadership role for American Jewry. For both of us, it means an unabashed but totally non-parochial pursuit of the Jewish dimension of our existence. We must unself-consciously focus on enhancing our Jewishness not in order to exclude others; but in order to draw the strength and the power to generate inspiration and teaching for others.

The second aspect of this reorientation applies exclusively to Yeshiva itself. For us, it means the opportunity and, indeed, the obligation to seek new definitions of the missions of our individual parts.

For instance, some of our schools have recently done just that. Ferkauf Graduate School of Psychology has found its soul in turning largely into a school of professional psychology. Wurzweller School of Social Work now has located its mission largely, although not exclusively, in preparing social workers for service in the Jewish community. The David J. Azrieli Graduate Institute of Jewish Education and Administration has for the last couple of years been working strenuously in preparing supervisors, principals, and administrators for Jewish schools.

Similarly, the Albert Einstein College of Medicine is groping for the proper focus for

its enormous vitality and intellectual energy. It began by successfully meeting an overwhelming societal challenge: discrimination against Jewish students and Jewish faculty members. By the very act of founding the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, that numerous clausus which kept so many of the best and brightest of our people out of medical schools, was broken. But that is only a part, albeit a magnificent part, of Albert Einstein College of Medicine's story. History alone cannot sustain us. The future cannot be a replay of the past, and we cannot rest on faded laurels. So, Albert Einstein College of Medicine is now dedicating its efforts at becoming an even greater center of medical research, even more than a great school of medical education. And it is seeking out certain areas and disciplines where its pre-eminence will be unchallenged.

The Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law is now engaged in a heroic effort to be a model to other law schools in showing how a young school, without any kind of significant endowment, can establish its own identity and seek its own destiny and survive the mindless swings of career fashions that make one profession too popular one year and inadequately respected the other.

Our undergraduate schools have but recently adopted a new and open attitude towards accounting, economics, and the world of business. I expect that in the near future the Board of Trustees, in consultation with its Academic Affairs Committee, will have some important announcement to make.

Our affiliated Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary has in recent years added three Kollelim, or post-graduate institutes, each of which is singular; and together they spell out a new dimension of commitment to scholarship and responsiveness to a changing community.

All our units, and the University as a whole, must be able to respond to new conditions with maleability and mobility. We live in a society where changes that used to take a hundred years can now occur in ten or fifteen years. Under conditions, rigidity is deadly, and flexibility an absolute necessity.

Finally, there is the "bottom line." We are a University that has made a tremendous contribution to this past century. The pity of it is that our contribution could have been ten-fold if only we had had the resources for it. We must determine that, as we face the second century, our administrative and academic leadership will not have to be so preoccupied with the daily struggle for fiscal survival that there is little intellectual stamina left for the profound thinking and intellectual reflection necessary for developing the educational norms and means for a new generation. The Centennial Year gives us a golden opportunity to increase our endowment, establish new chairs, fund new programs, create additional scholarships, and thereby release the enormous vitality, energy, and drive that we possess in order to conquer new horizons.●

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to express my praise for the struggle for self-determination by the people of Latvia and to express my continued indignation over the Soviet Government's relentless subjugation, oppression, and Russification of the Latvian people. My desire for Latvian

autonomy runs deep, and our Nation's recognition of their independence from foreign rule extends as far back as November 18, 1918: the day of national independence for Latvia. On that day, with the collapse of Germany, Latvian leaders were able to proclaim an independent Latvian Government in Riga.

The age-old Latvian struggle for an independent nation continues today as it has since the late 1800's. However, the roots of foreign intrusion extend deep into the early Middle Ages, when Viking marauders first penetrated Latvia for commercial use of their rivers—which are the envy of Latvia's neighbors to this day.

During the mid- to late-1100's, Latvia's closely knit tribal kingdoms, which comprised their ruling system at that time, were unable to repel the colonization of the north German merchants, who played off one Latvian tribe against another, securing territory and trade routes for years to follow. These merchants were replaced by Christian zealots from the Holy Roman Empire who were hungry for converts.

Subsequently, the bishop of Livonia, with papal consent, established the Knights of the Sword to consolidate the German domination which lasted for three centuries. In 1561, Latvia passed under Polish rule, and 8 years later, the Swedes took control in the south until 1721, when they ceded it to the Russians in the Treaty of Nystad. Russia gained complete control over the rest of Latvia through the many succeeding partitions of Poland. It was under Russian rule, however, that a steady growth in the national consciousness of the Latvian people began to emerge.

In 1868, the Riga Latvian Association was established. It soon became the fountainhead of a cultural renaissance. Thus, when the Russians adopted a russification policy for Latvia in the late 1880's, the people of Latvia responded with a determined assertion of their own national identity.

After the Russian Revolution, a Latvian National Political Conference passed a resolution which expressed Latvia's right for complete autonomy within the Republic of Russia. Soon thereafter, Germany overran Latvia, but could not overrun the Latvian spirit for self-determination. Germany and the newly formed Communist Government in Russia were negotiating for peace at Brest-Litovsk, but the Latvians did not believe these usurpers had standing to determine their fate. Thus, on November 18, 1918, with the collapse of Germany, the Latvian Government proclaimed its independence.

In the aftermath of World War I, many conflicting interests were at work within Latvian territory; namely,

the existence of foreign troops which were jockeying for position to remain indefinitely. Both the Soviets and Germany wanted to retain political, if not military, control over this Baltic region. With the aid of their northern neighbor, however, the combined Estonian-Latvian forces were able to defeat the last of the German forces in an effort to gain Baltic freedom.

On August 11, 1920, the Soviet Union signed a peace treaty with Latvia. Designed as it was only to pacify Latvian opposition to Soviet intrusion, the words of that treaty had no more meaning to the Soviet Government than does their more recent signature to the Helsinki accords. Article 2 of the Latvian-Soviet treaty stated:

The Soviet Union recognizes without preservation the independence, autonomy and sovereignty of Latvia and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights over the Latvian people and territory.

During the 20 years that followed World War I, the embryonic republic quickly developed into a strong agrarian country. Cultural life blossomed, and its system of education made tremendous strides. Politically, minorities were guaranteed cultural and political rights.

Latvians had achieved their dreams. Through years of foreign intrusions, through years of being caught up in the games of conquest played by their more powerful neighbors—Latvia's dream for autonomy and independence came to fruition. Joining the League of Nations, Latvia sought nothing but peace, for itself and for the world.

Mr. President, the events that unfolded on June 17, 1940, stand as a shock to the world. Clearly against reason and written promise, and without provocation, the Red Army of the Soviet Union invaded Latvia. Leading citizens of Latvia were tortured and murdered and 40,000 Latvians of all social classes were carted off to Siberia.

Since that day, the Soviet Union has embarked upon an intense, aggressive policy of Russifying Latvia, its politics, and its industry. Situated north and south of Latvia, both Estonia and Lithuania have suffered a similar fate. The extent to which the Soviet Union has attempted to extinguish the Latvian heritage and spirit has reached genocidal proportions.

The Soviet Union has directed an attack against the Latvian language, businesses, government agencies, and educational institutions. They even have formulated a plan to demographically limit the population density of the Latvian people within the cities through a special distribution of apartments. According to census taken in 1979, the proportion of Latvians in

the population of 2,521,000 was a mere 53.7 percent. In Riga, the capital city of Latvia, the percentage of Latvians sank to 38.5 percent through the immigration of Russians and other Slavs. As with other non-Russian republics, the Soviet Union is seeking to replace the cultural and social identity, indeed the national consciousness, of the Latvian people to enhance Soviet control.

As we have seen throughout history, however, the struggle for self-determination of the peoples of Latvia will continue. The United States will now, and always, recognize the independence of Latvia, just as Latvians themselves observe this 67th anniversary of their national holiday today. Let us, as a nation in love with liberty and freedom, continue our praise for the undying, stalwart spirit for self-determination that has, and will always, characterize our Latvian friends.

Thank you, Mr. President. ●

WEEKLY BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

● Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate, and ask to be printed in the RECORD, the budget scorekeeping report for the week of November 11, 1985, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office in response to section 5 of the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1986. This report also serves as the scorekeeping report for the purposes of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act.

The report follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, November 18, 1985.
Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report shows the effects of Congressional action on the budget for fiscal year 1986. The estimated totals of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are compared to the appropriate or recommended levels contained in the most recent budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 32. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32 and is current through November 15, 1985. The report is submitted under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311(b) of the Congressional Budget Act.

Since my last report the Congress has cleared for the President's signature the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill (H.R. 3038) and the Temporary Debt Limit Increase (H.R. 3721), and the President has vetoed the Treasury-Postal Service Appropriations Bill for 1986 (H.R. 3036), changing budget authority, outlay, and revenue estimates.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

RUDOLPH G. PENNER.

CBO WEEKLY SCOREKEEPING REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE,
99TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, AS OF NOVEMBER 15, 1985

(Fiscal Year 1986—In billions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues	Debt subject to limit
Current level ¹	1,069.0	982.5	793.1	1,861.0
Budget resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 32	1,069.7	967.6	795.7	² 2,078.7
Current level is:				
Over Resolution by		14.9		
Under Resolution by	7		2.6	217.7

¹ The current level represents the estimated revenue and direct spending effects (budget authority and outlays) of all legislation that Congress has enacted in this or previous sessions or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, estimates are included of the direct spending effects for all entitlements or other programs requiring annual appropriations under current law even though the appropriations have not been made. The current level excludes the revenue and direct spending effects of legislation that is in earlier stages of completion, such as reported from a Senate committee or passed by the Senate. Thus, savings from reconciliation action assumed in Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 will not be included until Congress sends the legislation to the President for his approval. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest U.S. Treasury information on public debt transactions.

² The current statutory debt limit is \$1,903.8 billion.

FISCAL YEAR 1986 SUPPORTING DETAILS FOR CBO WEEKLY
SCOREKEEPING REPORT, U.S. SENATE, 99TH CONGRESS,
1ST SESSION, AS OF NOVEMBER 15, 1985

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
I. Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues			792,800
Permanent appropriations and trust funds	717,617	631,009	
Other appropriations		185,348	
Offsetting receipts	-162,006	-162,006	
Total enacted in previous sessions	555,610	654,351	792,800
II. Enacted this session:			
Famine relief and recovery in Africa (Public Law 99-10)		421	
Federal supplemental compensation phaseout (Public Law 99-15)			10
Appropriations for the MX missile (Public Law 99-18)		368	
Contemporaneous recordkeeping repeal bill (Public Law 99-44)			13
United States-Israel Free Trade Act (Public Law 99-47)			-8
Statue of Liberty—Ellis Island Coin Act (Public Law 99-61)	-15	31	
International Security and Development Cooperation Act (Public Law 99-83)	-25	-25	
Supplemental appropriations bill (Public Law 99-86)	36	3,138	
State Department authorization (Public Law 99-93)			2
Emergency Extension Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-107)	-49	-230	210
Simplification of imputed interest rules (Public Law 99-121)			-31
Health professions educational assistance (Public Law 99-129)		-8	
Amendments-Special Defense Acquisition Fund (Public Law 99-139)	100		
Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145)	280	-5	
Energy and water appropriations, 1986 (Public Law 99-141)	15,252	8,245	
Legislative branch appropriations, 1986 (Public Law 99-151)	1,599	1,385	
Total enacted this session	17,178	13,320	195
III. Continuing resolution authority:			
Continuing appropriations, 1986 (Public Law 99-154)	463,542	303,400	
Offsetting receipts	-23,808	-23,808	

FISCAL YEAR 1986 SUPPORTING DETAILS FOR CBO WEEKLY
SCOREKEEPING REPORT, U.S. SENATE, 99TH CONGRESS,
1ST SESSION, AS OF NOVEMBER 15, 1985—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Total continuing resolution authority		439,734	279,592
IV. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses:			
Temporary debt limit increase (H.R. 3721)		-34	-156
HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations, 1986 (H.R. 3038)	56,909	36,247	
Offsetting receipts	-4,185	-4,185	
Total conference agreements	52,690	31,906	140
V. Entitlement authority and other mandatory items requiring further appropriation action:			
Payment to the CIA retirement fund	10	10	
Claims, defense	7	3	
Payment to the foreign service retirement trust fund ¹	(7)	(7)	
Range improvements	1		
BLM: Miscellaneous trust fund	(²)		
Payment to air carriers, DOT	18	17	
Retired pay—Coast Guard	21	19	
Maritime, operating-differential subsidies		3	
BIA: Miscellaneous trust funds	(²)	(²)	
Higher education facilities loans and insurance	4		
Retirement pay for PHS officers	12	6	
Medicaid	1,617	1,285	
Payment to health care trust funds ¹	(1,011)	(1,011)	
Child nutrition programs	254	234	
Advances to unemployment trust fund ¹	(516)	(516)	
Special benefits (general retirement and Federal employee retirement)	48	48	
Black lung disability trust fund	85	85	
Assistance payments	573	573	
Veterans readjustment benefits	180	137	
Veterans pensions	10		
Salaries of judges	3	1	
Payment to civil service retirement ¹	(214)	(214)	
National wildlife refuge fund	(²)	(²)	
Defense pay raise-military	925	897	
Total entitlements	3,769	3,318	
Total current level as of November 15, 1985	1,068,980	982,487	793,135
1986 budget resolution (S. Con. Res. 32)	1,069,700	967,600	795,700
Amount remaining:			
Over budget resolution		14,887	
Under budget resolution	720		2,565

¹ Interfund transactions do not add to budget totals.

² Less than \$500 thousand.

Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

SALUTE TO OUTGOING FFA
PRESIDENT

● Mr. FORD. Mr. President, about 22,000 Future Farmers of America delegates met in Kansas City last week for their annual convention, as members have each year since 1928.

With that annual fall pilgrimage now ended, I take this opportunity to salute an outstanding young man from Glendale, KY, who was national FFA president over the past year. That young man, Steve Meredith, has served admirably in this demanding, yet rewarding position. His duties have

taken him across the Nation, representing the interests of young men and women in agriculture.

Ralph and Ruth Meredith have good reason to be proud of their son, Steve. He graduated at the top of his 140-member high school class, and he was voted most likely to succeed. With high school behind him, Steve plans to pursue a degree in agricultural economics at the University of Kentucky. His career goal is to be a vocational agriculture teacher and farmer.

Steve's fellow-FFA members in Kentucky, more than 13,000 of them, are proud of his leadership and accomplishments. When Steve was elected, it has been 20 years since a Kentuckian had served as national FFA president. Kenneth Kennedy, of Cadiz, KY, had held the post in 1964. The Bluegrass State was proud to return a Kentuckian to the helm of that important organization.

The Future Farmers of America is truly an important and outstanding organization. Members compete both locally and nationally in a variety of contests, including public speaking, recordkeeping, and farm production projects. The organization's many activities develop skills in young men and women that will be beneficial to them in their future endeavors, both on and off the farm.

This is a difficult time for agriculture, as thousands of farmers are undergoing extreme financial hardships. Despite this bleak cloud, 500,000 students studying agriculture are FFA members. It is encouraging to know that so many young people maintain an interest in this, our Nation's largest industry.

We, in Congress, must be reminded of the responsibility that rests with us in shaping agricultural policy. We must ensure that these future farmers are rewarded for their hard work and preparations. Their expectations for a promising future in agriculture must be made possible through passage of agricultural legislation that works.

It was important for FFA, during this period, to be represented by a young man of Steve's caliber. I salute his efforts and wish him every success in his farming future.●

TRIBUTE TO DON SENTERFITT,
PRESIDENT, AMERICAN BANKERS
ASSOCIATION

● Mrs. HAWKINS. Mr. President, I would like to recognize today Floridian Don T. Senterfitt who has served his community for a number of years and has recently been elected to the distinguished position of president of the American Bankers Association. I congratulate Mr. Senterfitt in being the first native Floridian to be elected to this prestigious national position.

Born in Marianna, FL, Don's family has been in residence on the Sunshine State for five generations. Upon receiving his bachelor of arts degree from Carson Newman College in 1941, he began a legal education at George Washington University. Working his way through law school, he served on the staff of Florida's Senator Charles O. Andrews.

During World War II, Don proudly served in the 108th Infantry Division. After the War, he returned to our Nation's Capital to play an integral part on Senator Andrews' staff until the Senator's death.

In 1948, Mr. Senterfitt received his LL.B. degree from the University of Florida and went into practice in Orlando, FL. In 1958, his firm merged to become Akerman, Senterfitt, Edison, and in that same year, he assumed the position of outside counsel for the Florida Bankers Association. In 1978, the Florida Bankers Association awarded Mr. Senterfitt with the Distinguished Service Award.

