SENATE—*Friday, October 12, 1984*

(Legislative day of Monday, September 24, 1984)

The Senate met at 11 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, 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.

Word has just been received of the death of Senator MATTINGLY's brother. The Senator is with the family now in Indiana. Let us observe a moment of silence for them.

Almighty God, Sovereign Lord of the universe, Creator, Sustainer, Consummator of history, the prophet Isaiah declared that "the nations are like a drop from a bucket" to You. We see Earth from space as a blue marble and are aware of our tiny place in the cosmos. Yet You have extended Your preferential love toward us in the person of Your Son. You have created us free to choose and responsible for the consequences, yet in Your sovereignty You work with the human equation to bring to pass Your ultimate purposes for our benefit.

You know, gracious Lord, the complications of this extended session in aborted plans, family disappointments, rearrangement of schedules, added pressure of campaign commitments. "We trust You to work in all of this for good to those who love You and are called according to Your purpose." (Romans 8:28.)

May Your name be hallowed—Your kingdom come—Your will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven. Keep us in Your loving care while we are absent one from another. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

THE CHAPLAIN'S PRAYER

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have to confess I wondered how the Chaplain would approach this session today. His prayer, as always, was excellent—indeed outstanding. But the part of it that caught my fancy was where he asked us to be protected while we are absent each from the other. I devoutly wish for that result as soon as possible.

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, let me try to summarize the situation as I see it. The motion to reconsider the vote by which the debt limit resolution was not adopted is pending. At some point today, that motion is debatable and at some point, it is the intention of the leadership on this side to ask the Senate to vote on that resolution. Until I have an opportunity to confer with the minority leader and discuss the situation in general, I am not prepared to make an announcement of an approximate time for that but I do not anticipate that it will occur immediately.

THE ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

Mr. President, I do not anticipate that the Senate will be asked to take up any other matter with one possible exception. That is an adjournment resolution. I shall consult and confer as well with the minority leader on that. But Members should be mindful of the fact that we passed an adjournment resolution which has been adopted by the House of Representatives and is therefore the law which provides for sine die adjournment of the Congress no later than midnight tonight. I wish for that result but I am not certain of that result. It may be necessary to enact another adjournment resolution.

I have attempted to contact the Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the House. I have not yet been able to do that but I am sure I will before this day is much older. I am afraid that is as much as I can say right now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my time under the standing order may be reserved for my use at any time during the remainder of this day.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may reserve the minority leader's time for his use later today.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, may I ask the majority leader if no other Senator is speaking—I understand there are no special orders—if I may proceed as if in morning business.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, since no leader time is reserved, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business until not later than the hour of 12:30 p.m., in which Senators may speak for not more than 10 minutes each with the exception of the two leaders, against whom no limitation of time applies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR PROPONENTS OF THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION TO REDOUBLE OUR EFFORTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday's 87-to-2 vote in favor of Senate Resolution 447 is extremely gratifying. That resolution firmly puts the Senate on record as supporting the principles embodied in the Genocide Convention and makes it clear that the Senate will give the Genocide Convention priority for consideration at the beginning of the 99th Congress next year.

But no one, especially this Senator, believes that the adoption of this resolution will mean the automatic adoption of the Genocide Convention next year. Clearly, several yea votes were cast by Senators who have always done their best to prevent the Senate from consideration of the Genocide Convention but found it convenient to say "Look, I'm not opposed to the Treaty. I voted for this resolution."

Personally, I expect that the proponents of the treaty can expect a host of extraneous amendments, such as the one that was offered Wednesday and then withdrawn. I expect numerous delaying tactics: if not an outright filibuster, then a filibuster by amendment as we saw on Wednesday. I fully expect a cloture vote to be essential so that the Senate at long last will be able to vote on this important treaty's merits.

What does this mean? It means the proponents of the treaty cannot sit back on their laurels, basking in the warmth of an 87-to-2 vote. We need to use the time between now and the 99th Congress to get organized. The many organizations supporting this treaty need to continue to press the

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

case for the treaty with their Senators. They need to press the leadership of both parties for a firm commitment for prompt scheduling. And, most important of all, we will need the firm backing of the White House—not passive endorsement but active lobbying—by the top legislative staff, no matter who is President in January.

Mr. President, as I pointed out on Wednesday and Thursday, one of the most gratifying aspects of our debate this year has been the ability of proponents to assess the strength of support for the Genocide Convention, and the overwhelming strength of that support has been gratifying.

But, I believe that, with ratification at hand, now is not the time for us to ease off in our efforts. Now is not the time to turn to other business. Now is the time to press our case. Now is the time for us, as Senator Javits so movingly testified in 1981, "to redeem the honor of our country" and ratify the Genocide Convention.

HOW THE LAST WAR MAY COME FROM LITTLE NUKES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the nuclear arms technology race speeds on with even the most sensational revelations about the terrible danger we face, provoking no more than a yawn from the media or the public. Four months ago on June 3, in a Washington Post article, columnist Jack Anderson discussed a nuclear weapon most Americans have probably never heard of: atomic demolition munitions, or ADMS. These small nuclear land mines may well be the most likely way the world slips or sneaks into a nuclear war. Do you ask: Will nuclear war come form some kind of intercontinental ballistic missile launched from the Soviet Union? Well, it probably will not come that way. Neither superpower is likely to commit obvious and immediate suicide by firing intercontinental ballistic nuclear missiles. Here is why: Retaliation in kind would follow surely and swiftly.

Unless and until one side or the other develops an antimissile system in which it has complete confidence, the prospect of retaliation—another way of saying deterrence—will work to prevent a nuclear war initiated by the big nuclear systems. But the little, generally ignored atomic demolition munitions are something else. The experts who wrote the nuclear data book inform me that a full package including the charge itself, plus the radio gear and wiring, weigh only about 150 pounds. They also tell me the advice has less than a single kiloton explosive force, that is, less than 1,000 tons of TNT. But technology is changing that. We can expect the ADM to weigh less and have a higher kiloton force as the technology progresses. It is likely that the whole mechanism will weigh less than 100 pounds—a single terrorist would be able to carry it and to have an explosive power near to 1,000 tons of TNT, maybe more.

Now, Mr. President, how long before this little brother will fall into the eager and unstable hands of the Khomeini or a Qadhafi? And how long before this cheap and devastating open-sesame to power goes to work for a terrorist regime? It may be some time. These devices have been around for some 20 years. Anderson reports that they have been deployed in Western Europe and the Pacific since the middlesixties. In that period they have neither changed dramatically nor fallen into the hands of unstable third countries. There may be little change in the next 20 years, or there could be explosive changes. This is precisely the kind of relatively cheap, miniaturized mode which nuclear weapons could assume at their most dangerous. Any number of countries could afford them. Indeed, they would be ideal for government-directed terrorist groups. With such a relatively small explosive power, why the fuss? Why do these little nukes pose such a terrible threat? Well, Mr. President, it has been 39 years since any country set off a nuclear explosion for the purpose of gaining a military objective, that is, as an act of war against another country. That was 1945, when this country dropped its second and last war-ending atomic bomb on Nagasaki, Japan. Every nuclear explosion since then has been either for peaceful purposes or as a military test. No nation has exploded any nuclear device as an act of war.

As Anderson reports, we still protect Western Europe and parts of the Pacific by deploying atomic demolition munitions—ADM's. Against the massive advantage the Soviet Union has in tanks, planes, and ready-to-move manpower, these nuclear devices along with forward placed American troops provide a cheap and so far an effective deterrent. Any Soviet invasion of Europe runs up against double trouble. American troops right up in front trigger an immediate commitment of the United States to an all-out involvement in the defense of Europe. Second, the mining of approaches from Warsaw Pact countries to Western Europe with nuclear devices serves notice on the Soviets that any invasion by them of Western Europe will start right off with nuclear war, low-level nuclear war, but nuclear war for sure. So, what is wrong with doubling deterrence and getting a defense of Europe on the cheap? Nothing, as long as it works. And so far it has worked.