He was elected to the board of directors of Sun Bank in 1964 and became one of the founding directors of the holding company that became Sun Banks Inc. Don was then elected chairman of the holding company's executive committee in 1977. When Sun Banks and Trust Co. of Georgia merged, he became vice chairman of the new corporation, Sun Trust Banks, Inc. He was instrumental in many of Sun Banks, Inc., corporate decisions.

It is evident that Don Senterfitt will bring a wealth of experience to his new position. As the junior Senator from his home State, I sincerely congratulate Don on his accomplishments and wish him well in his term as president of the American Bankers Association. ●

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. 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 GENEVA SUMMIT: HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, during our last session, I began a series of statements on issues likely to arise at the Geneva summit. At that time, I discussed SDI. Today, I wish to spend a few moments talking about human rights in the Soviet Union.

There are some issues which should be discussed subtly and some which demand bluntness. The question of human rights in the Soviet Union is one of the latter. So let me be blunt.

U.S.S.R. A TOTALITARIAN STATE

The U.S.S.R. is a totalitarian state. It suppresses its citizens, denying them many fundamental human rights. It persecutes the religious and many minorities. It jails those who dissent, and will not permit those who want to leave to do so.

The Soviet Union does not have gulags—it is a gulag. Its performance on human rights matters is inconsistent with internationally recognized standards. Its performance is unacceptable to us. It is unacceptable to decent people everywhere.

HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION DETERIORATING

Because human rights issues will be very much on the President's agenda in Geneva, it is appropriate that we take a few moments now to review the Russians' sorry human rights record. Although there have been occasional hopeful signs, in general it is accurate to say that the overall human rights situation in the Soviet Union has been deteriorating since at least the late 1970's.

The most fundamental and glaring shortcoming of the Soviet system, of course, is that it is utterly nondemocratic. It is a system of the state, by the state, and for the state. Although virtually required to participate in periodic sham elections, the average Soviet citizen is denied the right to have any real say in the way he is governed or the way his government conducts its business. In that sense, all Soviet citizens are prisoners of the gulag.

BUT SOME ARE MORE "EQUAL" THAN OTHERS

When you think about it, though, you realize that we hardly ever talk about this fundamental, systemic denial of human rights anymore. And the reason we do not is as simple as it is tragic. For there are some people in the Soviet Union so specially and brutally suppressed that the everyday suppression under which all citizens suffer pales in comparison. The Soviet system maltreats some people so badly, and their plight so demands our attention, that we just do not have time to talk much about this fundamental, routine denial of human rights. George Orwell had it right—some are more "equal" than others, at least in the degree to which they are persecuted.

These cases of especially harsh denial of human rights fall into three general categories: First: political dissidents; second, ethnic and religious minorities; and third, emigration cases.

POLITICAL DISSIDENTS

To dissent in any way from official Soviet policy—and especially to voice that dissent in such a manner that it becomes known outside the Soviet Union—is to invite economic reprisal, internal exile, imprisonment—on trumped up national security charges

or patently phony psychiatric confinement—or worse.

The preeminent representative of the Soviet human rights movement, Andrei Sakharov, remains confined in the isolated city of Gorky, along with his wife, Yelena Bonner. Although the Soviets have recently permitted Sakharov to contact family members in the West and agreed to permit Bonner to travel abroad to seek sorely needed medical attention, there is no evidence that they are removing any of the basic restrictions on Sakharov.

Yuriy Orlov, the founder of the Helsinki Monitor Movement, is in exile in Yakutia.

Former Helsinki Monitor Anatoly Shcharansky has been imprisoned for more than 8 years. He is now at the Lerm labor camp 35, with 6 years remaining on his sentence.

Psychiatrist Anatoly Koryagin languishes near death in a Soviet prison, solely because he protested the misuse of psychiatric diagnoses to imprison people.

The list of dissidents—a few prominent like these, but most anonymous, ordinary Soviet citizens—could go on and on. All of them, ultimately, are guilty of only one crime—they spoke out for what they believed, in a system which demands only silent acquiescence.

ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS MINORITIES

There is widespread mistreatment and denial of fundamental rights to many ethnic and religious minorities in the Soviet Union.

The special case of Soviet Jewry. No group suffers more serious suppression than Soviet Jews. I shall speak in a moment about the Russians' failure to permit thousands of Jews who wish to emigrate permission to do so. But all Jews who wish to practice their religion or just study their heritage, whether or not they want to leave the Soviet Union, face state-sponsored suppression.

Jews are routinely arrested and interrogated for alleged antistate activities. Many have lost their jobs and had their apartments searched, mail seized, and telephones disconnected. Some have also been beaten, either by security officials or by state-organized thugs. The Soviet press publishes frequent anti-Jewish articles, under the rubric of an ongoing campaign against Zionism which the Soviets formally equate with racism and nazism.

Since July 1984, at least 16 Jewish cultural activists have been arrested, in a campaign to stamp out a revival of interest among Soviet Jews in their cultural heritage. To date, 14 of those arrested have been convicted on crudely trumped up criminal charges. At least two have been badly beaten, one of them to the point that he has lost nearly all of his eyesight.

Other ethnic and religious groups.—Nor are other groups, ethnic and religious, spared state repression. The dominant Christian church, the Russian Orthodox Church, and all other legal religious groups operate under tight controls. Sects cannot, for example, own their own church buildings but must rent them from the Government. Children are not allowed in churches but must be taught religion at home. All religious material must be approved by the State.

The second largest religious group in the Soviet Union, the Muslims, numbering about 45 million strong, are under particularly close scrutiny, as many live near sensitive border areas, for example, with Afghanistan. Reflecting state concern over their loyalty and activities, they are now limited to several hundred mosques nationwide, compared to the 25,000 which existed at the turn of the century.

A number of smaller Christian groups are outlawed entirely, among them the Ukrainian Catholic Church; with an estimated 1 million believers; many of the Evangelical Protestants—Baptists, Seventh-Day Adventists; and Pentacostals—and the Jehovah's Witnesses.

Some ethnic groups are similarly suppressed. Ethnic Armenians and Kurds, for example, many again resident in the border areas, are kept under close scrutiny and have their cultural activities strictly limited.

EMIGRATION

An especially noxious problem is the Soviet failure to permit thousands of its citizens who wish to emigrate the right to do so. Although the problem affects many thousands from various groups, three categories are especially troubling: First, American-interest cases; second, Soviet Jews; and, third, divided German families.

American-interest cases.—These fall into three groups. One group is the more than 20 American citizens—let me repeat that, so it is clear—the more than 20 American citizens whom the Soviets will not permit to return to this country. Let me cite just one such case, that of Karo Chrovian, who left Cornell university in 1932 for a 2-year engineering job in the Soviet Union and who has been trying unsuccessfully to return from the Soviet Union for a half century. Our message to the Soviets on the Chrovian case, and the others, is simple—let them come home.

A second category are the separated spouses cases. These are the two dozen or so cases where a Soviet citizen spouse of an American citizen is not being permitted to leave Russia to join his or her family in the West.

It is encouraging that the Soviets, apparently as part of their pre-summit public relations blitz, have agreed to allow about half of these spouses to come to the United States. But it

ought not take an event like a summit to take the simple, decent step of allowing husbands, wives, and children to live together in the place of their choosing.

Finally, there are the separated family cases. There are well over a hundred of these cases, involving the separation of nonspouse but immediate family members—parents, siblings, et cetera. There is no reason why all these cases could not be resolved soon.

Soviet Jews. As I noted earlier, the Soviet Union has systematically denied permission to tens of thousands of Soviet Jews to emigrate. Most of them wish to go to Israel, some to the United States. None of them have done anything to justify the Soviets' refusal to grant them exit visas.

In the late 1970's, there were signs that the Soviets were prepared to resolve this issue, at least partly in response to our repeated declarations that the problem constituted an important barrier to better bilateral relations. That year, more than 50,000 Jews were permitted to emigrate.

Since that time, though, the Russians have callously restricted the flow, to the extent that less than 1,000 have been permitted to depart annually over the past 2 years.

The Soviets explain these drastically reduced levels by claiming that virtually all Jews who wish to emigrate have already done so. That claim just will not wash. Thousands more would leave tomorrow, if given the chance. Hundreds of thousands would leave ultimately, if given the chance to do so in an orderly way and without risking their jobs, their peace of mind, their freedom, and even their personal safety by the act of applying for a visa.

Divided German families. Because of decades-old patterns of population movement in Europe and the events of World War II, nearly 2 million ethnic Germans, about half who consider German their native tongue, now live in the Soviet Union. Many of them, particularly the most culturally active, suffer special suppression. Informed observers believe that perhaps 100,000 of them would emigrate to West Germany if they had the opportunity.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, this is the record of the Soviet Union—a record inconsistent with the pledges that the Soviets have repeatedly undertaken; inconsistent with the treaties and agreements which the Soviets have signed: The U.N. Universal Declaration on Human Rights; the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights; and the Helsinki Final Act.

The Soviet Union blatantly violates all of these treaties and agreements. It blatantly suppresses its own citizens. It blatantly makes a mockery of its own claim to be a democracy—a workers' democracy.

And we must never forget that.

Yet, the Soviet Union is a reality—a powerful reality. We have to deal with it, even though we find its system and its conduct abhorrent. In fact, we have to deal with it even more because we find its system utterly inimical to ours and because we find its conduct on these issues and others unacceptable.

Yet, as we talk to the Soviet leaders, we can never forget this record. Even more important, we can never let the Soviets forget that their record remains a fundamental difference between their system and ours and a fundamental barrier to normal relations between our countries.

I know the President understands this very well. And I know that he will act on this understanding as he pursues his important, and broadly based, discussions with Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I would like to ask the distinguished minority leader if he is in a position to pass the following calendar items: Calendar Nos. 403, 404, 405, 406, and 407?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am pleased to respond to the distinguished majority leader by saying that these items have been cleared on this side and we are ready to proceed.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the calendar items just identified be considered en bloc and adopted en bloc, and that all reported amendments and preambles be considered agreed to.

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

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL CAMP FIRE ORGANIZATION FOR 75 YEARS OF SERVICE

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69) to recognize the National Camp Fire Organization for 75 years of service, was considered, and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, and the preamble, are as follows:

S. CON. RES. 69

Whereas the National Camp Fire Organization is celebrating its seventy-fifth anniversary during 1985;

Whereas Camp Fire has chosen to commemorate this significant anniversary in a national celebration of friendship;

Whereas Camp Fire councils offer young people opportunities to develop important friendships through informal educational programs for youth through the age of twenty-one;

Whereas in Camp Fire, recognition of accomplishments is combined with encouragement to use developing skills in service to others in the community; and

Whereas Camp Fire is to be commended for the opportunities for friendship the program offers young people throughout the Nation, and for the many services young people perform for the community as Camp Fire members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby recognizes the seventy-five years of service given by Camp Fire to the Nation.

NATIONAL BLACK (AFRO-AMERICAN) HISTORY MONTH

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 74) to provide for the designation of the month of February 1986, as "National Black (Afro-American) History Month," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution, and the preamble, are as follows:

S.J. Res. 74

Whereas in 1926 Dr. Carter Godwin Woodson launched the celebration of Negro History Week;

Whereas this observance evolved into a month-long celebration in 1976;

Whereas February 1, 1986, will mark the beginning of the sixtieth annual public and private salute to Black History;

Whereas the observance of Black (Afro-American) History Month provides opportunities for our Nation's public schools, institutions of higher learning, and the public to gain a deeper understanding and knowledge of the many contributions of Black Americans to our country and the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of February, 1986, is designated as "National Black (Afro-American) History Month", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that month with appropriate ceremonies and activities to salute all that Black Americans have done to help build our country.

AMERICAN LIVER FOUNDATION NATIONAL LIVER AWARENESS MONTH

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 202) designating November 1985 as "American Liver Foundation National Liver Awareness Month," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution, and the preamble, are as follows:

S.J. Res. 202

Whereas there are more than one hundred liver diseases which are progressive debilitating and often fatal;

Whereas liver diseases claim fifty thousand lives annually and are the fourth leading cause of death of Americans between the ages of fifteen and sixty-five;

Whereas liver diseases strike infants, children, adolescents, and adults, regardless of sex, race, or economic status;

Whereas there are no known causes, effective treatments (other than liver transplants), or cures for the vast majority of liver diseases;

Whereas there are many conditions which can lead to liver diseases, including congenital or inherited abnormalities, severe reactions to drugs, prolonged exposure to environmental toxins, parasitic and other diseases, as well as alcoholism;

Whereas people with a liver disease suffer not only physically from the disease but also emotionally from the unjust stigma placed on them due to the common, but mistaken, notion that liver disease is caused only by alcoholism;

Whereas the American Liver Foundation is the only national organization to focus on the full array of liver diseases;

Whereas the Foundation is a network of volunteers, families, researchers, and health care professionals located throughout the United States, dedicated to funding and increasing research to find the causes, treatments, cures, and ways to prevent these devastating diseases; and

Whereas the Foundation is committed to promoting the health of Americans by increasing public awareness of all conditions which can lead to a liver disease, providing health and therapy information and education programs about liver diseases for lay persons and professionals, and supporting and enhancing the quality of life for those individuals and their families who must cope with a liver disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That November 1985 is designated as "American Liver Foundation National Liver Awareness Month", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to—

(1) learn more about the liver and how to prevent liver diseases;

(2) support the search for the causes and possible cures for liver diseases;

(3) aid those who suffer from the crushing physical, psychological, and financial burden of a liver disease; and

(4) observe such month with other appropriate activities.

NATIONAL SOCIAL STUDIES WEEK

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 232) to designate October 6, 1986, through October 10, 1986, as "National Social Studies Week."

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I wish to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 232, a bill to designate October 6, 1986, to October 10, 1986, as "National Social Studies Week." This bill will recognize and commemorate the role of the social studies teacher in the United States. The social studies teacher must be a master of not one, but several disciplines to teach in any area of the social studies. These teachers must not only be bright, creative, and inquisitive, but they must also possess a world view and be committed to democratic values such as freedom, equality, peace, and justice. This knowledge is necessary in addition to the basic

qualities needed to be a teacher: Strong interpersonal skills, flexibility, tolerance of divergent viewpoints, and the ability to withstand the pressures of conflicting values within the classroom and the community. Social studies teachers are the ones who present the basics of our Government to the children of our Nation. They initiate an interest of the world and its peoples and cultures.

In the view that national attention should be focused on the exemplary efforts of social studies teachers in the United States, I would like to set aside October 6 through October 10, 1986, as "National Social Studies Week." During this week, social studies classes nationwide may undertake special projects, give recognition to their social studies teachers, and achieve a renewed spark of interest in their government, their country, and their world.

The joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution, and the preamble, are as follows:

S.J. Res. 232

Whereas national attention should be focused on the exemplary efforts of social studies teachers in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 6, 1986, through October 10, 1986, is designated as "National Social Studies Week," and that the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities.

NATIONAL MARK TWAIN DAY

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 259) to designate November 30, 1985, as "National Mark Twain Day," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the measures were agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I inquire of the distinguished minority leader if he is in a position to agree to the confirmation of the following nominations: Calendar No. 527, William C.

Carpenter, Jr.; No. 528, Benjamin L. Burgess, Jr.; No. 529, Marvin Collins; No. 530, Karen Pryor; No. 533, Francis J. Invancie; No. 534, William Robert Graham; No. 535, Michael A. McManus, Jr.; No. 536, Neal B. Freeman; No. 537, John A. Gaughan; No. 538, John K. Lauber; No. 539, James Curtis Mack II; No. 540, Jennifer Lynn Dorn; No. 541, Coast Guard.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am pleased to respond to the distinguished majority leader's inquiry. All the calendar order numbers to which he has referred have been cleared for action on this side.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations just identified be considered en bloc and confirmed en bloc.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William C. Carpenter, Jr., of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Delaware for the term of 4 years.

Benjamin L. Burgess, Jr., of Kansas, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Kansas for the term of 4 years.

Marvin Collins, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Texas for the term of four years.

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

Karen Pryor, of Washington, to be a member of the Marine Mammal Commission for the term expiring May 13, 1986.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Francis J. Invancie, of Oregon, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1987.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

William Robert Graham, of California, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORPORATION

Michael A. McManus, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation until the date of the annual meeting of the Corporation in 1987.

Neal B. Freeman, of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation until the date of the annual meeting of the Corporation in 1988. (Reappointment)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

John A. Gaughan, of Maryland, to be Administrator of the Maritime Administration.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

John K. Lauber, of California, to be a member of the National Transportation Safety Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1989.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

James Curtis Mack II, of California, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Jennifer Lynn Dorn, of Maryland, to be Associate Deputy Secretary of Transportation. (New position)

COAST GUARD

The following officers of the U.S. Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of commodore:

Capt. Richard I. Rybacki.
Capt. Martin H. Daniell, Jr.
Capt. Robert T. Nelson.
Capt. Marshall E. Gilbert.
Capt. Joseph E. Vorback.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the votes by which the nominations were confirmed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified that the Senate has given its consent to these nominations.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TESTIMONY OF SENATE EMPLOYEES AND REPRESENTATION BY SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished minority leader, Mr. BYRD, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 260) to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel and testimony of Senate employees.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the defendants in the case of *United States versus David Allen Anderson, et al.*, pending in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky, have subpoenaed both Senator Ford and Senator McConnell—as well as six members of their Louisville office staffs—to testify at their consolidated trial scheduled for tomorrow morning, November 19, 1985, at 10 a.m. In addition, the U.S. attorney has requested the presence of Senator Ford's district representative and Senator McConnell's State director.

These criminal prosecutions arose out of demonstrations at both Senators' Louisville offices on June 12 of this year. When the 29 defendants involved refused to leave upon request at closing time, they were arrested and charged with violation of a GSA regulation prohibiting disturbances in Federal buildings. Neither Senator Ford nor Senator McConnell was present at the time of the protest, but their

staff assistants named in this resolution were witnesses to the event in question.

Such resolution would authorize those Senate employees to testify and would direct the Senate legal counsel to represent Senator Ford, Senator McConnell and their staffs in connection with the subpoenas issued to them in this proceeding. This would be in keeping with our practice of facilitating justice consistent with the privileges and rights of the Senate. Mr. President, I move adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 260) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. Res. 260

Whereas, in the case of *United States v. David Allen Anderson, et al.*, Criminal No. 85-00089-L, pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky, the defendants have obtained subpoenas for the appearance of Senator Wendell H. Ford and Senator Mitch McConnell, as well as Blanche R. Mahoney, Carolyn Duffin, Ann Woods, and Cynthia Heckmann, employees in Senator Ford's Louisville office, and Larry E. Cox and Cynthia Paschall, employees in Senator McConnell's Louisville office;

Whereas, in the same case the United States has requested the testimony of Blanche R. Mahoney and Larry E. Cox;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate can, by the judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§ 288b(a) and 288c(a)(2) (1982), the Senate may direct the Senate Legal Counsel to defend Senators and Senate employees in any proceeding with respect to any subpoena or order directed to them in their official capacity;

Whereas, when it appears that the testimony of an employee of the Senate is needed for use in any court for the promotion of justice, the Senate will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges and rights of the Senate: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is directed to represent Senator Ford, Senator McConnell, and their staff assistants with respect to the subpoenas to them.

Sec. 2. That Blanche R. Mahoney, Carolyn Duffin, Ann Woods, Cynthia Heckmann, Larry E. Cox, Cynthia Paschall, and any other employees of Senator Ford or Senator McConnell who may have testimony relevant to this proceeding are authorized to appear and testify in the case of *United States v. David Allen Anderson, et al.*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY

RECESS UNTIL 9:15 A.M.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that once the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9:15 a.m. on Tuesday, November 19, 1985.

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

RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN SENATORS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, following the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, there will be a special order in favor of the following Senators for not to exceed 15 minutes each by previous order, the distinguished minority leader, and the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER].

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Following the special orders just identified, I ask unanimous consent there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to extend beyond 10 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not more than 5 minutes each.

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

RECESS BETWEEN 12 AND 2 P.M.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess between the hours of 12 noon and 2 p.m. tomorrow for the weekly caucuses.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, following routine morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the farm bill, S. 1714, and I am now advised that there will probably not be votes before noon. If the dairy amendment is completed, hopefully we can take up another amendment and if there is one or more, hopefully more than one vote, they will be conducted following policy luncheons at 2 p.m.

When the Senate reconvenes, as indicated, S. 1714 will be the pending business and hopefully by that time votes will be in order.

I will advise my colleagues that we can probably expect a number of votes tomorrow. There is, I sense, some indication that perhaps we can move very quickly on a number of the measures in the farm bill because it is important that we do so and go to conference very quickly.

RECESS UNTIL 9:15 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there being no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 9:15 a.m. on Tuesday, November 19.

The motion was agreed to, and at 5:47 p.m. the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 19, 1985, at 9:15 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Secretary of the Senate November 15, 1985, under authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1985:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Arnold I. Burns, of New York, to be Associate Attorney General, vice D. Lowell Jensen.

BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

Arch L. Madsen, of Utah, to be a member of the board for International Broadcasting for a term expiring April 28, 1987, reappointment.

HARRY S. TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

Truman McGill Hobbs, of Alabama, to be a member of the board of trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation for a term expiring December 10, 1991, reappointment.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Thomas A. Bolan, of New York, to be a member of the board of directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1988, reappointment.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 18, 1985:

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

Karen Pryor, of Washington, to be a member of the Marine Mammal Commission for the term expiring May 13, 1986.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Francis J. Ivancie, of Oregon, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1987.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

William Robert Graham, of California, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORPORATION

Michael A. McManus, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation until the date of the annual meeting of the Corporation in 1987.

Neal B. Freeman, of Virginia, to be a member of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation until the date of the annual meeting of the Corporation in 1988.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

John A. Gaughan, of Maryland, to be Administrator of the Maritime Administration.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

John K. Lauber, of California, to be a member of the National Transportation Safety Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1989.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

James Curtis Mack II, of California, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Jennifer Lynn Dorn, of Maryland, to be Associate Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officers of the U.S. Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of commodore:

Capt. Richard I. Rybacki.
Capt. Martin H. Daniell, Jr.
Capt. Robert T. Nelson.
Capt. Marshall E. Gilbert.
Capt. Joseph E. Vorbach.

The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William C. Carpenter, Jr., of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Delaware for the term of 4 years.

Benjamin L. Burgess, Jr., of Kansas, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Kansas for the term of 4 years.

Marvin Collins, of Texas, to the U.S. attorney for the northern district of Texas for the term of 4 years.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GENEVA: THE PRESIDENT'S
MISSION FOR PEACE

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, prior to departing for Geneva and his summit conference, the President shared his thoughts with all of us in a nationwide television address. During his speech, he told the American people of his vision of peace and his personal hopes for the meeting with Soviet leader Gorbachev. The President gave us a vision of the future and is to be commended for his brave efforts to honestly improve relations with the Soviet Union.

We all know that there are deep differences between our two nations. We all know that a realistic assessment of the talks would lead us to believe that a major agreement on arms reductions will not result from only 2 days of meetings. The President is correct in trying, however, to establish a dialog and build a framework for future discussions with the Soviet leader.

Our Chief Executive spoke of his hopes that a broad cultural agreement can be signed. Such an agreement would expand educational and cultural exchange programs between our two countries. Soviets from all walks of life would be exposed to the American way of life, and our open society. A bilateral agreement may also be signed which would result in opening new consulates in our respective countries. Also possible is the signing of an air traffic agreement to ensure the safety of passenger aircraft which fly near Soviet airspace.

We all know that regional issues divide our two nations. Events in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Nicaragua, Angola, and other areas of the world are viewed from totally different perspectives by our two nations. Tensions have been created as a result of our mutual suspicions over these areas of conflict. Resolving these problems is essential if the United States and the Soviet Union are going to build a truly peaceful relationship.

While our President is deeply committed to achieving deep and verifiable reductions in nuclear weapons, it is unlikely that much progress will be made on this issue in Geneva.

We must remember that this is the first high-level meeting between the United States and the Soviet Union in 6 years. The President is to be commended for trying to make a fresh start on the long road to peace with the Soviet Union. I am certain that all of us in the Congress wish him well in his quest.

With these comments in mind, I commend the following Presidential address to my colleagues in the Congress.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE NATION

My fellow Americans. Good evening. In 36 hours, I will be leaving for Geneva for the first meeting between an American President and a Soviet leader in 6 years. I know that you and the people of the world are looking forward to that meeting with great interest, so tonight I want to share with you my hopes and tell you why I am going to Geneva.

My mission, stated simply, is a mission for peace. It is to engage the new Soviet leader in what I hope will be a dialogue for peace that endures beyond my Presidency. It is to sit down across from Mr. Gorbachev and try to map out, together, a basis for peaceful discourse even though our disagreements on fundamentals will not change.

It is my fervent hope that the two of us can begin a process which our successors and our peoples can continue: facing our differences frankly and openly, and beginning to narrow and resolve them; communicating effectively so that our actions and intentions are not misunderstood; and eliminating the barriers between us and cooperating wherever possible for the greater good of all.

This meeting can be an historic opportunity to set a steady, more constructive course to the 21st century.

The history of American-Soviet relations, however, does not augur well for euphoria. Eight of my predecessors—each in his own way in his own time—sought to achieve a more stable and peaceful relationship with the Soviet Union. None fully succeeded. So I don't underestimate the difficulty of the task ahead. But these sad chapters do not relieve me of the obligation to try to make this a safer, better world. For our children, our grandchildren, for all mankind—I intend to make the effort. And with your prayers, and God's help, I hope to succeed.

Success at the summit, however, should not be measured by any short-term agreements that may be signed. Only the passage of time will tell us whether we constructed a durable bridge to a safer world.

This, then, is why I go to Geneva. To build a foundation for lasting peace.

When we speak of peace, we should not mean just the absence of war. Truce peace rests on the pillars of individual freedom, human rights, national self-determination, and respect for the rule of law. Building a safer future requires that we address candidly all the issues which divide us, and not just focus on one or two issues, important as they may be. When we meet in Geneva, our agenda will seek not just to avoid war, but to strengthen peace, prevent confrontation, and remove the sources of tension. We should seek to reduce the suspicions and mistrust that have led us to acquire mountains of strategic weapons.

Since the dawn of the nuclear age, every American President has sought to limit and end the dangerous competition in nuclear arms. I have no higher priority than to finally realize that dream. I've said before,

and will say again, a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.

We have gone the extra mile in arms control, but our offers have not always been welcome.

In 1977, and again in 1982, the United States proposed to the Soviet Union deep reciprocal cuts in strategic forces. These offers were rejected, out-of-hand. In 1981, we proposed the complete elimination of a whole category of intermediate range nuclear forces. Three years later, we proposed a treaty for a global ban on chemical weapons. In 1983, the Soviet Union got up and walked out of the Geneva nuclear arms control negotiations altogether. They did this in protest because we and our European allies had begun to deploy nuclear weapons as a counter to Soviet SS-20's aimed at our European and other allies.

I am pleased now, however, with the interest expressed in reducing offensive weapons by the new Soviet leadership. Let me repeat tonight what I announced last week: the United States is prepared to reduce comparable nuclear systems by 50 percent. We seek reductions that would result in a stable balance between us—with no first strike capability—and verified, full compliance.

If we both reduce the weapons of war there would be no losers, only winners. And the whole world would benefit if we could both abandon these weapons altogether and move to non-nuclear defensive systems that threaten no one.

But nuclear arms control is not of itself a final answer. I told four Soviet political commentators 2 weeks ago that nations do not distrust each other because they are armed; they arm themselves because they distrust each other. The use of force, subversion, and terror has made the world a more dangerous place.

Thus, today, there is no peace in Afghanistan; no peace in Cambodia; no peace in Angola, Ethiopia, or Nicaragua. These wars have claimed hundreds of thousands of lives and threaten to spill over national frontiers.

That is why in my address to the United Nations I proposed a way to end these conflicts, a regional peace plan that calls for negotiations among the warring parties, withdrawal of all foreign troops, democratic reconciliation, and economic assistance.

Four times in my lifetime our soldiers have been sent overseas to fight in foreign lands. Their remains can be found from Flanders Field to the islands of the Pacific. Not once were those young men sent abroad in the cause of conquest. Not once did they come home claiming a single square inch of other country as a trophy of war.

A great danger in the past, however, has been the failure by our enemies to remember that, while we Americans detest war, we love freedom and stand ready to sacrifice for it. We love freedom, not only because it is practical and beneficial, but because it is morally right and just.

In advancing freedom, we Americans carry a special burden—a belief in the dignity of man in the sight of God who gave birth to this country. This is central to our being.

A century-and-a-half ago, Thomas Jefferson told the world, "The mass of mankind

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

Boldface type indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

has not been born with saddles on their backs. . . ." Freedom is America's core. We must never deny it, nor forsake it. Should the day come when we Americans remain silent in the face of armed aggression, then the cause of America—the cause of freedom—will have been lost, and the great heart of this country will have been broken.

This affirmation of freedom is not only our duty as Americans, it is essential for success at Geneva.

Freedom and democracy are the best guarantors of peace. History has shown that democratic nations do not start wars. The rights of the individual and the rule of law are as fundamental to peace as arms control. A government which does not respect its citizens' rights and its international commitments to protect those rights is not likely to respect its other international undertakings.

That is why we must and will speak in Geneva on behalf of those who cannot speak for themselves. We are not trying to impose our beliefs on others. We have a right to expect, however, that great states will live up to their international obligations.

Despite our deep and abiding differences, we can and must prevent our international competition from spilling over into violence. We can find as yet undiscovered avenues where American and Soviet citizens can cooperate, fruitfully, for the benefit of mankind. And this, too, is why I am going to Geneva.

Enduring peace requires openness, honest communications, and opportunities for our people to get to know one another directly.

The U.S. has always stood for openness. Thirty years ago in Geneva, President Eisenhower, preparing for his first meeting with the then Soviet leader, made his Open Skies proposal and an offer of new educational and cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union. He recognized that removing the barriers between people is at the heart of our relationship. He said:

"Restrictions on communications of all kinds, including radio and travel, existing in extreme form in some places, have operated as causes of mutual distrust. In America, the fervent belief in freedom of thought, of expression, and of movement is a vital part of our heritage."

I have hopes that we can lessen the distrust between us, reduce the levels of secrecy, and bring forth a more "Open World." Imagine how much good we could accomplish, how the cause of peace would be served, if more individuals and families from our respective countries could come to know each other in a personal way.

For example, if Soviet youth could attend American schools and universities, they could learn first-hand what spirit of freedom rules our land, and that we do not wish the Soviet people any harm. If American youth could do likewise, they could talk about their interests and values and hopes for the future with their Soviet friends. They would get first-hand knowledge of life in the U.S.S.R., but most important they would learn that we are all God's children with much in common.

Imagine if people in our Nation could see the Bolshoi Ballet again, while Soviet citizens could see American plays and hear groups like the Beach Boys. And how about Soviet children watching Sesame Street.

We have had educational and cultural exchanges for 25 years and are now close to

completing a new agreement. But I feel the time is ripe for us to take bold new steps to open the way for our peoples to participate in an unprecedented way in the building of peace.

Why shouldn't I propose to Mr. Gorbachev at Geneva that we exchange many more of our citizens from fraternal, religious, educational, and cultural groups? Why not suggest the exchange of thousands of undergraduates each year, and even younger students who would live with a host family and attend schools or summer camps? We could look to increase scholarship programs, improve language studies, conduct courses in history, culture, and other subjects, develop new sister cities, establish libraries and cultural centers, and, yes, increase athletic competition.

People of both our nations love sports. If we must compete, let it be on the playing fields and not the battlefields.

In science and technology we could launch new joint space ventures and establish joint medical research projects. In communications, we would like to see more appearances in the other's mass media by representatives of both our countries: if Soviet spokesmen are free to appear on American television, to be published and read in the American press, shouldn't the Soviet people have the same right to see, hear, and read what we Americans have to say?

Such proposals will not bridge our differences, but people-to-people contacts can build genuine constituencies for peace in both countries. After all, people don't start wars, governments do.

Let me summarize, then, the vision and hopes that we carry with us to Geneva.

We go with an appreciation, born of experience, of the deep differences between us—between our values, our systems, our beliefs. But we also carry with us the determination not to permit those differences to erupt into confrontation or conflict.

We do not threaten the Soviet people and never will.

We go without illusion, but with hope—hope that progress can be made on our entire agenda.

We believe that progress can be made in resolving the regional conflicts now burning on three continents—including our own hemisphere. The regional plan we proposed at the United Nations will be raised again at Geneva.

We are proposing the broadest people-to-people exchanges in the history of American-Soviet relations, exchanges in sports and culture, in the media, education, and the arts. Such exchanges can build in our societies thousands of coalitions for cooperation and peace.

Governments can only do so much: once they get the ball rolling, they should step out of the way and let people get together to share, enjoy, help, listen and learn from each other, especially young people.

Finally, we go to Geneva with the sober realization that nuclear weapons pose the greatest threat in human history to the survival of the human race, that the arms race must be stopped. We go determined to search out, and discover, common ground—where we can agree to begin the reduction, looking to the eventual elimination, of nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth.