Unfortunately, however, in the words of Adlai Stevenson, there is no gain without pain. And the pain here is that those little atomic demolition charges will not remain the exclusive monopoly of NATO forever. Think of the accumulated risk involved. First, some one of these days one of those nuclear devices may go off and destroy a Soviet military unit. If that happens, how would the Soviets respond to what they would certainly consider an act of nuclear war? Second, the Soviets may double the risk by deploying their own ADM's. Third, this cheap and deadly military technology with the obvious power it projects will almost certainly, sooner or later, fall into the hands of third countries, including a Libya, or an Iran, or Iraq, or Syria. In that case, the likelihood of its use would become a certainty. And a nuclear war would then begin. Once it begins it might have no end before civilization perishes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred, by Jack Anderson, from the Sunday, June 3, 1984, Washington Post, be printed at in the RECORD.

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

LITTLE WEAPONS WITH A BIG BANG

(By Jack Anderson)

The Pershing II-cruise missile controversy has disrupted U.S.-Soviet relations, strained the NATO alliance and sparked demonstrations by peace groups throughout Europe. But something that poses a possibly greater nuclear threat has gotten no headlines: the intended use of "atomic demolition munitions," or ADMs, in the early stages of conventional warfare between East and West.

The little-known ADMs are the land mines and satchel charges of the nuclear age. Dug into the ground for maximum demolition effect, they could blow up the bridges or dams and block the mountain passes and highways that conventional Warsaw Pact forces would use to overrun Western Europe.

The ADMs are intended primarly for destruction of real estate, not tanks or personnel. In fact, they are deliberately designed to minimize fallout, since they would be used mainly in friendly territory to stop an enemy advance.

For that reason, though, ADMs are more tempting to use. Yet a nuke is a nuke, and the first use of any nuclear device might escalate into a holocaust.

My associate Dale Van Atta has reviewed secret military documents and an Army field manual, "Employment of Atomic Demolition Munitions," which detail the uses, advantages and disadvantages of the nuclear weapons that few people have even heard about outside the Pentagon. Here's what he learned:

The Army first deployed ADMs in Western Europe, the Pacific and the United States in the mid-1960s, and they are still there, ready to repel a communist invasion. There are two types: Medium and Special ADMs—or MADMs and SADMs.

As of early 1983, according to a secret Pentagon report, the United States had a total of 608 ADMs, 372 in Europe (mostly in West Germany), 21 in the Pacific (mostly in South Korea) and the rest stored in this country.

The SADM is so small—58 pounds—that it can be carried in a command's backpack on a raid behind enemy lines. Its maximum explosive power is one kiloton, equal to 1,000

tons of TNT, and it can be tuned down to the equivalent of 10 tons of TNT.

The SADM's small size is both its advantage and disadvantage: it would be easy for terrorists to steal. To protect the devices from theft, U.S. bases that have SADMs also have tight security measures, including better fences, light towers, barbed wire covering the weapons themselves, and smoke and noise generators that would be triggered if intruders got into the bunkers where the SADMs are stored.

The nuclear wallop of the MADM ranges from one kiloton to a Hiroshima-sized 15 kilotons. Yet it weighs less than 400 pounds, and can be transported easily by boat, helicopter or Jeep.

NATO sources said the nuclear demolition devices' best use would be in narrow valleys or mountain passes, near superhighways and in tunnels. "A blocked defile can stop an enemy advance and cause him to mass in an area where he can be destroyed by nuclear weapons," the manual explains.

From a military standpoint, ADMs should be in place ahead of time. But politically it would be impossible to do this in Western Europe. In fact, the ADMs will be phased out over the next few years as the Pershing and cruise missiles take over a larger responsiblity for NATO's defense.

ADMs will remain in South Korea, however. Some have already been deployed underground near—and possibly under—the Demilitarized Zone. They would be a formidable defense should the North Koreans decide to invade across the DMZ toward Seoul, only about 25 miles away.

Though ADMs could theoretically be used as tactical offensive weapons to impede or block enemy counterattacks, their principal use would be defensive: to "block avenues of approach by cratering defiles or creating rubble; sever routes of communication by destroying tunnels, bridges, roads and canal locks; create areas of tree blowdown and forest fires; crater areas including frozen bodies of water subject to landings by hostile airmobile units, [and] create water barriers by the destruction of dams and reservoirs."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to inquire if there is further morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT INCREASE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 654) increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to reconsider.

The motion was agreed to.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, to extend not later than 12:30 p.m., under the same terms and conditions.

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

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

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

FRUSTRATION IN THE SENATE

Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, I have watched with increasing dismay our performance as a Senate during the past week. I do not intend to lecture this morning, because I suspect that I am as guilty as my colleagues of some of the efforts which have led us so far astray. I certainly do not castigate the leadership of this body. My administration for the minority leader is great, and my admiration for the majority leader is unbounded.

Many have spoken during the past week or two about the majority leader and his leadership. Encomiums have flowed to such a degree that I suspect that sometimes it discomforts Senator BAKER. I have been privileged to know Senator BAKER for more than 20 years, and I regret that our service together in the Senate has been for only a little more than a year. He is unquestionably a true and faithful servant of the people of Tennessee. He is an important leader of the people of the United States. He, perhaps as much as any other Member who has ever served in this body, truly bears that rare and distinguished title—a Senator's Senator.

I hesitate, then, to follow those words of praise with words of dismay, but the experience of the last week has been dismal. The continuing resolution which we spent so much time to pass should be unnecessary. A continuing resolution merely represents the failure of our budget and appropriations process—perhaps not a failure so much in committee as a failure on the floor of the Senate. If we had done our task in a timely fashion, if the 13 appropriations acts had passed by October 1, if they had been laid before the President as they should have been and signed into law, no continuing resolution would have been necessary.

I tried, along with many of my colleagues during that period of time, to consistently vote in a procedural way to keep the continuing resolution only to those necessary, vital, and required spending programs.

I, like many, voted, therefore, in ways which occasionally shocked and dismayed many of my constituents. I, like many, ultimately voted to table a civil rights act in which I believe very strongly; but I felt, also, that we were faced with the unhappy choice of either voting to table, for this session of Congress, an important civil rights act or bring the entire Government of the United States to a halt. That is a Hobson's choice, indeed; but, Mr. President, I believe that those who joined to make a majority to temporarily lay that bill aside voted in an appropriate manner.

The ultimate dismay, however, was the action last night on the debt limit. Inconsistency ran rampant on the floor.

I shall take a moment just to detail the way in which we voted last night. The continuing resolution was passed by this body 78 to 11. That continuing resolution contained a very high percentage of all of the appropriated spending for this coming year. I suppose you could say it represents as close as we come to a comprehensive budget because so much of our appropriations ended up in the continuing resolution. But remember 78 out of 100 Senators voted in favor of that continuing resolution which unquestionably require us to raise our debt limit. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot expect to vote for the spending package and then turn around and vote against the necessary increase in debt limit which is required by that spending package. And yet did we ever do that.

Only 15 Senators voted in favor of both the continuing resolution and the increase in the debt limit. I think it is just as consistent for the five Senators who voted "no" on both the continuing resolution and the debt limit. I suspect that it takes an unusual amount of courage for the one Senator who voted "aye" on the debt limit feeling it was necessary but voted "no" on the continuing resolution presumably because he did not like the spending patterns.

But those three categories together add up to 21 Senators out of 100; 40 Senators did not vote on either debt limit or the continuing resolution or both.

But that leaves 39 Senators who voted "aye" for the continuing resolution, adding to the spending of this country way beyond our capacity to pay, and "no" for the debt limit.

I recognize that certainly in one case Senator BAKER changed his vote in order to be on the prevailing side to reconsider the vote by which the debt limit lost. I recognize there may well be others who felt they could work with their colleagues to help change their votes by voting "no" now and ultimately voting "yes" as a majority of this body must before we leave town.

Mr. President, I do not mean in any way to demean or challenge the motives of my colleagues. But I do mean to bring to this body and hopefully to the people of this country the inconsistency with which we approach perhaps the most important single measure we have acted upon this year.

I hope out of it we come back to the next session of Congress with a determination to change, a determination to examine new ways to allow us to do our task in an appropriate manner, a new dedication to completing the budget and the authorization and the appropriation process to follow as explicitly as we can the Budget Act of this Nation and to reach October 1, 1985, with all 13 Appropriations Acts having been passed and sent to the President.

We may well want to look at the desirability of a 2-year budget, at least examine its potential in getting us out of this appropriations morass. We certainly ought to look more at the germaneness of amendments we add to the various appropriations acts and ultimately the germaneness of those we attempt to add to a continuing resolution.