It is not an impossible dream that we can begin to reduce nuclear arsenals, reduce the risk of war, and build a solid foundation for

peace. It is not an impossible dream that our children and grandchildren can some day travel freely back and forth between America and the Soviet Union, visit each other's homes, work and study together, enjoy and discuss plays, music, television, and root for teams when they compete.

These, then, are the indispensable elements of a true peace: the steady expansion of human rights for all the world's peoples; support for resolving conflicts in Asia, Africa, and Latin America that carry the seeds of a wider war; a broadening of people-to-people exchanges that can diminish the distrust and suspicion that separate our two peoples; and the steady reduction of these awesome nuclear arsenals until they no longer threaten the world we both must inhabit. This is our agenda for Geneva; this is our policy; this is our plan for peace.

We have cooperated in the past. In both world wars, Americans and Russians fought on separate fronts against a common enemy. Near the city of Murmansk, sons of our own Nation are buried, heroes who died of wounds sustained on the treacherous North Atlantic and North Sea convoys that carried to Russia the indispensable tools of survival and victory.

While it would be naive to think a single summit can establish a permanent peace, this conference can begin a dialogue for peace. So we look to the future with optimism, and we go to Geneva with confidence.

Both Nancy and I are grateful for the chance you have given us to serve this Nation and the trust you have placed in us. I know how deep the hope of peace is in her heart, as it is in the heart of every American and Russian mother.

I received a letter and picture from one such mother in Louisiana recently. She wrote, Mr. President, how could anyone be more blessed than I? These children you see are mine, granted to me by the Lord for a short time. . . . When you go to Geneva, please remember these faces . . . remember the faces of my children—of Jonathan (my son), and of my twins, Lara and Jessica. Their future depends on your actions. I will pray for guidance for you and the Soviet leaders.

Her words—my children—read like a cry of love. And I could only think how that cry has echoed down through the centuries, a cry for all the children of the world, for peace, for love of fellow man.

Here is the central truth of our time, of any time, a truth to which I have tried to bear witness in this office.

When I first accepted the nomination of my party, I asked you, the American people, to join with me in prayer for our Nation and the world. Six days ago, in the Cabinet Room religious leaders—Ukrainian and Greek Orthodox bishops, Catholic church representatives including a Lithuanian bishop, Protestant pastors, a Mormon elder and Jewish Rabbis—made me a similar request.

Tonight, I am honoring that request. I am asking you, my fellow Americans, to pray for God's grace and His guidance—for all of us—at Geneva, so that the cause of true peace among men will be advanced and all of humanity thereby served.

THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
RIGHTS PROTECTION AND EN-
FORCEMENT ACT OF 1985

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today we are introducing legislation to help enforce and strengthen intellectual property rights in America. It's no secret that our artists, our scientists, and our creators are having their property and inventions taken and used without their knowledge.

President Reagan's Commission on Industrial Competitiveness (January 1985) recently confirmed that America has no greater economic advantage than its technology and innovation. Our most valuable economic resource is no longer our industrial power and natural resources but the creative potential of the minds of our citizens. While our innovation and creativity holds America's greatest promise for the future, it is also our most fragile commodity; fragile because, while difficult and expensive to produce and market, intellectual and industrial property once created is today relatively easy and inexpensive to copy and pirate.

The problem and the task of adaptation continues. It grows more serious every day because technology vastly expands the opportunities for copyrighted works to be replicated and used without the owner's consent and oftentimes without even the owner's knowledge. And the pace of technological innovation is itself accelerating. Our task is made particularly difficult when the public is offered the choice of using their work product for practically nothing.

To try and correct this, we are introducing the Intellectual Property Rights Protection and Enforcement Act of 1985. As its name implies, the bill is part of a continuing effort to encourage and protect American technological innovation which is so crucial to a growing U.S. economy and the worldwide competitiveness of U.S. industry. Specifically:

Title I would prohibit the practice of producing certain products overseas in violation of a U.S. process plant and shipping that product back to the United States. This provision passed the House last year on suspension;

Title II would enable U.S. patent holders and trademark and copyright owners to obtain cease-and-desist of exclusion orders against the importation of an infringing product without first having to show that importation would tend to destroy or substantially injure an efficiently and economically operated U.S. industry, as is currently required;

Title III would strengthen patent owners' ability to effectively license patents and efficiently transfer technology; and

Title IV would provide low-cost, effective protection against counterfeiting a protected article by copying its shape or appearance. Protection would extend for a 10-year

period. Nearly 10 times the number of design registrations are obtained in Japan by Japanese nationals as registrations in the United States by United States nationals and nearly 20 times our number are obtained in design-conscious West Germany. Foreign copycats divert an estimated \$12 billion in sales abroad and about \$3 billion in domestic sales, costing Americans over 250,000 jobs.

Unless new technology reaches the marketplace protected in the quickest and most efficient manner, our industry will not be able to reap the full benefits of that technology, and our economy will suffer. In fact, it is precisely in disseminating and marketing new technologies that U.S. industry has fallen behind in recent years. Therefore, we must ensure that our intellectual property laws allow—and even encourage—those who create new technology to market it in all its useful applications.

For all of these reasons, we urge the Judiciary Committee to give this legislation early and favorable consideration.

ENTERPRISE ZONES FOR ALL

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of legislation creating enterprise zones, I found the following article from the Wall Street Journal very good and want to share it with my colleagues. It points out that even as the Congress stalls on the enactment of enterprise zone legislation, the States have successfully implemented hundreds of zones creating billions in capital investment and thousands of jobs. It's obvious the potential for job creating that exist with enterprise zones and that we are wasting a valuable resource and opportunity by not enacting Federal legislation to create the same thing.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 7, 1985]

ENTERPRISE ZONES FOR ALL

While Congress stalls on enterprise-zone legislation, 20 state governments have plowed ahead, designating such zones on their own. In only a few short years, 1,300 enterprise zones have been established in 600 jurisdictions throughout the states. The 16 states with zones in existence for a year or more have attracted more than \$3 billion in capital investment, and retained or created more than 80,000 jobs total, the Department of Housing and Urban Development estimates.

Some states have posted particularly impressive results. Connecticut, for one, boasts six zones with a total of 453 development projects. These projects have attracted \$135 million in investment, while creating and retaining just over 8,500 jobs. Arkansas' zones have spawned 52 businesses, created more than 3,000 new jobs and drawn more than \$100 million in investment in little over a year of operation. Louisiana ambitiously projects creation of 10,000 permanent jobs, 8,000 construction jobs and private investment of more than \$600 million in its zones over the next five years.

Such numbers have to be weighted with some care, of course. States have had industrial-development programs for years, offering tax breaks and other inducements to anyone willing to set up shop. Sometimes "job-creation" numbers merely reflect normal economic growth or the moving around of jobs. But enterprise zones usually broaden the industrial-development approach by putting heavy stress on freeing employers from unjustified red tape as well as some share of the tax burden. There seems to be new emphasis on business and government working in partnership to provide jobs and training.

Enterprise zones, of course, are intended mainly to bring jobs into economically distressed communities with surplus labor and, in some cases, social problems to match. Initial experiences show this can be done. A Maryland zone incorporating sections of Hagerstown and Washington County (areas of high unemployment) has drawn \$5.1 million in private investment and spurred creation of almost 500 jobs. An Indiana zone encompassing Michigan City has attracted \$7.5 million in investment, saved 1,000 jobs and provided impetus for 400 new jobs.

Among the carrots state government dangle at companies are investment tax credits, per-employee tax credits, exemption from state sales and use taxes, exemption from utility taxes, reduction of capital gains taxes and use of industrial-development bonds. As an example of reduced regulation, a Wisconsin bill would exempt businesses within zones from rent controls, restrictive building-code provisions and overly stringent air-quality standards.

Of the 30 remaining states without active enterprise zones, half are well along in the start-up process. Six already have enacted enterprise-zone legislation and nine have such legislation under consideration.

The U.S. Senate has twice passed bills to promote enterprise zones nationally. New York Reps. Jack Kemp and Robert Garcia have sponsored enterprise-zone bills in the House the past two years only to have them derailed by Dan Rostenkowski's Ways and Means Committee. Messrs. Kemp and Garcia have revised the legislation this year, incorporating some of the changes suggested by Charles Rangel and others on Ways and Means in the hope that it will be viewed more favorably.

Letting the states proceed on their own may prove to be the best answer, however. For all the success enterprise zones may be having, there is a conceptual problem when some employers are offered special inducements merely to lure them to locations that, for a wide variety of reasons, might be less attractive than others. Experimentation of this sort often is better done at the state rather than the federal level.

Some states will find that cutting taxes and red tape works so well they will offer the same incentives statewide. Making entire states, and ultimately the entire U.S., into enterprise zones should be the ultimate goal. The U.S., through economic deregulation and an improved tax structure, has been moving in that direction, but greater benefits are waiting to be reaped.

SENATOR WYNONA LIPMAN

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure to attend a breakfast in Newark this past Sunday in honor of Senator Wynona M. Lipman. Senator Lipman is a dear friend and a dedicated person who has served the State for 13 years. During these years her energies have been directed to the concerns of the people of New Jersey. She believes in people working together to achieve common objectives even in the face of adversity.

Following is Senator Lipman's moving and eloquent expression of her philosophy on public service and her commitment to working to solve the problems of our community and State:

As we begin to enter the second half of this decade and look just beyond to the conclusion of this century, there are problems to be acknowledged and opportunities to be embraced. Having served as your State Senator for 13 years, I have seen first hand what can be accomplished when committed people work together to achieve a common objective even in the face of adversity. Knowing that success is in the offering if only we make the commitment, let me suggest three areas where our energies should be applied in the years ahead. These are problem areas, but they are also areas in which real opportunities for progress are equally clear.

For over thirty years the Democratic Party has been at the forefront of the effort to secure equal opportunity and fair treatment for all of America's citizens. There are rumblings in some quarters, however, that the party standing might benefit from a not so close association with its minority constituency and most particularly, its black constituency. I believe the Democratic Party's commitment to the black community is and will continue to be as strong as in the past. Those who would have us view the Democratic Party as abandoning the black community, of turning its back on us, would have us believe a lie. We have contributed much to the vibrancy of the Democratic Party and it, in turn, has contributed much to our struggle toward equality. If the Democratic Party holds fast to its commitment to the black community, we will hold fast to it.

Because our state is so rich in resources, the plight of our homeless is not justifiable. The "haves" in the suburbs have closed their eyes to the problem, hoping it will go away. The "have nots" in the urban centers have been left to shoulder the entire burden of homeless adults and children. Many of the homeless in urban centers were once productive citizens living in communities throughout the state. It is the responsibility of our entire state to assist in the resolution of this problem.

This State's push for excellence in education has taken on momentum. Parents, school administrators, students and concerned citizens are striving to overcome the obstacles that have stood as barriers to quality education for too long in our State. The cities of New Jersey have the most distance to travel in search of educational quality and the most to lose by not achiev-

ing it. Our energies must be firmly fixed on ensuring that the young people in our school system will be prepared to compete once they leave the classroom. Nothing can be permitted to keep us, their elders, from working toward this end.

My good friend the Reverend M. William Howard, the guest speaker gave a memorable speech that was enjoyed by all. Reverend Howard is an outstanding individual who has dedicated himself to relieving the plight of others, both in the United States and abroad. For example, in 1984 he was elected president of the North American conference for Action Against Apartheid which is the largest conference for action against apartheid. Reverend Howard has been elected to several prominent national boards, such as the Urban League Board of Trustees and the Children Defense Fund Board of Directors.

Also at this memorable event a number of awards were presented: Haven Claybourne and Kim Garrett received scholarships; awards were presented to Sandra Robinson, executive director of Essex Newark Legal Services; Newark Museum Black Film Festival; Barbara Bell, executive director of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Newark; James Brown, director of the Newark Public Library Black Studies Program; and Raymond Rivera, executive director of La Casa de Don Pedro.

I was proud and privileged to attend this event and want to extend my appreciation to the honorary chairman, Kenneth A. Gibson and Peter Shapiro, and the chairperson Dorothea Lee, for organizing the "Friends of Wynona Lipman."

THE FREEDOM TO LEARN

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, our society is currently confronted with many rightwing organizations whose aim is to remove from our society the traditional American freedoms of speech and thought and replace them with a society that conforms to their tightly structured guidelines and standards.

One such group, inappropriately called Accuracy in Academia was created last summer to expose perceived inaccuracies and ideological bias in college teaching practices. Such a group is particularly dangerous, because it targets one of this country's most important freedoms, the freedom to learn.

Through its student contacts on more than 100 campuses, Accuracy in Academia collects complaints about professors and after an investigation by these self-styled moralists, informs professors by letter if "seriously inaccurate material" has been found in their teaching. If they do not make the appropriate corrections in the classroom the group publicizes the uncorrected errors in its newsletter, which goes to the groups' 50,000 members.

Recently Joseph S. Murphy, chancellor of the City University of New York spoke on

the subject of Accuracy in Academia. As he eloquently noted, the free expression of ideas, "whether in the classroom, on the pages of a journal, or, for that matter, on a streetcorner" is a moral value and a fundamental tenet of our national tradition, embedded in the Constitution. I would like to submit to the RECORD, and draw my colleagues attention to, this extremely accurate speech.

REMARKS OF JOSEPH S. MURPHY, CHANCELLOR OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK BEFORE CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Let me begin by putting the subject of Accuracy in Academia in some perspective.

Unlike some of my colleagues, I do not view this group, in and of itself, as a major threat to the idea or the practice of academic freedom. It may become that in due time; the forces that it represents certainly pose as grave a menace to the free exchange of ideas in our society as they do to the existence and extension of economic and political freedom. As of November 1985, however, the Accuracy in Academia organization, with its budget of \$50,000 and its full-time professional staff of one, represents only an irritation.

It may be, ironically, a useful irritation. Like most of the other fringe entities with which we have become familiar in recent years, this group combines a paucity of valid ideas with an impressive capacity for media manipulation. It has already pushed itself and its concerns onto a dozen television talk shows, the pages of a hundred newspapers, the American consciousness, and the agenda of the AAUP. In doing so it has given us the opportunity to restate the case for academic freedom—what Einstein called "the right to search for the truth and to publish and teach what one holds to be true."

The arguments on our side of the issue can be stated in simple terms.

Why is free expression of ideas, whether in the classroom or the pages of a journal or, for that matter, on a streetcorner, a right of moral value? Not solely because it represents a fundamental tenet of our national tradition, embedded in the Constitution and in a two-century-old body of case law; private property rights, after all, have a similar Constitutional and case law basis and few among us hold those to be sacred. We contend that there is something of greater import about academic freedom that impels us to defend it from attack from whatever quarter.

To put it directly, we believe in the proliferation of ideas. We believe especially in the promulgation of ideas that put to the test the dominant hypotheses and the dominant class and social structures of our culture—ideas that challenge economic and political hegemony. We believe this not because we are revolutionaries or Marxists, by and large: even Accuracy in Academia admits that ninety-eight percent of us in the profession are not. Our reason for defending what some would call the right to subversive thought is more profound. We believe that when the dominant ideology is subjected to the test of competing ideas it will emerge stronger, more resilient, more valid than before, or it will be transformed by the intellectual force of contrary dogma. Either way, society is well served.

We have all seen the process work, at sometime or another. Students faced with ideas that run counter to the mainstream notions they brought with them to college—

generally the middle-class world view inculcated by the media and the elementary and secondary school system—test and modify those notions, or cling to them more tightly than before, more confident of their truth. Defenders of the prevailing ways of thought and action in the larger community will, when confronted with a dissident perspective, refine their arguments and develop new proofs. This, at least, is what we aim for—even knowing that it may be a vain hope for the vast majority of students, who are drawn to the university in pursuit of greater earning power. But for a few, the concepts of skeptical thought that guided Galileo and Newton, Darwin and Freud, Marx and Keynes may be a living reality.

The systemic, almost automatic impediments to this kind of freedom are known to most of us. We have, in fact, accepted many of them as basic and immutable facts of our professional lives.

The most important, of course, is our system of tenure tracking and peer review. Tenure exists primarily to protect academic freedom. But let me pose the question: Is there anyone in the profession who has not felt the subtle pressures, in the five years before the awarding of tenure, to stay within a respectable range on the ideological spectrum—and to avoid offensive language and potentially offensive themes, to cover safe issues in preference to inflammatory ones, to use conventional texts instead of those that convey deviant concepts? Some of us rise above the pressure and others do not; all of us feel it. And while, for many, the coercive force stops with the awarding of tenure or the final promotion to full professor, for the rest it becomes so internalized that they become in the end of defenders (or the enforcers) of conformity.

But there are other threats as well. In recent days we have seen this Administration announce its plans to use federal funds—Star Wars funds—to lure faculty into personally lucrative research efforts. They promise that technology developed with public sector defense grants can then be peddled for individual gain in private sector markets. Coercion can come in many forms, and we may soon have evidence on this issue that grants can be as inimical to free thought as is out and out censorship.

The drive to turn universities into tools of economic productivity, with the encouragement of more contractual linkages between the campus and the corporation, poses another set of threats; how many institutions will jeopardize big dollars for the sake of a few faculty members lingering loudly outside the dominant consensus and criticizing capitalism in general and the affiliated corporations in particular? As colleges compete for more private sector dollars, how many will be immune from the fear that a negative press created by dissident professors will alienate potential clients—as it might alienate potential students and potential donors?

These are serious concerns, but they move us away from the topic of the moment, Accuracy in Academia.

What we have before us, in my view, is a group that exists largely as a symptom of serious underlying problems: the frustrated national quest for simplistic philosophical truth in a confusing time, mirrored in the same quest that accounts for much of Ronald Reagan's mandate. It has spawned an anti-intellectualism characteristic of an era in which our leaders give us at best a vacuous ideology such as in the 1950's and the 1920's, and an expression of anger at

large and powerful institutions wrongly perceived to be antithetical to the goals of those people who define themselves as part of the American middle class.

It may be beyond our present capacity to address those larger concerns. We can, at least, address Accuracy in Academia—and do so in a way that will win those outside of the profession to our cause.

For over two hundred years this society has tolerated the existence of reactionary forces who include the academy prominently among their targets of attack. In this sense Accuracy in Academia is only the latest chorus of an old song. We have coexisted with such groups in the past; why not simply shrug this one off now?

For two reasons:

First and most obvious is Accuracy in Academia's totally offensive methodology—the recruitment of students (and others incited to enroll as auditors) as a corps of thought police, the development of a private bureau of investigation, the exposure of private individuals to public condemnation, the announcement and promulgation of some self-defined concept of acceptable truth.

All of us in the profession are repulsed by that means of operation (or ought to be) no less than if the perpetrators of the acts were government agents rather than privately-funded vigilantes. Censorship does violence to most of what is good about the American political tradition and all that is worthy in the traditions of the academy. It matters little in the end whether the censors are cloaked in public or private garb.

I cannot speak for the leaders of other institutions. Speaking for myself I can make clear at every opportunity that no group functioning in the manner of Accuracy in Academia will have any influence over any hiring, firing, promotion or tenure decision, or any other decision, at the City University of New York as long as I am Chancellor.

Second, there is the possibility that this group and those behind it will establish themselves as a significant presence in the public agencies that regulate, fund, and in better times serve as advocates for the higher education community. This has been the case in a host of areas already. It takes no great flight of fantasy to imagine that an Administration that turned to Anne Burford for environmental advice would turn to Reed Irvine and the twenty-two-year-old executive director of Accuracy in Academia for advice about what grants to award and what institutions to help.

How should we in the profession deal with this potential menace? My own approach has several basic elements.

One is a restatement of the essential legitimacy of intellectual freedom, and a clear and cogent denunciation of attempts from any source to restrict it. Such attempts are more than arrogant; they do violence to the fundamental tenets of democratic government.

Secondly, we should present to those members of the public who follow these issues the contention, clear to most of us in the profession, that the very concept of "accuracy" in academia is seductively misleading. Truth is a goal to be pursued rather than a commodity to be packaged. In this society more than in most others, contradiction is an inherent element of ideology and multiple ideologies usually cohabit the same academic space. We cannot identify what is true. At best, we can more or less determine what is the conventional wisdom, what represents a dissident view, and what is outrageously dissident. Apparently what Accu-

cy in Academia is trying to do is ferret out of higher education all that is outrageous and most of what is dissident. They delude the public, and probably themselves, when they contend that what they are up to has anything to do with truth, or even that they know what it is. On all the important questions, no one does.

Third, we should maintain and extend free access to our campuses to all who come in an orderly manner, whatever their purpose. When Adlai Stevenson was spat upon in Dallas a month before the Kennedy assassination, he was asked if he would send the people who did it to jail. No, he said, he would send them to school. That should be our attitude.

Fourth, we should defend without apology and without concession those cited by an external group as perpetrators of incorrect thought. We may give them the resources they need to respond, but make it clear that from the institution's point of view no response is necessary.

Finally, we should avoid the guilt mentality that has taken root in our profession as it has in most others—the reflexive response to external criticisms that we and we alone can and will remedy any defects extant in our institutions.

The argument, or, if one insists, the concession, that we make should follow a different path. There are indeed defects within the academy, and "inaccuracies" may be among them. Many are simply not susceptible to remediation; they come with the territory. Those who would purge higher education of error would transform higher education into something it should not be—something of trivial value at best, and something of no greater purpose than the advancement of vocationalism. Let us concede the existence of what Accuracy in Academia characterizes as deficiencies, but make the case that they are part and parcel of a valuable whole.

We in the academy are privileged, as are few others in American society, to perform important work to deal with profound ideas, and to examine and explicate the critical issues of our time, but these privileges do not come free. They carry with them profound obligations.

None of those is greater than the duty to be on guard for, and to speak out against, any and all who would put at risk the free generation and dissemination of knowledge—and to arouse our community and the social system of which it is a part to stand firm against substantial threats to our fundamental rights in a democratic society.

The threat from Accuracy in Academia is as of this moment not large, but it is real. And the threat to academic freedom from forces larger than this individual group—forces that, directly or indirectly, spawned and sustain it—is a central and vitally important reality of our lives. Our obligation to resist those forces, and to encourage the lay public to do likewise, is clear.

THE KREMLIN CRITICIZES PRESIDENT'S RADIO ADDRESS

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as we near the starting date for the Geneva talks

between President Reagan and Soviet leader Gorbachev, the Kremlin is taking off the gloves and playing hardball again. If any progress is to be made in the talks, the Soviets should stop saying "nyet" to everything and start listening to what our President is saying.

This past Saturday, President Reagan used the Voice of America to beam his radio address to the Soviet people. Although the President recently talked at length with Soviet reporters, Soviet newspapers excluded most of his comments. The included comments were intentionally distorted. Our Chief Executive chose to use the Voice of America to communicate with the people in the Soviet Union. His message was one of hope, friendship, and peace. The President told his audience that the United States has no hostile intentions toward the Soviet Union. He told his listeners that our two countries must never engage in a nuclear conflict. The President also told them that he hoped the upcoming summit meeting would be fruitful and would lead to future meetings between the two leaders. Our President explained his plans for a space-based antimissile defense and described the existing Soviet-American ties and relationships in many areas. He also called for expanded contacts, to include the opportunity to communicate on each other's television systems. What do the Soviets now think about the free flow of communications among nations?

Unfortunately, radio broadcasts from the free world are routinely jammed by Soviet jamming stations. Sources in the U.S.S.R. advised that President Reagan's comments could be heard clearly in translation on two frequencies only. The other 17 channels used by the Voice of America for Russian programming were, however, jammed. It is possible that the Soviet authorities honored our Government's request that they not jam the President's message. It is also possible that the suspension of jamming on those two frequencies could have been a technical lapse.

Unbelievable as it may seem, the Kremlin condemned the President's address. The Soviet paper Tass reported that the President was more interested in talking about preventing nuclear war than in doing something concrete to produce an arms control agreement. Tass also accused the President of "falsifying facts," and talked about a White House propaganda machine at work.

As strange as it may seem at this late date, the Kremlin failed to take the olive branch from our President. Rather than reacting positively to the President's comments, Tass attacked the President's remarks. This is no way to set a favorable climate for high-level talks on what is almost the eve of the meeting.

If any progress is to be made in Geneva, the Soviet Union must stop saying "nyet" to every American proposal for improving relations between our two nations. It takes two to tango and it takes two to put together an agreement. Let's hope for a change of attitude on the part of the Soviet leader when he arrives in Geneva.

With these concerns in mind, I commend the following article describing the Soviet reaction to the President's radio address to my colleagues in the Congress:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 11, 1985]

KREMLIN ASSAILS REAGAN SPEECH AS EMPTY TALK

(By Philip Taubman)

Moscow, Nov. 10.—The Soviet Union today condemned President Reagan's radio address to the Russian people on Saturday, charging the broadcast showed Washington was not interested in peace.

The criticism, published in the form of a commentary by the press agency Tass, said Mr. Reagan "uttered a good deal of words about peace" but offered no sign the White House was "prepared to go its part of the road to the cause of preventing an arms race in outer space and of radically curbing it in earth."

The commentary did not mention that Mr. Reagan's radio talk was directed specifically to the Soviet Union and was broadcast by the Voice of America in Russian as well as English.

HEARD CLEARLY IN MOSCOW

Although most of the short-wave frequencies used by Voice of America for Russian-language programming were jammed Saturday evening during Mr. Reagan's address, his words could be heard clearly in English and Russian on several channels in Moscow.

It was not known whether the clear signals were the result of a Kremlin decision to suspend jamming on some frequencies, as the White House had requested, or were produced by a technical failure in the jamming system.

The Tass commentary said Saturday's broadcast and other recent Reagan speeches suggested that the Administration was more interested in talking about preventing nuclear war than doing something concrete to produce an arms control agreement.

In his 10-minute talk, Mr. Reagan said, "Americans are a peace-loving people—we do not threaten your nation and never will."

The Tass article quoted these words, but went no farther in suggesting that Mr. Reagan's comments were aimed at Russians. Tass said only that "the propaganda machinery of the White House continues to increase the number of the U.S. President's speeches beamed at various regions of the world on the eve of the summit in Geneva."

Mr. Reagan and Mikhail S. Gorbachev, the Soviet leader, are scheduled to meet in Geneva on Nov. 19 and 20.

Tass accused Mr. Reagan of "juggling" words about his plans for a space-based missile defense. It repeated Soviet charges that the program, called the strategic defense initiative by the White House and popularly known as "Star Wars," would make the arms race worse rather than reducing it.

The commentary also challenged Mr. Reagan's assertion that after World War II, the United States offered to turn its nuclear weapons over to an international authority so that, in Mr. Reagan's words, "No country would have such destructive power at its disposal."

"FALSIFYING FACTS," TASS SAYS

Tass called this account "a deliberate attempt at falsifying facts," adding that the United States, in its attacks on Japan, was the first nation to use nuclear weapons against civilian targets and "did not respond to the proposal advanced by the Soviet Union way back in 1945 to ban nuclear weapons."

Responding to Mr. Reagan's comment that Washington and Moscow "owe it to the rest of humanity" to help resolve local and regional conflicts elsewhere in the world, Tass said, "The world remembers who trampled down the independence of Grenada, and who violates the rights of Arab countries."

"Who if not U.S. secret services," the commentary went on, "raise their hand threateningly against whole countries and their governments, seeking by force of arms to impose 'American-style democracy.'"

BEHIND THE WORDS AT THE WORLD BANK

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a recent article in the Wall Street Journal, September 30, 1985, "Behind the Words at the World Bank." This article cites many examples of the World Bank's inconsistencies with regard to their encouragement of private enterprise.

Recently the World Bank has been credited with a "new awareness of the private sector." Even World Bank President A.W. Clausen has been quoted as "having praise for private enterprise." However, these recent promotions for private enterprise by the World Bank are not supported by its past record. Since 1981, World Bank loans to Communist countries have increased four times. In particular, bank President Clausen favors doubling its loans to China which are already at \$1 billion.

I strongly oppose any loans by the World Bank to Communist countries, especially since the United States is the World Bank's largest shareholder. It is imperative that we stop subsidizing Communist countries, or to paraphrase Lenin, "The capitalists will sell us the means by which we can destroy them." Earlier this year I introduced H.R. 97, which will prohibit all extensions of credit, credit guarantees, investment guarantees or grants by any agency of the U.S. Government to a Communist country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read this article which provides insight into how the World Bank is using our money to support Communist countries and what the World Bank is not doing to promote private enterprise. Again I strongly urge my fellow colleagues to support my bill, H.R. 97, which will stop all credit and loans to Communist countries.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 30, 1985]

BEHIND THE WORDS AT THE WORLD BANK

(By James Bovard)

As some 9,000 interested parties gather in Seoul this week for the World Bank's annual meeting, accolades will be heard for the bank's new awareness of the private sector, and its crucial role in spurring international development. But what changes the bank has made in recent years don't add up to an improvement.

Bank President A.W. Clausen often praises private enterprise these days, but the vast majority of World Bank loans still go to strengthen government bureaucracies and reinforce their control over the economy. Loans to communist countries alone have increased fourfold since 1981 and will constitute 13.4% of the bank's 1985 lending. The bank has been the driving force behind the nationalization of oil and natural gas throughout the Third World. And all the while, it has shown too little concern for human-rights violations in its projects.

SET CROPS ON FIRE

The bank has given the government of Indonesia more than \$600 million to remove—sometimes forcibly—several million people from the densely populated island of Java and resettle them on comparatively barren islands elsewhere in Indonesia. Despite reports of violence, the bank continues lauding the project as "the largest voluntary migration" in recent history.

The London-based Anti-Slavery Society for Human Rights reported to the United Nations that at least one supposedly vacant island being given to the migrants was already inhabited—and that the Indonesian army cleared the island by setting the original inhabitants' crops on fire. Indonesia is sending hundreds of thousands of migrants to the island of Irian Jaya—and the island's original inhabitants claim they are being driven from their lands by the Indonesian army. The Indonesian government is also resettling Javanese on the island of East Timor—which the army seized in 1975. According to a 1983 Washington Post account quoting relief workers, an estimated 150,000 of the island's 700,000 inhabitants were killed or left to die of starvation in the ensuing strike.

The transmigration project is supposed to make the migrants more productive. But the project mainly moves poor farmers from small amounts of good land to large amounts of nearly worthless land. The government often fails to honor its promises to provide water, roads, schools and tools. It costs about \$6,000 to move each family, yet most families that are moved end up making little or no income from their new habitats, and many who previously supported themselves in Java have gone on welfare.

The Polonoroeste project in Brazil is a similar fiasco. The bank has poured almost half a billion dollars into a scheme to move landless farmers into cleared areas in the Amazon tropical forests. But about all the project succeeded in doing was building a road and encouraging tens of thousands of people to move to an area with terrible farm land and almost no infrastructure. The project has pointlessly cut down hundreds of square miles of rain forests and engendered much violence between the new arrivals and the indigenous Indians. The bank specified in the original loan agreement with Brazil that the Indians' rights must be respected, but then did nothing when the Indians' lands were trampled. After two years' uproar by U.S. environmental groups and extensive congressional hearings, the bank has temporarily stopped funding the project.

To its credit, the bank has contributed funds to help privatize a few government corporations in Africa and Asia. But at the same time the bank is spending a few million dollars to resurrect private companies that previous bank loans often helped nationalize, it is pouring billions into maintaining state-owned enterprises (SOEs) throughout the Third World.

The bank's latest kick is "public sector improvement loans"—basically, transferring the cost of socialist inefficiency from the recipient government to the World Bank's donors. Morocco received \$200 million for "actions to improve public investment planning and the functioning of the public enterprise sector." Chile received \$11 million to help the government "orient and guide the process of resource allocations" among SOEs. Ecuador received \$14 million "to increase the public sector's contribution to economic growth by improving the management of key public enterprises."

The bank's biggest socialistic binge is occurring in energy projects. Most World Bank energy loans either displace foreign private investment or deter the development of private companies in recipient countries. World Bank 1985 energy loans include \$92 million to the Yugoslavian government for oil and gas exploration, \$233 million to the Pakistani government oil companies, \$248 million to the Indian government for coal-mine development, and \$110 million to the Bangladesh government for natural gas exploration. These loans do nothing to increase development—but only add to the size of Third World governments, breeding more bureaucrats and fewer entrepreneurs.

The biggest change at the bank since Mr. Clausen took over in 1981 is the huge increase in lending to communist countries. Since 1981, China, Romania, Ethiopia, Yugoslavia and Hungary have received more than \$6 billion—including almost \$2 billion in 1985. Even though China has easy access to commercial credit, Mr. Clausen favors doubling World Bank lending to China from the current \$1 billion a year. Nor is World Bank financing being used to pry China away from socialism—the bank gave China a \$47 million zero-interest, 50-year loan for the development of its state farms.

The bank also is busy subsidizing America's trade competitors. South Korea received \$556 million in World Bank loans this past year for purposes like providing "much needed capital for economically and financially viable industry projects" and enhancing rail capacity in the Seoul industrial corridor. South Korea is better managed than most World Bank borrowers—but, like most borrowers, it has long had easy access to commercial credit and need not rely on the bank's subsidies.

The bank, like most international organizations, has tried to use the African famine to drum up support to boost its own budget. Though much of Mr. Clausen's rhetoric is devoted to Africa's dire straits, barely 10% of the bank's 1985 loans have gone to sub-Saharan Africa. And the biggest beneficiary was Ethiopia.