I personally believe as at least one Senator that an item veto for the President might do a lot to get us back to germaneness and get us back on track in this budgetary pack.

Mr. President, with all of these frustrations expressed from the back of the bus, from a Senator who ranks number 100 in seniority, I am still honored to serve in this Senate. It is a rare privilege for any of us who had served and who are now serving. I simply want to see it represent the very best of what I think is the most important legislative body of any free nation on Earth.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I should like to commend the remarks of my colleague to all of the other Members of the Senate and to associate myself with them.

I can remember another example of the type of inconsistency to which he refers on an occasion somewhat over 2 years ago, after several weeks of debate, the Senate of the United States by somewhat more than a two-thirds majority proposed a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget. Immediately after the dramatic vote on that issue the Senate turned to a number of spending programs which impacted upon the deficit and on the ability of the United States to balance that budget, and almost half of the Members who in the morning voted for a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget voted in the afternoon for a politically popular program to increase the budget deficit, in other words to unbalance the budget by an additional $5 billion.

Some of the same temperament regrettable may have taken possession of some of our colleagues last night though I do suspect that we will do better today.

ICE

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, almost every Member of this body has suffered another disappointment in this last week of the 98th Congress. To the surprise and regret of almost every Member, Congress has failed to adopt an interstate cost estimate or to put that in more colloquial terms a highway bill which would permit the continued construction and completion of the Interstate Highway System.

Federal moneys for these programs total something over $12 billion a year, and our failure to authorize expenditures for the next 6 months can be attributed almost totally to an unwillingness of Members, particularly Members of the other body, simply to distribute those moneys in accordance with formulas set out by law in an objective fashion.

In fact, it is my understanding, and I will ask my colleague to comment on this subject, as he was a member of the conference committee on the differences between the two Houses, that compromise finally was wrecked on the shoals of the demand of the House on behalf of the Speaker of the House for an authorization for a specific project costing well in excess and perhaps twice as much as $2 billion, to come off the top not after the formula for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In one sense, of course, that demand was similar to the request of many other Members of both the House and Senate for special projects for demonstration projects. The Senate, however, managed to deal with that in what seems to me to be a reasonably responsible manner by limiting all such demonstration projects to a relatively modest $25 million, 50 percent of which was to come from State funds and the Senate conferees were willing either to operate under that rule all who asked for demonstration projects, or to pass an entirely clean interstate cost estimate with no special projects at all.

The House refused. The House refused over this one huge project, all out of proportion to any other proposal in size, and as a result much needed construction of the interstate system may well grind to a halt during the course of the next 6 months in spite of the fact that there is sufficient money in the trust fund to continue that construction in spite of the fact that that construction in every one of the 50 States is overwhelmingly needed.

I commend the Senate conferees for not succumbing to what I consider to be a totally unreasonable demand. I regret intensely that my State and the other 49 States will suffer as a result. But I believe that, in this case, the Senate conferees have acted in a highly responsible fashion and I hope that the result of that responsibility very shortly after the commencement of the 99th Congress will be a clean and objective and appropriate Interstate cost estimate.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, I would like to follow those remarks of my colleague because I suppose that the frustration I expressed a little earlier was partially caused by this first experience of mine on a conference committee.

Mr. President, 27 years ago, I was elected to the State Legislature of the State of Washington and became a member of the highway committee of that State legislature. Even then, more than a quarter of a century ago, we were initiating some priority systems, measurements, if you will, of the relative need of highway projects throughout the State and various stretches of road to get away from the traditions of logrolling, pork-barreling, of legislators designating where and how highways should be built.

In the ensuing quarter of a century, most State legislatures have come to the point where they depend heavily on a priority system—a priority system which is based on engineering knowledge, based on traffic, based on the needs of the State and, which is almost totally removed from those State legislatures, the kind of individual designation of projects which seems to be growing in this Congress.

I commend my chairman, the Senator from Vermont, Senator STAFFORD, for his leadership on the Committee on Environment and Public Works. I believe the Senate conferees did try to at least moderate the demonstration projects by requiring that most projects have a healthy match, 50 percent from the States, and that there be a limit on their size. But when we got right down to it and compromised even further to a two-thirds/one-third split and a $30 million limit per project, the House conferees simply walked away. They could not and would not give up the large number of demonstration projects for which they wanted upwards of 92 to 94 percent Federal money and most of all could not give up a project which is estimated to cost not just $2.2 billion, but by the time it is completed, if ever, would cost something closer to $4 billion.

I recognize that it was a favorite project of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, but I think it is too bad that all of the States of the Nation, for construction projects so desperately needed throughout this country, must be held hostage and that now no one will have an opportunity to move forward with these interstate highway constructions to add to the convenience, the economy of our various States, and the safety of the citizens who use those roads.

So, Mr. President, that, I suppose, just represents one more element in the frustration which I feel and which I feel is shared by so many in this body.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 155—PROVIDING FOR A SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I send a concurrent resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 155

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses of Congress adjourn on Friday, October 12, 1984, Saturday, October 13, 1984, Sunday, October 14, 1984, Monday, October 15, 1984, Tuesday, October 16, 1984, Wednesday, October 17, 1984, Thursday, October 18, 1984, or Friday, October 19, 1984, they stand adjourned sine die, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House, and the Majority Leader of the Senate, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to its consideration.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 155) was considered and agreed to.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 5361

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have been given a House concurrent resolution to make corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 5361. I send the concurrent resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 378) correcting the enrollment of H.R. 5361.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the current resolution.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, this is to make corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 5361 where there were clerical errors. I am advised that there are no matters of substance involved.

AMENDMENT NO. 7130

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, in addition to the concurrent resolution, I now send to the desk an amendment on behalf of the distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator DOLE.

Before the clerk states this amendment, let me say that I am advised there is nothing in this amendment except to make corrections in enrollment only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], for Mr. DOLE, proposes an amendment numbered 7130.

Mr. BAKER. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

Mr. President, I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the concurrent resolution add the following:

On page 5, line 7, strike "(I)" and insert the following: "(II)".

On page 5, strike lines 32 and 33, and insert the following: "(II) APPLICATION WITH CLAUSE (ii).—THIS CLAUSE SHALL NOT APPLY TO".

On page 6, line 1, strike "subparagraph (B)" and insert the following: "clause (ii)".

On page 6, line 3, strike "subparagraph" and insert the following: "clause".

On page 6, line 14, strike "transaction" and insert the following: "transactions".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 7130) was agreed to.

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

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 378), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. 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.

SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, it is difficult for me to imagine the U.S. Senate without the presence of the senior Senator from West Virginia, JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH has served in the Congress since 1932, the year I was born. His service spans some of the most turbulent times in the history of our great Nation, and some of the most significant technological developments. Throughout that great period of history the Senator from West Virginia has been a steadying force in the U.S. Congress, gently reminding us of our roots and this Nation's great heritage. I know that we will all miss him greatly when he retires this year and goes home to Almost Heaven, WV.

I consider the Senator from West Virginia personally responsible for our Nation's great Interstate Highway System. His accomplishments in the environmental area are almost too numerous to mention. Suffice it to say that he was in the forefront in protecting this country's vital natural resources before there was even such a thing as the environmental movement.

He and our late colleague Scoop Jackson were personally responsible for establishing the National Fuels and Energy Policy Study, authorized by Senate Resolution 45. Senate Resolution 45 passed the Senate on May 3, 1971, well before the vast majority of the American people were aware of the energy issues that would be studied and clarified under the authority of Senate Resolution 45. That resolution provided for a comprehensive study of programs and policies required to meet national energy needs by the then Interior, Public Works, Commerce, and Joint Atomic Energy Committees. The National Fuels and Energy Policy Study provided the groundwork so that the Congress was prepared to respond in a comprehensive fashion to the turbulent events in the world of energy in the 1970's.

During that time, the Senator from West Virginia never allowed us to forget that we are dependent upon

and must develop our own domestic energy resources. Indeed, I cannot even think of coal without thinking of the Senator's vital interest in coal policy, coal use, and coal development. His early advocacy of synthetic fuels development is almost legend; indeed, the fledgling program we have established would not have gotten as far as it has today without the Senator's interest and efforts.