This past year, much to the bank's embarrassment, its loan volume fell 7%. A classified internal World Bank memo late last year outlined plans to relax all types of loan requirements in order to spur borrower demand. The bank subsequently abolished its one-quarter percent "handling fee" on loans. The bank currently has \$17 billion in unlent cash reserves.

Despite the bank's inability to meet its loan goals, Mr. Clausen wants to expand. Earlier this year he said he hoped to request a \$40 billion increase in callable capital (existing total: \$55.8 billion), though he may be retreating from that goal now. Whatever, Mr. Clausen wants the bank to have a larger role in managing the international debt crisis—which would be akin to appointing Mrs. O'Leary's cow chief of the Chicago Fire Department.

BANK'S LARGEST SHAREHOLDER

Mr. Clausen and his predecessor, Robert McNamara, beat the bushes to encourage more commercial lending to Third World governments. Now we have a debt problem that is indeed serious, and foolish American banks are in trouble. But if the U.S. wants to bail out its banks it should give them the money directly and not launder the hand-outs through the World Bank and Third World governments.

Mr. Clausen's term as bank president expires in mid-1986. The U.S., as the bank's largest shareholder, has effective power to appoint a new bank president. One hopes the Reagan administration will find a replacement, but in the meantime the funding issue must be addressed.

The bank can sustain a lending level of \$13 billion a year simply by relying on its principal repayment and interest earnings. Its 1985 lending amounts to \$14.4 billion. That's more than enough to cover good projects to well-managed countries that do not have access to commercial credit. A poorer bank would be a wiser bank—and a better friend to the Third World.

A TRIBUTE TO RABBI JACOB AND MARJORIE PRESSMAN

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, we would like to ask you and our distinguished colleagues to join us in saluting two outstanding Los Angeles leaders, Rabbi Jacob and Marjorie Pressman.

On December 9, 1985, a gala banquet will be held to mark Rabbi Jacob Pressman's retirement as spiritual leader of Temple Beth Am. Rabbi Pressman has held the pulpit of this distinguished congregation for 35 years. During that period, Rabbi Pressman built Temple Beth Am into one of the largest and most dynamic conservative temples in the United States.

Rabbi Pressman has been a leader in numerous projects. Yet, his work has never lacked focus. His first concern has always been with our youth. He established and actively guided the Herzl Schools and the Beth Am Academy. He served not only the Jewish community but the larger community as well by establishing the Beverly Hills Maple Center—a guidance center designed to help young people and their families.

Rabbi Pressman's influence has been felt far beyond the Los Angeles and Beverly Hills communities. In Israel, Rabbi Jacob Pressman is revered as one of Israel's staunchest, most articulate, and most effective friends in the entire American rabbinate. Under Rabbi Pressman's dynamic leadership, Temple Beth Am has risen to the No. 1 position nationally in support of State of Israel bonds.

Despite the enormous burdens of guiding a huge congregation, Rabbi Pressman has served in leadership positions in virtually every rabbinical organization—from the local Board of Rabbis of Southern California to the National Rabbinical Assembly.

Marjorie Pressman has amazingly carried the considerable burdens of first lady" of Temple Beth Am and also vigorously and successfully pursued many interests of her own.

This remarkable woman used her talents as an administrator and an organizer to bring together a multifaceted event at Temple Beth Am called Israel Expo West. Attendance topped 50,000.

The same talents Mrs. Pressman brought to her temple and Jewish community activities, she has now brought to the world of commerce and enterprise. Mrs. Pressman may be the only rebbitzen—rabbi's wife—to serve as a vice president and director of a savings and loan. Mrs. Pressman holds those positions with Unity Savings & Loan Association which she helped found.

Such diverse organizations as the American Youth Symphony, the Women's League for Conservative Judaism, Hadassah, and the Beverly Hills Theatre Guild have benefited from the energy and talent of this remarkable woman.

The Pressmans are the proud parents of two sons and a daughter, and three grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, we ask that you and our colleagues join us in expressing praise and gratitude to Rabbi and Mrs. Pressman on the occasion of his retirement. We further ask that the leadership and Members of the House of Representatives join us in wishing these extraordinary Americans good health and many years of continued contributions to our community and our Nation.

THE 67TH ANNIVERSARY OF LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is of great importance to note that, on the eve of the Geneva summit between President Reagan and Soviet Leader Mikhail Gorbachev, Americans of Latvian descent will be celebrating, in exile, the 67th anniversary of that Baltic nation. Today marks that anniversary, which is bittersweet indeed. The Latvian heritage, so vibrant and rich, has been continually crushed underfoot by the Soviet Union, yet it is to the credit of these dedicated men and women that they stoically maintain their national identity.

The United States policy of nonrecognition of this domination on the part of the U.S.S.R. has been maintained for many years, and it is an important and intrinsic part of the Latvian struggle for freedom. On this date in 1918, the Latvian people declared themselves an independent nation, with a separate heritage, religion, and cultural and political outlook. That brief period of self-determination was soon swept away by the oppressive forces of the Soviet Union; the last decades having been spent in an ever-growing struggle to overcome this tyranny in order to reestablish the Latvian nation.

Mr. Speaker, when President Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev meet in Geneva, the issue of Latvian independence, and indeed, that of all the captive nations, must be on the agenda. We must take advantage of this opportunity to impress upon Soviet officials our commitment to this noble principle, and to the concepts embodied in the Helsinki Final Act. Men and women are not free if they do not feel free themselves—they are not free if their actions and writings are monitored and banned. The Latvian people have made their feelings known to us on many occasions, and it is incumbent upon us as Members of Congress to express our solidarity with them in their continuing aspiration for freedom from Soviet domination. Not to do so would be a grave injustice to them and to ourselves as a people.

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY— NOVEMBER 18, 1985

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 67th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Latvia. This small but proud country enjoyed independence from 1918 until 1940 when the dark hand of Soviet savagery choked the life out of Latvian freedom. Latvia remains an occupied territory of the Soviet Union, yet another "worker's paradise" in the still growing list of victims to vicious and relentless Soviet hegemony. Today, Latvians everywhere tenaciously strive to free their homeland from the grip of the Soviet Union. We in Congress must support the efforts of Latvians to keep the flame of Latvian freedom alive for this and future generations.

It is a particularly important time for those of us who enjoy freedom to focus attention on the plight of Latvia. Tomorrow, President Reagan meets with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in Geneva, Switzerland. It is appropriate that on the eve of this important event we remember the short-lived independence of the Republic of Latvia.

I know President Reagan will be thinking of Latvia and all the other free and independent countries that are no more, as he looks into the cold and calculating eyes of Mr. Gorbachev. We in this body should also remember the fate of Latvian freedom. It is important for all Americans to be fully aware of the sobering track record of our smiling adversary as our President prepares to meet him. We should not prejudge the potential results of this historic meeting. We also should not overlook, in the interests of conciliation, the history that precedes it. The illegal occupation of Latvia is an important and continuing element of that history.

THE HANDICAPPED CHILDREN'S PROTECTION ACT—RESTORING BASIC CIVIL RIGHTS

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the passage of H.R. 1523, the Handicapped Children's Protection Act of 1985. The defense of the rights of each individual in our Nation is the basis of the freedom and equality as we all enjoy. H.R. 1523 helps us reach this goal. It protects the educational rights of handicapped children by guaranteeing that handicapped children and their families receive the same civil rights protections Congress has extended to all other protected groups in attorney's fees laws.

The passage of this bill makes clear the original intent of Congress when it passed the Education of the Handicapped Act in 1975, which ensured that every child who is handicapped has the right to a free and fair education.

In 1984, the Supreme Court ruled in Smith versus Robinson that parents could not receive attorney's fees for hearings in which discrimination against their child by a school board was shown to have taken place. H.R. 1523 returns that right to the parents.

The House of Representatives, in passing H.R. 1523, has made clear that this issue is a fundamental matter of fairness and justice. How meaningful is the law if parents must fight through administrative and judicial hearings against publicly financed school administrations which arbitrarily decide to deny equal access to the system for handicapped children? How meaningful is the law if lower income families, who might otherwise not have the legal knowledge or the financial resources, cannot gain help in this grueling process?

The parents of handicapped children carry a great enough burden already and should be spared the additional emotional ordeal of fighting alone for their children's rights against skilled attorneys representing the school district. I am gratified that the House has acted to correct this error. By so doing we reassert the most basic principles of our heritage. We are providing to handicapped children and their parents the same rights that are provided to all other groups under the other Civil Rights Acts of the United States. These people deserve no less.

THE OLYMPIC FUNDING BILL

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation that will pro-

vide funds for our 1988 and future Olympic efforts.

The legislation is necessitated by the fact that the U.S. Olympic Committee is perhaps the only Olympic committee in the world that does not receive direct funding from its government. As the Members may recall, an Olympic checkoff bill was passed by the Senate in 1984. However, it was not accepted in the conference on the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 because of alleged complexity. Despite this, the need for funds to maintain and continue our Olympic efforts remains.

Under the bill a 10 percent tax would be imposed on the amount paid by any U.S. business for the rights to televise or broadcast an Olympic event in the United States. The tax would be contributed to a special Olympic trust fund. The amounts in this fund would be used to provide training facilities, coaches and other specialists for the summer and winter Olympic games. The bill would be applicable to the amounts paid for the rights to broadcast the 1988 winter and summer Olympic games.

The legislation is intended to impose a tax on the sale of rights to broadcast Olympic events in the United States whether the rights are sold by the host country Government or by an independent company or agency formed to sell or otherwise market these rights. The tax imposed by the bill will be fully creditable against any U.S. income or withholding tax otherwise due. Thus, the possibility of double taxation is removed.

The bill recognizes the fact that, in most, if not all foreign countries, the radio and television broadcast systems is owned by the government. The United States is unique in that it has a number of networks which compete for programming. As a result, unlike other foreign countries, the price bid for the right to broadcast Olympic events is a function of the competition which occurs between the networks. This competition, in effect, produces a windfall to the sponsors of the Olympic events, whether they be in the United States or some other foreign country. The effect of the Olympic excise tax would be to recoup a small portion of that windfall element. This seems only fair in view of the fact that the most significant component of the competitive bidding accrues to the sponsors of the Olympic games. Moreover, this approach recognizes that the Federal Government in the United States offers little, if any, assistance to the Olympic program. It is unlikely that such a tax will significantly raise the costs of acquiring U.S. broadcasts rights to U.S. television networks.

Since the sale of the broadcast rights for the 1988 winter and summer games has been completed I urge prompt consideration and passage of this bill. We all benefit from this legislation.

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO
THE HONORABLE GEORGE
EDWARD (NED) SHRIVER, PH.D.
OF NEW JERSEY 1985 "PAUL
HARRIS FELLOW," ROTARY
CLUB OF WAYNE

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, November 21, the residents of Wayne, my congressional district and State of New Jersey will join together with our fellow Rotarians at a testimonial dinner sponsored by the board of trustees of the Foundation for the Handicapped in honor of an outstanding community leader, distinguished citizen and good friend, the Honorable George Edward (Ned) Shriver, Ph. D. of New Jersey, whose standards of excellence throughout his lifetime have earned him the most highly coveted honor of being chosen 1985 Paul Harris Fellow of the Rotary Club of Wayne—the highest award that Rotary can bestow upon any of its members.

I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our heartiest congratulations to Ned Shriver and share the great pride of his good wife Alice May; son David and wife Elizabeth; son Douglas and wife Roanne; and grandchildren in applauding this milestone of achievement in their family endeavors.

The Rotary Club of Wayne is one of our Nation's most prestigious affiliates of Rotary International whose motto: "We make a living by what we get—we make a life by what we give—service above self"—and their good deeds in helping others, young and adults alike have served to inspire all of us. Dr. Shriver has by his example and lifetime of dedication to these same true American ideals personified exemplary leadership in his outstanding responsible service to our people.

Mr. Speaker, Ned Shriver has been a staunch supporter and active participant in many civic and community improvement programs and we applaud the quality of his leadership endeavors in the vanguard of service to people's needs. He was born in Baltimore, MD, on June 5, 1908. He lived in Baltimore until age 6, when after a severe respiratory illness he was sent to his paternal grandmother's home in the rolling hills of Westminster, MD. After grade schooling in Westminster he attended Western Maryland College, graduating in 1929 summa cum laude with a B.A. degree in chemistry. While in college he became cadet major, commanding the college ROTC battalion, played varsity tennis; was varsity head cheerleader; led the college dance orchestra, and played in a professional orchestra in Baltimore.

In the fall of 1929 he obtained a teaching fellowship in the chemistry department of New York University, with an annual stipend of \$900 for living expenses. Living in Greenwich Village he pursued graduate

studies in chemistry and physics, receiving an M.S. degree in 1932 and Ph.D. in physical chemistry in June 1934. He augmented his income during this period by playing saxophone in a semipro orchestra in Staten Island, NY.

In February 1935, Dr. Shriver accepted a position as research chemist at the general laboratories of the U.S. Rubber Co.—now known as Uniroyal—in Passaic, NJ. In 1943 he was appointed manager of the company's applied and operating research department where he directed a team of 90 scientists, engineers, and technicians in the areas of chemical, plastics, and synthetics rubber research and technology. Notable products that were commercialized by the company from this work include latex foam sponge, ABS high-impact plastics, improved synthetic rubber for tires, and chemicals for agricultural crop protection.

During World War II, he was exempted from military service because of his expertise in synthetic rubber technology. He was a member of the research advisory committee which met regularly to coordinate the industry-wide research on synthetic rubber under the auspices of the U.S. Government Rubber Reserve Organization.

In 1951 he was appointed manager of project planning and economic evaluations for Uniroyal's central research department. In this capacity he made numerous trips during the period 1954-60 to Cuba, Mexico, Great Britain, France, Germany, and Japan on technical surveys to assess foreign technology developments to assist top management of Uniroyal in formulating commercial policy.

From 1957 until his retirement in 1972, he was assistant director of the company's corporate research center in Wayne, responsible for the administration of project planning, budget preparation and all research service departments.

Mr. Speaker, this special tribute to Dr. Shriver has been sponsored by the board of trustees of the Foundation for the Handicapped, a sheltered workshop for physically and mentally handicapped adults, in testimony to his outstanding public service during his tenure as executive director of the foundation. It is important to note that the workshop was founded by the Wayne Rotary Club in an abandoned sewerage treatment plant in Wayne, NJ, in 1968. During that same year Dr. Shriver joined the Rotary Club as a representative of the Uniroyal Research Center of Wayne. He was chairman of the attendance committee from 1969-74. During this period he raised the club's, average weekly attendance from 75 percent to 90 percent. He also served 4 years on the board of directors of the Wayne Rotary Club attaining a perfect attendance record of 17 years.

Through his association with Rotary he became aware of the Foundation for the Handicapped and as coordinator for the move of Uniroyal from Wayne to Connecticut in 1972 he arranged for much surplus office furniture and production work tables to be donated to the workshop.

In 1973, after retiring from Uniroyal Corp., Ned took on the part-time job of executive director of the Foundation for the Handicapped, which at that time consisted of 13 handicapped workers servicing industry in a 1,200 square foot abandoned sewerage treatment plant.

Twelve years ago, the small company had a gross income of less than \$20,000, no assets, a substantial debt and a consumer list of six. Today, under Ned's direction, dedication, and just plain hard work, 55 of our handicapped citizens have a meaningful job, sales now exceed a quarter of a million dollars annually, a modern plant of 6,000 square feet, which is still growing and assets in the six figures. Perhaps the most significant factor is that all this was accomplished under Ned's leadership without 1 cent of Government subsidy.

The success of this privately run project has brought Wayne Rotary perennial recognition from Rotary District 749 and two citations from Rotary International. Dr. Shriver was made a Walter Head Fellow for his contribution in 1982. After a second career spanning 12 years he finally retired from his position as executive director in May 1, 1985, but is remaining on the board of directors.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed appropriate that we reflect on the deeds and achievements of our people who have contributed to the quality of life and way of life here in America. As we gather together on November 21 in tribute to Dr. Shriver's leadership endeavors and personal commitment dedicated to service to people. I know that you will want to join with the board of trustees of the Foundation for the Handicapped and the Rotary Club of Wayne, NJ in honoring our good friend Ned as an outstanding citizen and great American. We do indeed salute the Wayne Rotary Club's "Paul Harris Fellow"—Hon. George Edward (Ned) Shriver, Ph.D. of New Jersey.

NOVEMBER—NATIONAL ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE MONTH

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, the month of November marks National Alzheimer's Disease Month. Not only does this commemorative month underline our continued commitment to greater understanding of Alzheimer's disease, but it also represents the distance we have come in our recognition of the impact this devastating disease has on us all.

When I first came to Congress almost 7 years ago, not a single bill had been introduced to deal with the problems of Alzheimer's. In the 97th Congress, only three bills were introduced. By the 98th Congress, the total number had climbed to 26. And now, in this Congress, 24 bills have already been introduced, which I believe gives a strong indication of our growing commitment to those individuals and their families who suffer with Alzheimer's disease.

It has been estimated that between 3 and 4 million Americans suffer from some form of dementia, the majority of whom have Alzheimer's disease. One in three families will see a parent succumb of Alzheimer's, making it the fourth leading cause of death in this country. In most cases of Alzheimer's disease, the families will bear the brunt of the responsibility for care. A recent study has found that families provide 80 to 90 percent of needed personal care for older family members. Since the course of Alzheimer's disease may run anywhere from 3 to 20 years, the family commitment to the Alzheimer's victim is substantial. Only at the end stages of the disease do most families turn to institutionalization as a means of care. This family care comes at a high price, not only emotionally, but financially. For those requiring long-term care, the financial impact can be staggering. In all, the cost of care for Alzheimer's victims ranges between \$17,000 and \$50,000 per person per year, most of which is borne by the family.

During the last two Congresses, I have attempted to highlight and support the problems that caregiving creates for the entire family and to develop more skilled individuals to deliver that care. As a consequence, I have introduced legislation that would provide tax assistance to family caregivers. H.R. 468 would provide a deduction for taxpayers providing home care and adult day care to family members with Alzheimer's disease. As a part of the Economic Equity Act, I introduced H.R. 2527 which would expand the dependent care tax credit and make respite care an eligible expense. And just last month, Mr. CONTE, Mr. LEWIS, and I introduced H.R. 3523 which would provide a tax credit for home care, respite and adult day care, and nursing home care for families providing this care for family members with Alzheimer's disease.

I am pleased that legislation I introduced was incorporated into the Older Americans Act which now requires that special consideration be given to providing assistance to older persons with Alzheimer's disease and that priority for grants and contracts be given to students who specialize in the custodial or skilled care of victims of Alzheimer's disease. I have also introduced a package of legislation that targets the care of veterans who suffer from Alzheimer's disease as a means of assisting the Veterans' Administration in its planning for the rapidly growing number of aging veterans and the impact that can be expected from an increased number of Alzheimer's victims.

Increasingly, greater effort has been turned to understanding the biomedical aspects of Alzheimer's disease. I am pleased to note that, following a bill which I introduced to increase authorizations to the National Institutes of Health for research on Alzheimer's disease, the appropriations committee increased funding for basic research in this area. Secretary Heckler also established an interagency task force on Alzheimer's disease. That was the first concerted effort to elevate Alzheimer's to the level of recognition it so badly needed. And

while the money spent on research for Alzheimer's disease has increased rapidly in recent years, today only about \$150 million is spent on research on Alzheimer's disease. That amounts to only \$10 to \$20 per Alzheimer's victim as compared to cancer research which spends about \$200 per cancer sufferer.

While we can all take some satisfaction in the strides we have made, we have only begun to address the difficult issues associated with this disease. The issue of home and institutional care will persist until we can develop a coordinated system of long-term care that provides a range of financing mechanisms that include both private and public financing. That is but one of the larger tasks that looms for us in the coming years.

It is fitting that the month in which we celebrate Thanksgiving, a family holiday, should be the month chosen to give special thought to those who suffer from Alzheimer's disease because Alzheimer's is a family issue.

CARDINAL O'CONNOR'S COMMITMENT TO HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my colleagues of a noble undertaking by John Cardinal O'Connor of the New York Diocese on the eve of President Reagan's summit conference in Geneva with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

At a recent meeting with members of the Rabbinical Assembly, an international organization of 1,200 conservative rabbis, Cardinal O'Connor stated, "The story of Jewish and Christian suffering in the Soviet Union must be told to every man, woman and child. We cannot be rebuffed in this mission to educate everyone regarding this deprivation of human rights." He then stated that he intended to lead Catholic members of his diocese in lighting candles this evening for world peace, for the release of Soviet Jewish prisoners of conscience, and that every Jew and Christian in the Soviet Union be permitted to worship and study without harassment.

Mr. Speaker, this evening, hundreds of communities across the country will heed Cardinal O'Connor's call, and in solidarity with their brethren behind the Iron Curtain, candles will flicker from coast to coast. Many of us remember Cardinal O'Connor's sincere and committed gesture to religious freedom and human rights when he had the doors of St. Patrick's Cathedral opened in support of Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry. On the steps of the cathedral, Cardinal O'Connor put his words into action, as he will again demonstrate this evening. This significant expression of solidarity is highly appreciated by us all and Cardinal O'Connor is to be lauded for his leadership.

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on November 18, 1918, the modern Republic of Latvia was established as a free and independent country, and the courageous Latvian people proclaimed their right as a nation to stand proudly among the other free countries of the world.

The Latvian Republic rose out of the death and destruction of World War I, and had every hope of success. The Latvians proved their devotion to democracy by establishing a representative government with a parliament, a cabinet, a president, and freely organized parties. With a strong sense of national purpose and educated devoted leaders committed to the cause of freedom, the Latvians began to boldly initiate new economic, social, and political programs.

Latvia was one of the first European countries to reform their financial system, and their land reform law of 1920 was a model of fair, democratic dispersal of feudal estates. This division of land ended forever the supremacy of the Baltic nobles over the vast majority of the population.

By 1937, there were over 5,500 industrial enterprises in Latvia, and 70,000 farmers had enrolled in more than 2,300 educational societies. The national income increased despite the depression experienced in other parts of the world, and the Latvian National Banks' assets rose significantly. By 1939, Latvia was almost completely self-supporting.

Sadly, however, in June 1940, Latvia, along with the other Baltic States, was invaded, and brutally occupied by the Red army. The Communists cynically disregarded their earlier treaty commitments recognizing the sovereignty of Latvia. Today, although the Communists continue in their attempts to destroy the heritage and culture of the Latvians, the determined spirit of the Latvian people is still unbroken, as they continue in their fight to free Latvia.

This year, a panel of judges sponsored by the World Baltic Conference convened in Copenhagen to hear testimony on Soviet crimes committed against citizens of the Baltic States, and at this point in the RECORD, I would like to include an article which appeared in the July 31, 1985 edition of the Wall Street Journal, which describes some of the testimony at this Conference. The article follows:

BALDIC WITNESS AGAINST THE SOVIET TYRANNY

(By Seth Lipsky)

COPENHAGEN.—The community of exiled Balts put the Soviet Union on trial here last week. Before a panel of judges, convened at the Hotel Scandinavia by the World Baltic Conference, witnesses testified on Soviet crimes in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in the years since those nations were taken captive under the terms of Stalin's pact with Hitler. Exiles, including many assimilated into Western life, came to hear others,

some recently arrived, report on the Russification of their homelands, a process that represses native culture, language and politics and replaces it with an alien ideology from Moscow. The verdict seemed clear enough. Then the group took a chartered ship up the Baltic coast to gain a glimpse of the lost lands.

As protests go, it wasn't much; the 150 or so people involved included almost no famous figures, although one legendary Soviet dissident, Vladimir Bukovsky, was on hand. But the fate of the Balts is something to think about as the glitterati gather in Finland this week to congratulate themselves on the signing a decade ago of the Helsinki Final Act. It reminds us that statesmen can sign all the documents they want, whether they be Molotov and Ribbentrop inking the 1939 Russo-German pact or Gerald Ford, Leonid Brezhnev and a few others putting their names to the 1975 Helsinki accords. Still, the claims individuals hold in their hearts have a way of haunting the diplomats.

The World Baltic Conference found its mark in Helsinki in 1973, when the ground work was under way on the now notorious Final Act. The conference, then a year old, had sent a delegation to Helsinki to press free Baltic interests. One of their number—a Latvian named Uldis Grava, who otherwise works as a marketing man for the Newspaper Advertising Bureau in New York—got invited to a press reception at the East German embassy, where he ended up face to face with the Soviet foreign minister, Andrei Gromyko. The ensuing conversation so angered Gromyko that he stalked out of the reception and had the Finnish government arrest the Baltic delegates at their hotel. It took the American secretary of state—then William Rogers—to get the Balts bailed out. They've been getting the Soviet goat ever since.

The gathering here last week is the latest example. Tass went into a tizzy. It used adjectives like "recidivist burglar" and "alcoholic troublemaker" to describe witnesses against the Russification of the Baltic nations. The Soviets sent to Copenhagen their own delegation of captive Balts, with Russian escorts, to tell local newspapers that everything back home was peaches and cream. Their claims won't emerge as credible with those who followed the testimony, some in writing, some in person, of the free Balts. They conveyed not merely the humiliation of an invasion by the Red Army, such as struck the Baltic nations in 1940; they emphasized the more maddening attempts, under way in Tallin, Riga and Vilnius, to erase the concept of a nation.

A defector, Valdo Randpere, formerly assistant to the Estonian minister of justice, told how the legal code of the Russian republic was transferred to Estonia. A young Russian, Sergei Zamasckov, who was educated in Latvia, defected in 1979 and now lives in Los Angeles, described university reserve officers training classes, where future Soviet military leaders hear condemnations of Latvian ethnic traditions considered to be "bourgeois nationalism." A one-time Lithuanian communist now teaching in England, Alexander Shtromas, spoke of those "who grew old only to realize the monstrosity of the cause they chose to serve." A former Soviet tobogganer and now a Munich housewife, Rita Bruvere, told of Russians telling Latvians on an overcrowded bus in Riga: "We slaughtered too few of you fascists."

Then there was the case of an ex-agent in the Latvian KGB, Imants Lesinskis, now

living in the U.S. under a new name. The World Baltic Conference wrote to him at the post office box through which he maintains contact, and he agreed to participate. He was put on the schedule. Two hours before he was to testify in Copenhagen, he telephoned regrets, as too many spies were around. At 8:30 the next morning, though, according to a conference organizer, Mr. Lesinskis walked into the hotel. He appeared uncomfortable amid the photographers and met conference officials in private. He asked to be driven into the city. His escort of Balts drove him about town, and when he was satisfied he wasn't being tailed, he got out of the car and walked into the train station and out of sight.

So it goes on the front lines of the Cold War. On Sunday, the Baltic Star docked at Helsinki, after its charter up the coast. About 400 Balts staged what the Associated Press called "Finland's first major anti-Soviet protest" since the Warsaw Pact invaded Czechoslovakia in 1968. Mr. Bukovsky, who spent 15 years in Soviet labor camps, was the demonstration's featured speaker. The 10 years since the signing of the Final Act, Mr. Bukovsky told a crowd of 2,000, "have been marked by the communist authorities by the increased aggression, by the unprecedented arms buildup, by the support of international terrorism, by the increase of repression, by jamming radio broadcasts, by imprisoning anybody who is willing to speak out."

Few think the free Balts, in their persistent vigil, threaten the Soviets—except, it would seem, the Soviets themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the Latvian people have experienced the denial of civil rights and fundamental freedoms, and on this 67th anniversary of Latvian Independence Day, it is a most appropriate occasion to reaffirm our sympathy for the aspirations of the Latvian people in their struggle to resist the tyrannical communistic system. I am privileged to join with Americans of Latvian descent in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, which I am honored to represent, and Latvian-Americans throughout the Nation who continue to work and pray for the day when Latvia will once again be a free and independent state.

THE PEOPLE'S FIREHOUSE: A DECADE OF DEDICATION AND DETERMINATION

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 10th anniversary of a remarkable community organization, the People's Firehouse of Brooklyn. It began as a grassroots effort to prevent the city of New York from closing Engine Company 212, the firehouse which provided protection to the residents of the northside and North Greenpoint communities.

This neighborhood is an older ethnic residential area characterized by an aging housing stock, struggling small businesses, and industries. But it is blessed with a wealth of talented, energetic people who have deep ties to the area's churches, insti-

tutions, and organizations. Faced with this threat to their very survival, they decided to organize, fight, and beat City Hall.

In the best traditions of American democracy, the men and women of the People's Firehouse, led by its president, Adam Veneski, have the pioneering spirit. They are willing to "do it themselves," and they never take no for an answer.

Arson plagued both businesses and residents. The People's Firehouse decided to find a way to prevent arson and improve the fire safety of older buildings. Fritz Ringle, executive director of the firehouse, and Ron Webster, the director of housing and development, talked to experts and went to City Hall, Albany, and Washington. They researched the Byzantine Building codes, fire laws, and insurance records. They identified buildings likely to succumb to arson and informed city and State agencies of the risk. Then the firehouse organized merchants and tenants, taught them fire safety and arson prevention, and interested them in neighborhood improvement.

The enthusiasm and initiative of the firehouse attracted attention. Foundations and Government became interested in supporting their efforts. Arson rates came tumbling down in the neighborhood; and the new organizations of tenants, homeowners, and businessmen started to work together on housing and economic development programs. Adam Veneski decided it was time to take this antiarson campaign on the road. If they could save this neighborhood in Brooklyn, then hundreds of other communities threatened with blight and destruction could also be saved. Housing and businesses could be rebuilt and new jobs created in older neighborhoods.

The People's Firehouse is composed of determined, professional community activists who know the virtue of being prepared and the power of persistence. They listen to what is asked, they learn their facts, and they deliver cost-effective and practical programs that save hundreds of lives and millions of dollars.

The firehouse has become the catalyst of a national lobby effort, and Congress provided \$1 million for community-based fire safety and antiarson programs.

The need for decent, safe, affordable housing in the neighborhood has also kept the firehouse staff busy for the past 10 years. Recently, after countless proposals, plans, meetings, and hard lobbying, the firehouse won 72 apartments for the elderly and handicapped under the Federal 202 Program. The Alexis Jarka Hall, which will rise at 184 Metropolitan Avenue, is one of the few grants given to Brooklyn this year. It would not have happened if the firehouse had been willing to take "no" for an answer.

I am proud to pay tribute to the People's Firehouse and its dedicated, determined community activists who have devoted the past 10 years of their lives to making their community a better place to live and work. Men like Adam Veneski prove that Americans are still willing to volunteer, to roll up their sleeves, work long hours, and take dozens of bus trips to Albany or Washing-

ton to make sure that Government doesn't forget the power of the people or its obligation to provide for the well-being of all our citizens.

I am pleased to have been able to work with the People's Firehouse to preserve this community and to have played a role in their effort to convince the Federal Government to undertake an improved national fire safety and antiarson program. These are accomplishments of which we all can be proud.

Today I wish that the fiery determination, consuming commitment, and flaming idealism that have characterized the first 10 years of the firehouse remain unquenched in the years ahead.

People's Firehouse—take a bow!

GENEVA SUMMIT

HON. DOUGLAS H. BOSCO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. BOSCO. Mr. Speaker, as the November 19-20 summit meeting between President Reagan and Soviet leader Gorbachev approaches, it is vitally important that congressional attention continue to be focused on the plight of Soviet Jews. In so doing, we may help ensure that this important issue be given a high priority at the upcoming Geneva talks.

I rise today to ask my colleagues to take a few minutes to read the following profile of a second Soviet refusenik that I have adopted, Mr. Alexander Kushnir. Alexander is a 37-year-old construction engineer residing in Odessa. Because he desires to emigrate to Israel to join his mother and younger brother, he has been unable to find work in his profession. Alexander's mother and brother left the Soviet Union for Israel in 1973. However, Alexander was unable to apply to leave because 5 years had not elapsed since his demobilization from the Navy where he had served from 1969-70. In the Soviet Union at least 5 years must elapse following military service before one is likely to be allowed to leave the country. Since first becoming eligible for an exit visa, Alexander has been refused six times.

While waiting for permission to leave, Alexander participates in Hebrew lessons and seminars on Judaism along with other refuseniks. He and his friends have also celebrated Jewish festivals together. For this activity, they were warned in December 1982 not to associate with other activists among Jewish refuseniks.

Alexander Kushnir's tragic predicament exemplifies the plight of many thousands of Soviet Jews. Soviet Jews are arbitrarily singled out as a group and denied fundamental human rights, including the right to freedom of religious and cultural expression. Yet, while faced with constant persecution, Soviet Jews are prevented from emigrating to Israel or other nations where they might live and worship freely. Moreover, many Jews like Alexander who are

separated from their families are cruelly denied the right to join them in other countries.

Mr. Speaker, for the 400,000 Soviet Jews who await exit visas, the upcoming Geneva summit meeting offers renewed hope. I would hope that our President's effective communication skills might persuade Soviet leaders to agree to a swift resolution to the issue of Jewish emigration and human rights for Soviet Jews.

PAN AMERICAN FLIGHT MARKS GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. BEN GARRIDO BLAZ

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. BLAZ. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, a young boy on Guam stood with his father by a picturesque cove to witness an event he would never forget. As he stood there watching a silvery flying boat descend gracefully over the glistening tropical lagoon, he had no way of knowing he was about to witness an historic event, a milestone in American aviation history.