Above all, the Senator exemplifies the type of personal qualities that bring honor to this body. He has long been one of the Senate's ablest legislators. He has gone far beyond the call of duty in his service to the people of West Virginia. I consider myself privileged to know him and hope that his retirement brings him happiness and contentment in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR TSONGAS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, when the Senate adjourns sine die today, it will mark the end of Senator PAUL TSONGAS' all too brief Senate career. All of us who have served with Senator TSONGAS during the past 6 years know him to be a thoughtful and responsible legislator and a decent and caring human being.

It has been a special pleasure for me to serve with PAUL TSONGAS on the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee during his tenure in the Senate. In that capacity, Senator TSONGAS has played a major role in the formation of natural resource policy for this country. He has been in the forefront of the conservation movement since he came to the Senate and has championed the cause of the environment effectively and faithfully.

Most notably, in 1979 and 1980 PAUL TSONGAS, along with a handful of other leaders in the Senate, negotiated the compromise on the landmark Alaska lands legislation which was ultimately passed by the House and signed by President Carter. I do not think it is an exaggeration, Mr. President, to say that without Senator TSONGAS' leadership and perseverance, the Alaska lands bill would not have been enacted in 1980.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, PAUL TSONGAS was the author of the legislation establishing the Lowell National Historical Park in Lowell, MA. Since coming to the Senate, he has worked tirelessly and effectively to ensure adequate funding for the Lowell project. Likewise, both in the Senate and the House, Senator TSONGAS has been an ardent defender and proponent of this country's cultural and historic preservation programs.

Mr. President, I wish our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts well in his endeavors. It has been a pleasure knowing and working with him, and I know we will all miss him very much.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHN TOWER

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, as we come to the close of the 98th Congress, I wish to add my tribute to others expressed by my colleagues to the distinguished Senator from Texas, JOHN GOODWIN TOWER. JOHN TOWER has served his State, his Nation, and this body not only with distinction and dedication, but also with devotion and wisdom of the highest possible order. He is recognized as one of the leading authorities on defense matters, not only in this country but throughout the world, a reputation he richly deserves.

JOHN TOWER has been a Member of the U.S. Senate for more than 23 years and as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee for the past 4 years. During that time, Senator TOWER has steadfastly supported a strong national defense for the United States and our allies under seven Presidents from both political parties. But more than that, JOHN TOWER has had the courage to stand by his convictions for a strong and capable Military Establishment to protect our national interests during a time when those convictions were not popular with many of his colleagues and many of his countrymen. His foresight during those times and his leadership on the Armed Services Committee and on the floor of the U.S. Senate have played a most significant role in keeping our country strong and free. He has never apologized for his belief in a strong America, nor should he. In times past, JOHN TOWER would have been characterized as an American patriot. As he leaves the U.S. Senate, I want to say to my good friend from Texas, being an American patriot is a singular honor and one he richly deserves. This body will miss his intelligence and devotion. I will miss a friend.

THE RESIDENTIAL CONSERVATION SERVICE AND THE COMMERCIAL AND APARTMENT CONSERVATION SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Residential Conservation Service [RCS] and the Commercial and Apartment Conservation Service [CACS] programs were developed with the objective of encouraging the installation of energy conservation and renewable energy resource measures in existing homes and commercial and apartment buildings. These programs seek to inform utility customers of opportunities to make use of such measures by providing site-specific energy audits of the customer's buildings. By requiring utilities to offer these audits, Congress hoped that improvements would be made in existing buildings that would reduce the growth in demand for energy in the United States and conserve nonrenewable energy sources. The programs were conceived in the 1970's, during a period of rising energy prices with perceptions of continued increases and shortages of critical fuels.

The RCS Program requirements are requirements on electric and gas utilities. In general, there are no "sunset" provisions for these requirements. The one exception to this rule is the expiration on January 1, 1985, of the requirement that the utilities notify their customers of the availability of the program. The CACS Program has yet to be fully implemented. The Department of Energy actually triggers the effectiveness of CACS Program requirements when it approves a State CACS plan. Only one plan—that of the State of Michigan—has been approved as of this date. However the DOE has a number of State plans in hand, so that the utilities in several States could find themselves required to implement the CACS Program requirements quite soon.

Very late in this session of the 98th Congress the House passed and sent to us H.R. 5946, the Conservation Service Reform Act of 1984. This bill extended the RCS Program notification requirement until January 1, 1990, and made numerous substantive changes in the RCS statute. It also would have repealed the CACS Program. Much of the credit for the enactment of this bill in the House goes to Republican RALPH M. HALL of Texas.

Because the House bill arrived in the Senate so late in the session, there was no time for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to hold hearings or to otherwise evaluate the proposed substantive changes in the RCS Program or the justification for the repeal of the CACS statute. For a while, it appeared that there might not be time for the Senate to do anything at all on the issue.

Because I was concerned about the potentially large costs associated with the CACS Program, accordingly, I asked the committee to consider a substitute to the House bill. The committee and the Senate eventually adopted this substitute. My substitute extended the RCS notification requirement for 1 year and removed the authority of the DOE to approve any more CACS plans for 1 year. The purpose of this proposal was to freeze the status of the two programs so the Senate would have time to evaluate the House-proposed changes next year. We may well find the House proposals meritorious. But the creation of the necessary consensus for these proposals and the responsible evaluation of other proposals that Senators may

want to make takes time. Under my substitute, that time would be provided without prejudicing either of the programs. I was very hopeful that the House would give us the time to do our work while holding the status quo in place.

Apparently, that will not happen. As of this moment, there has been no constructive response from the House to the Senate's bill. It appears that there may not be any such response. If this is the case, it will be unfortunate. The status of the RCS program will be thrown into uncertainty, with many program requirements continuing in law, but the notification requirement expired. On the other hand, utilities could be forced to incur substantial startup costs for a CACS program that the House voted to repeal and the Senate voted to defer.

I strongly urge the administration to take cognizance of these facts. We do intend to review these programs early in the next Congress. It is this Senator's intention to propose the amendments to existing law that our review indicates are justified. It would be very unfortunate if, in the meantime, the Nation's utilities and their ratepayers were forced by this administration to incur the startup costs of the CACS Program when that program is such a likely candidate for substantial amendment or repeal.

Mr. President, the case for an early review of these programs is strong. The RCS Program was enacted into law in 1978 as a part of the National Energy Act. However, by the time the RCS Program was implemented in 1980, most energy prices had begun to stabilize and the United States was in the midst of a recession. Interest in energy conservation investments had fallen off. It seems fair to say that the enthusiasm of the administration and the utilities for the program has been decidedly lukewarm throughout this period.

During years the RCS Program has been in effect, participation by eligible customers has been very disappointing. According to the Department of Energy, only 3.5 million of the 62 million eligible customers have taken advantage of RCS audits. The Department of Energy published a report evaluating the RCS on January 19, 1984, that concluded:

> Overall, the RCS Program has had success in motivating states and utilities to provide audit information to the residential sector. Response rates have been highest where the Program was promoted aggressively and where provisions went beyond the minimum required by federal law. In general, the most aggressive RCS states also face perceived high marginal costs of energy. Participation has been greatest among the group that could be described as more affluent, better educated and homeowning, and their energy savings are roughly 1.8 times those of a comparable non-participant group, considering only the investments made within one year of the audit. Nonetheless, participation to date has been less extensive or demographically broad than desired, and audit costs, now averaging $120, include certain elements that are recognized as neither necessary nor cost-effective.

I believe we should take a good hard look at the record this program has been able to achieve and at whatever reforms to the program are proposed, including those that were proposed in the House version of H.R. 5946. We can and will do that next year.

The CACS Program is estimated to cover about two-thirds of all multifamily households and about half of all commercial buildings. Despite the wide coverage of the CACS Program, the Department of Energy estimates that the annual realized energy savings will be one-tenth that of the RCS savings. By acting this year to delay the implementation of CACS, we would save utility customers the startup costs associated with this program, including hiring and training auditors, acquiring and programming required computer equipment, and preparing and mailing notices to all potential customers. I am sorry the House is unwilling to do this.

Both the RCS and CACS Programs are predicted on the notion that utility costs and electric and gas rates will be lower as a result of the programs because the need for higher priced marginal supplies of energy and new facilities will be reduced due to conservation and the use of renewable energy sources. Many question whether this is in fact what happens. Whose view is the correct one?