When the strange looking aircraft gently touched down on the calm waters of Sumay, Guam, Pan American World Airways had completed its first commercial crossing of the Pacific Ocean. The *China Clipper* was only a day's flight over the Philippine Sea to Manila, the final stop on the record-setting voyage.

I was that boy. Now, 50 years later, I am honored to be able to help mark the anniversary by participating in a special Pan American World Airways commemorative flight. Pan American will celebrate the golden anniversary of service across the Pacific on November 22 by staging a nostalgic reenactment of the fabled *Clipper's* pioneering flight between San Francisco and Manila.

I call this historic event to the attention of my colleagues in recognition of Pan American's contribution toward making the U.S. aviation industry preeminent in the world.

This anniversary also serves to focus attention on the huge expanse of the Pacific Ocean and how recent our conquest of its vast distances has been. Bridging the Pacific has had a tremendous impact on America's commercial and political relations with Asia and expanded the territory of Guam's role as America's transportation and communications hub of the Western Pacific.

The anniversary flight will be on a Boeing 747 Jet Clipper named *China Clipper II* in honor of the Martin 130 flying boat that inaugurated commercial air service across the world's largest ocean. *China Clipper II* will fly the exact route of her namesake, making stops at Honolulu, Midway, Wake, and Guam, a flying distance of 8,210 statute miles.

The 1935 trip took 6 days, 7 hours and 46 minutes. The Pan Am Boeing 747 anniversary flight will cover the journey in less than a day—a striking testament to the

role Pan American has played in making the four corners of the world within our easy reach.

A TRIBUTE TO ALIE RANDLETT

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to honor Alie Randlett, who has decided to return to New Jersey after 4 years of service as director of the State of New Jersey Washington office.

As the director, Alie has had to work on very important matters affecting New Jersey. She has served her position in the New Jersey Washington office with distinction and provided the State with a valuable asset here in Washington. Alie was an efficient administrator whose loyal help and endless support will be hard to match.

Alie Randlett has set high standards that people should seek to emulate. I commend you, Alie, for a job well done and I wish you all the best and good luck in your future endeavors.

CONGRATULATIONS ON CITIZENSHIP

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate one of my interns, Marcelo Mottes, who, on Friday, became a U.S. citizen.

Marcelo and his family came to the United States from Argentina 10 years ago and since that time have worked hard to build a life for themselves in this country. At the same time, they have remembered their roots in Latin America. Their new citizenship marks a proud moment in their family's history.

I am particularly proud of Marcelo, who is a special example of someone who has come to this country and, in spite of the difficulties posed by a new culture and way of life, has persevered and been rewarded for his efforts. As my American Studies Program intern for this fall, he went through an extremely selective screening program which chose 40 students from 73 different colleges around the country. I am particularly excited for him because of the unique opportunity this internship program gives students to see up close how our Government works.

I also consider myself lucky, because Marcelo has been a pleasure to work with and a tremendous help in the office. I know that my staff joins me in congratulating him on this happy occasion and wishing him great success in his future as an American citizen.

YELENA BONNER

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, reports that Yelena Bonner, wife of Nobel Peace Prize laureate Andrei Sakharov, has been given permission to leave the Soviet Union for medical treatment are encouraging. Those of us who have been advocates for the Sakharovs and have witnessed firsthand the hardships this brave couple has endured are hopeful that this information is accurate.

Ms. Bonner's being permitted to go abroad may be a Soviet initiative indicating some awareness of the human rights issues which may be central to the summit meeting between Soviet leader Gorbachev and President Reagan. Since the state of détente between the United States and the Soviet Union—of which the Helsinki accords were a product—we have seen a worsening of East-West relations. This deterioration can be partially attributed to differing interpretations of the highest law involving individual rights and freedoms. Before any other question, whether political or economic, can be resolved between the United States and the Soviet Union, the human rights question must be addressed.

If the Soviet leadership decides to let Yelena Bonner get the medical attention she desperately needs, they will be sending a sorely needed signal to the world. This gesture could prove that this Government is not immune to world opinion. However, this signal alone will not appease the millions of Soviet citizens who are denied their liberty and justice.

I am hopeful that Ms. Bonner will receive medical treatment. I am also hopeful that this action signifies a more flexible position by the Soviet Government on human rights issues. While we focus on new arms control measures and the November summit, we must never lose sight of the plight of the Sakharovs, and others like them, whose fate remains uncertain.

MONTEREY HONORS ITS NATIONALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY RENOWNED RESTAURATEURS—TED BALESTRERI AND BERT CUTINO

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform my colleagues that the people of Monterey will gather on November 10 to honor two of our most successful and well-known businessmen, Ted Balestreri and Bert Cutino, the owners of the renowned Sardine Factory in Monterey's Cannery Row.

Ted and Bert, who I am proud to say have been good friends of mine for many

years, are being honored for the contribution they have made to the tourism and hospitality industry along the California coastline, which is one of the mainstays of the economy not only of coastal communities but of the entire State.

The Sardine Factory is well known as one of the finest restaurants in the Nation. It has received a number of prestigious awards, including the Ivy Award, the Travel/Holiday Magazine Award, the Nation's Restaurant News Hall of Fame Award, the Mobil Travel Guide Award, the Signature Award of the Diners Club, the Business Executives Dining Award, Wine Spectator's Grand Award, and the Knights of the Vine's Gold Vine Award. In addition, it has been named by the *Armstrong Gourmet Guide* as one of California's Top 10 Restaurants and was one of 50 restaurants selected to serve at the last two Presidential inaugurations.

Ted and Bert also operate the Carmel Butcher Shop in Carmel, the Rouge Restaurant on Fisherman's Wharf in Monterey, and the San Simeon Restaurant near the Hearst Castel in San Simeon. In addition, they own a number of real estate ventures together.

Ted was born in Brooklyn, NY, and moved to the Monterey Peninsula in 1957. He graduated from Carmel High School in 1958 and attended Monterey Peninsula College as well as Lewis Management School in Washington, D.C. He has worked in the hospitality industry as everything from busboy to owner.

Ted has been very active in the hospitality industry both locally and nationally. He currently serves as president of the National Restaurant Association. He is a past president of the California Restaurant Association and is also past chairman of the Executive and Finance Committee of the CRA. He is a member of the board of trustees for the National Institute for the Foodservice Industry and is a member of the Corporation of the Culinary Institute of America. Ted serves on the State of California's Tourism Corporation as well as on the California Tourism Commission.

Locally, Ted is a past president and one of the founders of the Monterey Peninsula Hotel and Restaurant Association. He is also a founder and past president of the Northern California Restaurant Association, which he helped move into a merger with the Southern California Restaurant Association to form the California Restaurant Association.

Ted has also served as regional director of the Monterey Peninsula Chapter of the Wine Investigation for Novices and Oenophiles and is currently a Master Knight in the Monterey Chapter of The Brotherhood of the Knights of the Vine. He served as bailli of the Monterey Chapter of the Confrerie de la Chaine des Rotisseurs.

In the community, Ted has been appointed to serve on the Monterey County Sheriff's Advisory Council and is chairman of the Membership Committee of the Monterey Chamber of Commerce.

In 1981, Ted received the Restaurant Hospitality Magazine's Hall of Fame Award, and in 1982, he received the Gold Plate Award from the American Academy of Achievement. He has also received the Outstanding Hospitality Professional Award from the Monterey Peninsula Hotel and Restaurant Association and the Silver Plate Award and the prestigious Gold Plate Award from the International Foodservice Manufacturers Association.

Ted and his wife, Velma, have two sons and live in Pebble Beach.

Bert Cutino was born in Monterey and graduated from Monterey High School in 1957. He received an A.A. degree from Monterey Peninsula College in 1964 after attending at night while working full time in restaurants.

Bert started his restaurant career at the age of 13, and has worked as everything from dishwasher and chef to manager and owner.

Bert's specialty has always been the culinary arts. He is a certified executive chef and a member of the American Culinary Federation and the American Academy of Chefs, which is the honor society of the American Culinary Federation. He is also a member of the American Institute for Food and Wine, founded by Julia Child, and is a member of the Confrerie de la Chaine des Rotisseurs, in which he holds the office of vice chancellor-argenter. He is also a member of the Wine Investigation for Novices and Oenophiles and a Master Knight of the Monterey Chapter of Knights of the Vine. He is a member of the Guild of Sommeliers from England and the Toques Blanches International Society.

Locally, Bert has served as president, vice president, and secretary of the Monterey Peninsula Chefs Association. He is currently its chairman of the board. In 1982, he founded the Culinary Arts Salon held at the California Wine Festival in Monterey.

Bert helped institute the culinary program at Monterey Peninsula College and has also been active with the college as a guest lecturer and a strong supporter of education in the culinary arts. Bert is a vice president of the Monterey Peninsula Chamber of Commerce and is a member of the Chamber's Visitor Education Committee.

In 1982, Bert received both the Distinguished Alumni Award from the California Association of Colleges and the Monterey Peninsula Chefs Association President's Award for outstanding service. In 1983, the Chefs Association named him Chef of the Year, and he was chosen as the California Restaurant Association Chef of the Year in 1984.

Bert, his wife, Bella, and their daughter and two sons live in Monterey.

Mr. Speaker, Ted Balestreri and Bert Cutino have made tremendous contributions to the Monterey Peninsula, and the community is going to give them a well-deserved tribute. I know my colleagues join me in congratulating them and their families and in wishing them the best of luck in the future.

SALUTING VICTORY OUTREACH

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me today in saluting the Victory Outreach Program which will be celebrating its 18th anniversary on November 20.

Victory Outreach has provided assistance to thousands of individuals throughout the southwestern United States who are involved with substance abuse and gang activity. The program has established over 50 sites in California alone. Founded by Rev. Cruz Arguninzi and his wife, Julie, Victory Outreach has provided spiritual guidance and help to men and women with drug and family problems.

The program has been recognized by many Federal, State, county, and community agencies for its outstanding work. I, too, now recognize and join in congratulating Victory Outreach for these many years of successful service and ministering to those in need.

HONORING SHERWIN BIEBER OF QUEENS COUNTY, NY

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1985

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Sherwin Bieber of Queens County, NY, who will be honored by the Israel Center of Hillcrest Manor on behalf of the United Jewish Appeal-Federation Campaign on Sunday, November 17, 1985.

Sherwin Bieber is a veteran leader in Jewish communal and synagogue life in Queens; he is one of those dedicated New Yorkers who has been responsible for the strength of that community. Sherwin is the honorary president of the Israel Center of Hillcrest Manor, and he is a former Queens cabinet member for the UJA-Federation campaign. He also represented Queens this year as a delegate to the World Council of Synagogues, and he has won many prestigious awards from major national and international Jewish organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I have been particularly impressed with Sherwin Bieber's deep commitment to strengthening the Jewish community of Queens. Not only has he been involved in a wide range of organizations, but he consistently has looked ahead to anticipate the challenges that the Jewish community as a whole must face.

Mr. Speaker, I call now on all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Sherwin Bieber as he is honored by his own community, and to wish him every success as he continues to be an important leader in Queens County.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, November 19, 1985, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

NOVEMBER 20

9:00 a.m.

Armed Services

To continue hearings on the organization and decision-making procedures of the Department of Defense and the Congress.

SR-253

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

Finance

To resume hearings to review U.S. trade policy.

SD-215

Select on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.

SH-219

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee

Business meeting, to mark up S. 1578, to improve procedures for the implementation of compacts providing for the establishment and operation of regional disposal facilities for low-level radioactive waste.

SD-406

Governmental Affairs

Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Government Processes Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the 1985 Conferences on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and on the International Atomic Energy Agency.

SD-342

Judiciary

Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1384, to clarify the operation of the derivative works

exception of the Copyright Act of 1976.

SD-226

11:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-419

Conferees

On H.R. 3424, appropriating funds for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies.

H-140, Capitol

11:15 a.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings on S. 1655, to provide for the private enforcement of prohibitions concerning the importation or sale of merchandise in U.S. commerce.

SD-226

2:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of Paul M. Cleveland, of Florida, to be Ambassador to New Zealand, and Laurence W. Lane, Jr., of California, to be Ambassador to Australia, and to serve concurrently as Ambassador to the Republic of Nauru.

SD-419

Judiciary

To resume closed hearings on the nomination of Stanley Sporkin, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

S-407, Capitol

3:30 p.m.

Rules and Administration

Business meeting, to consider S. Res. 204, to authorize supplemental expenditures by the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, S.J. Res. 214, to provide for the reappointment of Carlisle H. Humelsine as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and S.J. Res. 215, to provide for the reappointment of William G. Bowen, as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and other pending legislative and administrative business.

S-207, Capitol

NOVEMBER 21

9:00 a.m.

Armed Services

To continue hearings on the organization and decision-making procedures of the Department of Defense and the Congress.

SD-138

*Judiciary

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-226

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Aviation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings to examine government policies regarding airline mergers and acquisitions, and the impact of such transactions on airline employees.

SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Regulation and Conservation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings to review Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Order 436, final rule and notice requesting supplemental comments on regulation of natural gas pipelines

after partial wellhead decontrol (Docket No. RM85-1-000).

SD-366

Finance

To continue hearings to review U.S. trade policy.

SD-215

10:00 a.m.

Select on Intelligence

Closed briefing on intelligence matters by officials of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

SH-219

2:00 p.m.

Armed Services

Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the ABM Treaty relating to the Strategic Defense Initiative program.

SR-232A

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of Charles R. Carlisle, of Vermont, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as United States Negotiator on Textile Matters, and Jose Manuel Casanova, of Florida, to be United States Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank.

SD-419

Judiciary

To hold hearings to review the antitrust provisions of S. 638, Conrail Sale Amendments Act of 1985 (pending on Senate Calendar).

Room to be announced

Labor and Human Resources

Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee

Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Higher Education Act.

SD-430

NOVEMBER 22

9:30 a.m.

Finance

Savings, Pensions and Investment Policy Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1250, to extend the targeted jobs income tax credit for 5 years.

SD-215

NOVEMBER 27

9:30 a.m.

Select on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.

SH-219

DECEMBER 3

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To resume hearings on S. 812, to authorize the President to restrict the export or transfer of money or other financial assets to countries subject to national security export controls.

SD-538

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on S.J. Res. 192, to authorize financial assistance for the Northern Mariana Islands, and S. 1441, to provide for a plan to govern the use and/or disposal of Federal lands by Guam.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Armed Services

To hear and consider the nomination of Russell A. Rourke, of Maryland, to be

Secretary of the Air Force, and to consider routine military nominations.

SD-138

Environment and Public Works

To hold oversight hearings on the Acid Rain Precipitation Assessment program

SD-406

Judiciary

Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Administrative Conference of the United States.

SD-226

Labor and Human Resources

Children, Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the issues of child-care, focusing on education, job training and the labor market.

SD-430

DECEMBER 4

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on the nominations of Ralph W. Tarr, of Virginia, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, Gerald R. Riso, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Policy, Budget and Administration, and J. Steven Griles, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Land and Minerals Management.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-406

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on the impact of space technology on human resources.

SD-430

DECEMBER 5

9:30 a.m.

Office of Technology Assessment

The Board, to meet to discuss pending business.

EF-100, Capitol

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on the nominations of Donna R. Fitzpatrick, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Conservation and Renewable Energy), and Mary L. Walker, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environment, Safety and Health).

SD-366

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to review the health, soil, and forest effects of acid precipitation.

SD-406

DECEMBER 6

9:15 a.m.

Finance

Health Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review possible reforms in the Federal supplementary medical insurance program (Medicare Part B) payments for physicians' services.

SD-215

32286

9:30 a.m.

Joint Economic

To hold hearings on the employment/
unemployment situation for November.

Room to be announced

DECEMBER 10

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Water and Power Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1785, to amend
the Garrison diversion project in
North Dakota.

SD-366

Environment and Public Works

Toxic Substances and Environmental
Oversight Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on environmental
effects of global atmospheric
warmings.

SD-406

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

10:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on the nomination of
Jeffrey I. Zuckerman, of Maryland, to
be General Counsel of the Equal Employment
Opportunity Commission.

SD-430

DECEMBER 11

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending
calendar business.

SD-366

DECEMBER 12

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending
calendar business.

SD-366

November 18, 1985

CANCELLATIONS

NOVEMBER 20

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To resume hearings to examine certain
barriers to health care.

SD-430

NOVEMBER 21

4:00 p.m.

Select on Intelligence

Closed briefing on worldwide intelligence
matters.

SH-219

4:30 p.m.

Select on Intelligence

Closed briefing on technology transfer
and Soviet research and development.

SH-219