We need to inquire into the record of the RCS Program. Are rates lower than they would otherwise be? Or, as some program critics have claimed, are upper income customers being accorded the benefits of RCS at the expense of all other ratepayers. If this is what is happening, we need to know it, and we need to either make the program effective or repeal it. There is absolutely no justification for a program that burdens energy consumers just to squeeze marginal amounts of energy conservation from the building sector. This Nation's utility industry is in no financial condition to absorb the costs of cost-ineffective programs that we find pleasing on other grounds.

Mr. President, I look forward to working with my colleagues on these programs next year.

REGARDING THE DEBT LIMIT

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, throughout my term in the Senate I have, with one exception, voted against increasing the debt ceiling.

But today we face this issue under circumstances which are unlike those when previous votes were cast.

With sine die adjournment moments away and the prospects of the Government running out of funds before the Congress will meet again, thereby precipitating a crisis for those dependent on Government retirement program, health care services and other benefits, this Senator finds himself in the unhappy position of having to vote to raise the debt ceiling.

Earlier today I consulted with Treasury Deputy Secretary McNamar about this matter.

He has provided me a letter regarding the effect congressional failure to pass the debt limit would have on Social Security beneficiaries, which I now ask be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY
OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, DC, October 12, 1984.

Hon. JOHN WARNER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNER: As a follow-up to our conversation today, and your concerns that the mailing of social security checks not be interrupted in any way, I want to assure you that it is absolutely essential that Congressional act in on the debt limit be completed before the Congress adjourns sine die.

Without the authority to raise new funds from market borrowing the Treasury is rapidly depleting its cash balances and will thus be unable to meet the Government's obligations, including issuing checks to social security recipients, meeting the payroll for our men and women in the armed forces, federal retirement and other payments that are required by law.

Our cash balances decline precipitously between now and the end of the month and will clearly be exhausted before payment of social security benefits the first of November.

The Senate must act to meet the Government's obligations in an orderly manner before adjournment. Please express my concerns to your colleagues.

Sincerely,

R.T. MCNAMAR.

DEBT LIMIT INCREASE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, last night this body recoiled from the largest single increase in the debt ever requested, $251 billion. The rejection of the increase in the public debt, by Senators from both sides of the aisle, was tantamount to a rejection of the policies of this administration that have given us the largest budget deficits and the fastest peacetime increase in the public debt ever.

Unless this administration gets serious about a plan to control these deficits, we face a sea of red ink that the Congressional Budget Office estimates could reach $263 billion in just 5 years and a debt that could reach $3 trillion before the end of the decade.

The legislation before us would increase each American's share of the debt by $1,000. Even with this monumental increase, we would need to again raise the debt limit in just 12

months unless action is taken to reduce deficits.

Just what does this increase in the debt limit mean? For one, it means that the American people will be spending $367 million per day next year just to pay the interest on that debt. That finance charge is equal to 37 cents of every dollar paid by Americans in individual income taxes. But worse than that, it is money that does not buy one lunch for a hungry schoolchild, does not send one gifted student to college, does not provide medical care for one veteran, nor buy a stronger defense.

Interest payments are now the third largest Government spending program—behind military spending and Social Security—and the fastest growing program, faster even than the Pentagon's budget. Between 1981 and 1984, the military budget increased by some 46 percent. At the same time, the interest costs on the debt were climbing by 64 percent. If this trend continues unchanged, the CBO estimates that interest costs will nearly double over the next 5 years.

What this means for the average family of four is that their share of this debt will amount to over $30,000 and could reach $50,000 by the end of the next administration if nothing is done. Their share of the interest payments will amount to over $2,200 next year under this bill and could reach $3,500 per year by 1989.

The finance charge on our debt under this bill is double that in 1980 under the Carter administration. In fact, in just 5 short years, the Reagan administration will have doubled the public debt that it has taken 195 years and 39 administrations to accumulate.

Now we are being asked to increase the debt by $251 billion It is only fair to ask how we got to this disastrous situation. Clearly the recession had its effect. But even after adjusting for the effects of that economic downturn, the Congressional Budget Office cities two major causes of the growing debt: The administration's 1981 tax cuts and runaway spending for the Pentagon.

What is this administration doing to reduce the deficit and limit the increase in the debt? So far, Mr. Reagan appears content to pass the blame around for the cause of the deficit. He blames Congress, he blames Democrats, he even blames the Constitution for the lack of balanced budget amendment. In short, he blames everyone but his own administration.

But what he always neglects to mention is his own record. Despite frequent promises to balance the budget, first by 1982, then by 1983, then by 1984, and now with no certain date, President Reagan has never during these 4 years, submitted a balanced budget to the Congress. When reporters asked him recently what his plans for reducing the deficit would be, he referred them to his previous budgets and the proposals that Congress did not enact. Yet, he neglected to mention that not one of those budgets, even if enacted in its entirety, would have produced a balanced budget.

The deficits have reached a crisis state. The cloud the prospects for continued economic growth. They keep interest rates at high levels. They contribute to an overvalued dollar that makes American products too expensive overseas while allowing foreign countries to flood this country with cheap imports. They cost American jobs. And they make our economic policy more vulnerable to the whims of foreign investors.

Mr. President. I shall cast my vote against this legislation.

A BRIEF LOOK AT DEFICIT SPENDING

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a few weeks ago one of my grandsons wrote a paper titled, "A Brief Look at Deficit Spending." I ask unanimous consent that his paper on the subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A BRIEF LOOK AT DEFICIT SPENDING

(By Erik Fatemi)

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, there have been few economic problems which have caused as much concern among government officials and the general public alike as the escalating national debt and the enormous budget deficits that have occurred under the Reagan Administration. This report will provide a brief overview of how the government has dealt with these issues in the past, a description of the present situation, and an analysis of possible repercussions in the economy arising from deficit spending.

First, it is necessary to define some of the more frequently-used terms. The word "debt" is an ambiguous term, since there are four major ways of measuring the Federal debt: gross Federal debt, debt subject to limit, debt held by the public, and debt held by government accounts. The first three terms are all often referred to as "the Federal debt," with the debt subject to limit probably used most frequently, followed by the debt held by the public. There are, however, important distinctions. Gross Federal Debt is the most encompassing measure of Federal debt. It is the sum of the debt held by the public and the debt held by government accounts.

The debt subject to limit is used in the Congressional budget process and is increased periodically by acts of Congress. In FY 1983, this number was $1.378 trillion, 99.7 percent of the gross Federal debt, $1.382 trillion.[1] The small difference arose from the fact that not all areas of government spending are subject to limit. The debt held by the public is the amount that the Treasury or the Federal Financing Bank (FFB) borrows directly from the public.[2] In FY 1983 this figure was $1.142 trillion, 82.6 percent of gross Federal debt. *Debt held by government accounts* is the amount that some agencies within the government owe to other Federal agencies. "Public debt" and "agency debt" are still other terms measuring the Federal debt, but they are not used by the CBO.

The measurement of interest on the debt is also confusing. The most common term, and the one used by the CBO, is net interest. This figure represents the interest cost of debt held by the public.[3]

The relationship of the deficit to changes in the debt is the most complex. The budget deficit "represents the difference between the currently defined budget receipts and outlays of the Government."[4] The total deficit (a term less frequently used) is the sum of the budget deficit and off-budget outlays. The confusion exists because neither the budget deficit nor the total deficit equals yearly changes in gross Federal debt, debt subject to limit, or debt held by the public. The differences come about from internal exchanges of funds and securities.[5] The important fact is that the debt figures usually increase by an amount greater than the yearly budget deficit.

BACKGROUND

The first instance of concern over the level of federal spending came at the very beginning of the Republic. In 1789, the national debt was $78 million, which at this time was a tremendous amount.[6] Most of the debt existed in the form of certificates which had either been used for payment to Revolutionary War soldiers or had been bought by private citizens to aid the war effort. These certificates had since depreciated greatly. However, Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, pledged to reimburse the holders of the certificates at face value and have the national debt completely paid off in 30 years.[7] It was a bold plan, yet there was much public support. Tariffs, excise taxes, and the sale of public lands were the primary methods used to raise revenue. In addition, Hamilton began the practice of encouraging private investors to aid in the financing of government accounts.[8] Unfortunately, the efforts met with little immediate success. The debt remained above $50 million until 1810.[9]

Due primarily to the income received from customs duties, there were few deficits in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Excluding periods of wars and deep recessions, there were only ten years in which there were deficits between 1789 and the Civil War.[10] In 1834, the national debt had been reduced to an all-time low of $38,000. The Civil War drove the national debt up to $2.7 billion, but budget surpluses immediately returned. From 1866 to 1893, there were 28 uninterrupted years in which budget receipts were higher than outlays.

In fact, government officials began to perceive the presence of budget surpluses as a major problem. President Grover Cleveland called this situation a "culpable betrayal of American fairness and justice."[11] The next president, Benjamin Harrison, and the "Billion Dollar Congress" quickly took care of liquifying the excess funds. In 1892, the Dependent Pension Act was passed, increasing pensions for Union Army veterans. Other handouts included the return of federal taxes paid during the Civil War to Northern states and porkbarrel projects for river and harbor improvements.[12] Needless to say, the budget surplus problem has not plagued the United States economy since that time.

The depression of the 1890's and funding for the Spanish-American War and the

[1] Footnotes at end of article.

Panama Canal brought on a series of deficits at the end of the nineteenth century. World War I led to the highest deficit which had ever existed, $13.4 billion, in 1919. In this one year, the national debt more than doubled to $25 billion. Reacting to this increase, Administrations in the 1920's engaged in a concentrated effort in budgetary reform to reduce the debt.[13] They succeeded in bringing the level down from $24.3 billion to $16.2 billion.

The presence of large deficits during the Great Depression years began a trend which has never been fully abated. In the 54 years between FY 1931 and FY 1984, there have been only six years of budget surpluses and five years in which there was a net decrease in the national debt.[14] Since 1961, there has been only one fiscal year, 1969, in which there was a budget surplus.

Under the policies of the Reagan Administration, these problems have intensified. In FY 1981, Carter's final year in office, the deficit was $57.9 billion, up only $13 billion from Ford's final year. Under Reagan, the deficit skyrocketed $137.5 billion from FY 1981 to $195.4 billion in FY 1983. Though the deficit is expected to fall this year to $172 billion, the CBO projects that by FY 1987 deficits will rise to levels over $200 billion. In FY 1981, the debt held by the public as a percent of GNP was 27.8 percent. During the present Administration this figure has reached levels not seen since World War II. In FY 1983, it was 35.4 percent, and by FY 1989, the debt held by the public is expected to be 46 percent—nearly half—of the GNP. Furthermore, in the 192 years between 1789 and FY 1981, the debt subject to limit was $999.8 billion; in only 8 years that number is expected to triple. By FY 1989 the CBO projects that Reagan's policies will bring the debt to $3.14 trillion.

President Reagan can no longer put the blame of the enormous deficits on wasteful domestic spending. Though outlays for Social Security and Medicare have increased as a percent of GNP, overall non-defense domestic spending has decreased and it will continue to decrease under President Reagan.[15] In FY 1983, domestic spending was 15.4 percent of GNP; by FY 1989 the CBO projects it to be 12.8 percent. Federal expenditures are rising faster than revenues because of three major recent developments: the rise in defense spending, the indexation of many entitlement programs, and the rise in net interest costs.[16] In only seven years, the net interest on the national debts projected to rise 137 percent, from $90 billion in FY 1983 to $214 billion in FY 1989.

LEGISLATION

Until the Great Depression, legislation requiring a balanced budget was rare. Government officials and the general public accepted it for granted that outlays should not exceed receipts except in times of national emergency. Secondly, there were relatively few deficits which occurred. These two factors rendered most legislation calling for a mandatory balanced budget unnecessary.[17] The majority of government measures involved in reducing the deficit were indirect methods, such as budgetary and financial management reforms.

The large and continued deficits of the Great Depression led to an unending interest in requiring that budget outlays not exceed receipts. In every Congress since the 84th, legislation prohibiting budget deficits has been introduced.[18] Until 1978, Congress opted to pass legislation on income tax surcharges, expenditure ceilings, public debt legislation, and budgetary reforms.[19] However, in the 95th Congress, two provisions relating directly to the balanced budget became laws. One was an amendment by Harry Byrd tacked onto an IMF bill.[20] This amendment stated that beginning with FY 1981, budget outlays could not exceed receipts. This law has been disregarded. The Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978 (known as the Humphrey-Hawkins bill) establish a goal of a balanced budget, but set no target date.[21]

Since 1978, the movement supporting a mandatory balanced budget has accelerated. By 1982, 32 state legislatures, two short of the number required, had petitioned Congress to call a constitutional convention. In August 1982, the Senate approved an amendment of its own, but the legislation was blocked in the House. President Reagan has recently renewed his efforts at achieving passage of such an amendment.

In addition, there have been other attempts to reduce deficits. Since World War II there have been several bills introduced linking federal spending to GNP.[22] Another idea was the alternative balanced budget. According to this proposal, which has been offered at least twice, the President would be required to submit two budgets, one of which must be balanced.[23]

EFFECTS OF DEFICIT SPENDING

One reason for the tremendous grass roots support for a mandatory balanced budget is that there are many popular misconceptions surrounding the issue of deficit spending. One of the most common mistakes is comparing the Federal government to a family. Unlike a private family, the U.S. government will never go bankrupt. It can always raise revenues by taxation, and it is a fundamental rule that "no nation need ever fear defaulting on debts that call for repayment in its own currency." [24] Secondly, there is no need for the Federal government to pay off its debt; whenever some securities are paid as they mature, the Treasury can roll over the debt by replacing them with new securities. Another popular belief is that the higher taxes necessary to pay increased interest payments on the debt will burden our children and grandchildren. On the contrary, since the debt is owned by private citizens, they also receive the higher interest payments as income. The country is not suffering as a whole, since money is merely being transferred from some individuals to others. However, any interest paid on the portion of the debt that is owned by foreigners does represent a loss of American funds.[25]

Deficit spending is not always harmful to the economy. During a recession, deficit spending can serve as a stimulant for a low rate of investment. According to the "crowding-in" hypothesis, deficit spending would induce investment by creating an outlet for idle savings and the economy would expand. Resources that would otherwise be unused would be employed, and the consumers' increased demand for public goods would be satisfied.[26]

However, there are several valid problems that arise from deficit spending. The Federal government finances deficit spending by borrowing from private citizens. Government bonds compete with corporate bonds for the available funds in the money market. When the government is forced to borrow a large sum of money, it must offer attractive high interest rates on its bonds. This rise in the interest rate has many unfortunate repercussions in the economy. Since the interest rate "determines the cost at which businesses must borrow in order to get the output to invest in plant, equipment, and inventory,"[27] the higher it is, the lower the investment. Another way of looking at it is through the "crowding-out" effect. When funds are used for government bonds, there remains less money to buy private bonds, Private borrowers are "crowded out" of the market.[28]

In either case, the net result is the same. If interest rates become too high, inventories increase, production is cut back, unemployment rises, and the economy contracts. Future generations will be left with less capital and equipment, so they will have a reduced production potential. High interest rates particularly inhibit such industries as housing, which depends on public financing. The steel and rubber industries, which are already hurting, will be hampered in obtaining the funds they need in order to experiment and stay technologically competitive with the rest of the world.[29] Finally, new businesses will have difficulty getting started.

Another area in which huge deficits hurt the economy is international trade. High interest rates raise the value of the dollar as foreigners exchange their own currency for American currency. This means that imports will increase and international demand for U.S. exports will decrease. U.S. firms will have a hard time competing with imports from abroad.

Moreover, in the first quarter of 1984, net domestic private savings met only slightly more than half of the government's credit demands for financing.[30] The rest was financed by foreign capital attracted by U.S. interest rates, which are relatively high compared to other countries. These foreign inflows have risen from $11 billion in 1982 to $41 billion in 1983 and an expected $80 billion in 1984.[31] Since more U.S. debt is becoming foreign-owned, an increasing amount of U.S. funds will be lost as a result of the interest paid to foreign accounts. The U.S. already has an enormous merchandise trade deficit. This year, it is expected to reach a record-high $130 billion. Economists are predicting that soon the U.S. could be paying more to foreigners with assets in this country than it earns from investments in their countries.[32] Finally, by attracting capital out of poorer countries, higher interest rates worsen the problem of international debt management.

CONCLUSION

Several times throughout U.S. history budget deficits have posed problems for the economy, but under the Reagan Administration, the nation is experiencing the most severe such crisis to date. The CBO projects that the effects of the indexation of many entitlement programs, the rise in defense spending, and the increased interest on the national debt will more than cancel out his cuts in domestic programs. With the possible advent of the expected over-$200 billion deficits beginning in fiscal year 1987, one wonders if Reagan policies will make the deficit problem uncontrollable. By the end of this month, the debt will already have increased over $572 billion since Reagan took office. This fiscal year we will have paid $111 billion just for the interest on the debt, and the CBO expects that this figure will nearly double in only five years. The interest paid can no longer be dismissed as returning entirely to U.S. citizens, since more and more of federal obligations are held by foreign investors.

Several areas of the economic recovery will begin to slow as budget deficits cause in-

terest rates to rise. According to the CBO, housing starts and the sales of homes will decrease. High interest rates should inhibit some of the investment incentives created by recent tax law changes. This will adversely affect business growth. Another portent of things to come occurred on September 5, when the dollar reached record levels in world foreign-exchange markets. This will cause the trade deficit to widen further and spell trouble for U.S. exports and U.S. firms competing with foreign imports. Foreigners already perceive the United States to be a safe place to invest their money. Rising interest rates only aggravate this problem and encourage foreign take-overs of American companies.

The key to stopping these problems is reducing the budget deficits. These deficits will not be magically reduced by merely supporting a balanced budget amendment, as President Reagan seems to assume. Most government outlays will have to be cut, including defense spending, and revenues will have to be increased. Reduced government spending and tax increases are not going to make anyone's life easier in the short run, but there are no effective alternatives for the long-term good of the country.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Congressional Budget Office, "The Economic and Budget Outlook: An Update," Congress of the United States, August, 1983, p. 67. All other figures after 1982 appearing in this paper come from this source unless otherwise noted.

[2] Philip D. Winters, "Federal Debt and Interest Measures Used in the Federal Budget," Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, report no. 83-158, August 9, 1983, p. 6.

[3] Winters, p. 14.

[4] Winters, p. 17.

[5] Winters, p. 20.

[6] Philip Winters, "Public Debt Ceiling: Its Current Status," Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, issue brief no. IB82081, Aug. 25, 1984, p. 1.

[7] John D. Fisk, "Legislation to Limit Federal Expenditures: Past and Present," Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, report no. 79-19E, Jan. 18, 1979, p. 3.

[8] John M. Blum and others, *The National Experience: A History of the United States* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1981), p. 148.

[9] U.S. Department of Commerce, "Summary of Federal Government Finances-Administrative Budget" 1789-1939," *Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1700*, 1974, p 1104. All debt and budget deficit figures from 1789 to 1939 appearing in this paper will come from this source unless otherwise noted.

[10] Fisk, p. 2.

[11] Fisk, p. 4.

[12] Blum and others, p. 509.

[13] Fisk, p. 6.

[14] Ronald Reagan, *Economic Report of the President* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1984), p. 306. All budget deficit and debt figures from 1940 to 1982 come from this source unless otherwise noted.

[15] William Cox and David Grinnell, "Budget Deficits: Causes, Effects, and Some Remedial Options," Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, issue brief no. IB84005, Aug. 24, 1984, p. 1.

[16] John B. Henderson, "Balanced Budget Proposal: Some macroeconomic Implications," Congressional Research Service, the Library of Congress, issue brief no. MB79229, August 24, 1984, p. 4.

[17] Fisk, p. 2.

[18] Fisk, p. 10.

[19] Fisk, p. 10.

[20] Fisk, p. 12.

[21] Fisk, p. 13.

[22] Fisk, p. 16.

[23] Fisk, p. 9.

[24] William J. Baumol and Alan S. Blinder, *Economics: Principles and Policy* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1982), p. 269.

[25] Baumol and Blinder, p. 269.

[26] Baumol and Blinder, p. 265.

[27] G. Thomas Woodward, "Do Deficits Influence the Level of Interest Rates?" Congressional Research Service, the Library of Congress, report no. 83-1790E, p. 4.

[28] Baumol and Blinder, p. 264.

[29] "Does the Red Ink Matter?" *Newsweek*, Dec. 12, 1983, p. 43.

[30] Congressional Budget Office, p. 32.

[31] Congressional Budget Office, p. 32.

[32] John M. Berry, "Tide Turning Against U.S.," *The Washingtonm Post*, Dec. 18, 1983, p. F1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baumol, William J., and Alan S. Blinder. *Economics: Principles and Policy.* New York: Harcourt Brice Jovanovich, Inc., 1982.

Berry, John M. "Tide Turning Against U.S.," *The Washington Post*, Dec. 18, 1983, p. F1.

Blum, John M., and others. *The National Experience: A History of the United States.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1981.

Congressional Budget Office. "The Economic and Budget Outlook: An Update," Congress of the United States, August, 1984.

Cox, William and David Grinnell. "Budget Deficits" Causes, Effects, and Some Remedial Options," Congressional Research Service, the Library of Congress, issue brief No. IB 84005, Aug. 24, 1984.

"Does the Red Ink Matter?" *Newsweek*, Dec. 12, 1983, p. 43.

Fisk, John D. "Legislation to Limit Federal Expenditures: Past and Present," Congressional Research Service, the Library of Congress, report No. 79-19E, Jan. 18, 1979.

Henderson, John B. "Balanced Budget Proposal: Some Macroeconomic Implications," Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, issue brief No. MB79229, Aug. 27, 1984.

Reagan, Ronald, *Economic Report of the President.* Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1984.

U.S. Department of Commerce. "Summary of Federal Government Finances-Administrative Budget: 1789-1939" *Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1700.* Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1984.

Winters, Philip D. "Federal Debt and Interest Measures Used in the Federal Budget, "Congressional Research Service, the Library of Congress, report No. 83-158, Aug. 9, 1983.

Winters, Philip D. "Public Debt Ceiling: Its Current Status," Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, issue brief No. IB82081, Aug. 25, 1984, p.1.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2122. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of trapping in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2519. An act for the relief of Audrey O. Lewis and Emerson B. Vereen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3406. An act to recognize the organization known as the Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War 1861-1865; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3701. An act to designate the main channel for the project for San Leandro Marina, California, as the "Jack D. Maltester Channel" to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 4853. An act to authorize the creation of a record of admission for permanent residence in the cases of certain natives of Cuba and Haiti, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6440. An act to designate the main channel for the project for San Leandro Marina, California, as the "Jack D. Maltester Channel" and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary reported that on today, October 12, 1984, he has presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 864. An act to amend the Volunteers in the Parks Act of 1969, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 12, 1984, through November 18, 1984, as "National Reye's Syndrome Week."

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred or acted upon, as indicated:

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. Res. 481. Resolution bidding a fond farewell to Howard H. Baker, Jr.; considered and agreed to.

S. Res. 482. Resolution to commend the extraordinary cooperative conduct of the distinguished minority leader; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. BYRD):

S. Res. 483. Resolution commending William F. Hildenbrand; considered and agreed to.

S. Res. 484. Resolution to commend the exemplary service of the party secretaries and staffs, other various officers of the Senate, and their staffs; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BAKER:

S. Res. 485. Resolution tendering the thanks of the Senate to the Vice President for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

S. Res. 486. Resolution authorizing the President of the Senate, the President of the Senate pro tempore, and the majority leader of the Senate to make certain appointments after the sine die adjournment of the present session; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. Res. 487. Resolution tendering the thanks of the Senate to the President pro tempore for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BAKER:

S. Res. 488. Resolution commending the employees in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, the Honorable William F. Hildenbrand; considered and agreed to.

S. Con. Res. 155. Concurrent resolution providing for a sine die adjournment of the Congress; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

AMENDMENT NO. 6881

At the request of Mr. STAFFORD, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Florida [Mrs. HAWKINS)], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 6881 intended to be proposed to House Joint Resolution 648, A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 5361

DOLE AMENDMENT NO. 7130

Mr. BAKER (for Mr. DOLE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 378) correcting the enrollment of H.R. 5361; as follows:

At the end of the concurrent resolution add the following:

On page 5, line 7, strike "(I)" and insert the following: "(II)".

On page 5, strike lines 32 and 33, and insert the following: "(II) APPLICATION WITH CLAUSE (ii).—This clause shall not apply to".

On page 6, line 1, strike "subparagraph (B)" and insert the following: "clause (ii)".

On page 6, line 3, strike "subparagraph" and insert the following: "clause".

On page 6, line 14, strike "transaction" and insert the following: "transactions".

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I wish to announce for the information of Senators that the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations is planning to hold hearings during the interim between the 98th and 99th Congresses. These hearings may be held here in Washington, DC, or at other locations. Details will be provided in the final issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the 98th Congress.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

AN ACT OF HEROISM

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, this week in Geneva the Nansen Medal, the highest honor for humanitarian efforts on behalf of refugees, was awarded to three American seaman, Capt. Lewis M. Hiller, Mr. Jeffrey H. Kass, and Mr. Gregg Turay for their heroism in the rescue of 86 Vietnamese "boat people" off the north coast of Borneo.

The award was made by Mr. Paul Hartling, U.S. High Commissioner for Refugees, and may be said to be a statement of world opinion, or more to the point, the opinion of that portion of the world that does not drive its inhabitants to the desperate efforts of escape such as these we have witnessed from totalitarian Vietnam for a decade now. It is in order that the United States do so as well. Were we not in the closing hours of the 98th Congress, I would propose a resolution of gratitude to the captain and her valiant crew, members of the Seafarers' International Union.

If I may be allowed a personal reference, my son John McCloskey Moynihan has sailed as a member of the crew of the *Rose City*, and he has more than once described to me the quiet heroism of these merchant mariners. I am confident the Senate joins me in expressing admiration for this only most recent incident of the valor of those who go down to the sea in ships.

I submit for the RECORD an article relating to this matter:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 9, 1984]

DARING "BOAT PEOPLE" RESCUE BRINGS HONOR TO 3 AMERICANS

(By Henry Kamm)

GENEVA, October 8.—Chua Quach was not present at an awards ceremony here today at which three American seaman were honored by Paul Hartling of Denmark, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

Yet no one knows better than Mr. Quach, a Vietnamese refugee who now works as a laborer in a furniture factory in Philadelphia, what happened on the night of Sept. 23, 1983, in the stormy sea off the north coast of Borneo.

That was when Capt. Lewis M. Hiller stopped his 94,000-ton tanker, the Rose City, and went to the aid of Mr. Quach and 85 other refugees who were adrift in a small boat. Neither Mr. Quach nor the other refugees were present at the award ceremony today.

Without the heroic assistance of the Americans, Mr. Quach says, he would have died that night, together with his son. So would the other Vietnamese "boat people" adrift with him in the South China Sea—without food, with water only for the children and having burned most of their clothes in eight days and nights trying vainly to signal passing ships.

The award given to Captain Hiller and two crew members, Jeffrey H. Kass and Gregg Turay, was the Nansen Medal, the highest honor for humanitarian efforts on behalf of refugees. It was presented at the Palace of Nations here by Mr. Hartling on behalf of a special committee. The group, similar to the one that awards the Nobel Peace Prize, is made up of representatives of Norway and other governments and international organizations.

MANY BOATS ARE IGNORED

Since Vietnamese began fleeing their country in great numbers in 1975, accounts have multiplied of their small, often disabled, boats' being ignored by merchant vessels whose masters are eager to avoid the often time consuming, and thus expensive, formalities of bringing the refugees to land.

Mr. Quach, said that "more than 10" ships had passed the refugee vessel before the American tanker stopped. He recalled that crew members on one ship waved in greeting as the ship sailed out of sight of the refugee boat.

SWAM TO SAVE 2

Mr. Quach said in an interview from the United States that he was particularly grateful to Mr. Kass, 31 years old, a seaman from Seattle whose chief activity when he is not at sea is tending an organic garden on an island off Vancouver.

Mr. Kass swam through turbulent waters at night to rescue Mr. Quach, 43, and his 8-year-old son, who had clung to a lifesaver for two hours.

"He saved not only our lives but that of my wife, who remained behind in Vietnam," Mr. Quach said, his voice choking. "She would have committed suicide if our son had drowned."

Mr. Quach said that at the time of the rescue, there was no food and little water left on the rickety boat, heavily overloaded with 36 men, 20 women and 30 children. A 16-year-old girl drowned during the rescue operation.

"NEVER DONE MY DUTY"

When he decided to escape, Mr. Quach had just been released after seven and a half years in a "re-education" camp, to which he was confined for having been a lieutenant in the South Vietnamese Army. "I had never done my duty as a father to my son," he said, "so my wife and I decided we had to do this."

Mr. Quach and his son said they hoped Mrs. Quach would soon be able to leave Vietnam and join them.

When the lights of the Rose City beckoned in the distance, Mr. Quach said, he had abandoned hope for two days and was devoting all his time to consoling his son, "to spend my time on him before we die."

"I held my son to my bosom and waited for the time to die," said Mr. Quach, a graduate of Saigon University in linguistics who speaks fluent English.

He was chosen to be the first to try to climb aboard the Rose City, which had let down rope ladders. "I was supposed to lie," he said. "I was supposed to say we were 50, because we feared we would be refused if I said we were about 90."

He never told his lie, because his son slipped out of his embrace as he tried to climb the ladder and Mr. Quach jumped into the sea after him. "I didn't think," he said "I knew I couldn't live without my son."

Fortunately, he had instructed the child before leaving Vietnam in how to stay underwater. He had made his son immerse his head fully in a tub, successively lengthening the time the child held his breath. They reached one of the life rings Captain Hiller had ordered thrown toward the refugee boat.

From his reading, Mr. Quach recalled that lifesavers had signal lights attached. "When I found it and turned it on," he said, "I felt hope and told my son we would be rescued. But time passed and nobody came. The Rose City got smaller and smaller, and I came to lose hope."

"I told my son, 'I'm very sorry I haven't done my duty as a father."

"He said, 'Don't talk about this; say something cheerful.' But I made up my mind to throw away the lifesaver and to hold my son and die quickly together."

HELP ARRIVES

At about that time, Mr. Kass, who with others of the crew had descended into the refugee boat to use it to search for survivors and had been ovecome by seasickness, spotted the father and son. He handed one end of a line to a shipmate and jumped into the choppy sea. Reaching father and son with great difficulty, he pulled the lifesaver and those holding onto it to the refugee boat.

Mr. Kass jumped into the sea a second time when Mr. Turay, 27 years old, carrying an unsecured line, swam out to rescue another survivor who was clinging to a lifesaver. All three men made it back through a heaving sea. Earlier, a human chain of seamen on the rope ladders had handed the young and old up to safety, timing their moves as the heavy waves raised the refugee boat partly up the 40-foot height difference between the vessels.

"FELT TOTALLY OBLIGED"

The principal message of the High Commissioner's speech was to plead with the maritime industry to obey the moral law of the sea that Captain Hiller said he followed without hesitation.

The moral law of the sea, which is not codified in any statute book, is to give help to those in need and has long been a tradition among seamen. But there is no stated policy per se that has been adopted toward the boat people.

"I am sad and disturbed about so many reports that ships are passing by refugees in trouble," said Captain Hiller, 55, of Lakehurst, N.J., in an interview. "I felt totally obliged to stop and offer any assistance I could."●

SENATOR DAN QUAYLE

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to share with all of my colleagues an article paying tribute to Senator DAN QUAYLE of Indiana, which was recently published in the Journal of the National Association of Retail Druggists. This article brings to light the many contributions Senator QUAYLE has made to the U.S. health industry through his vigorous support of small business, tax reform, and traditional Republican values. I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

SENATOR DAN QUAYLE—INDIANA'S YOUNGEST SENATOR EVER IS A STAUNCH ALLY OF SMALL BUSINESS

Dan Quayle looks too young to be a U.S. Senator, And in fact he nearly is. Elected to the Senate in 1980 at the age of 33, Quayle is the youngest U.S. Senator ever to serve the state of Indiana.

But despite his boyish good looks, Quayle is already well on his way to becoming a seasoned Capitol Hill veteran. He first ran for elected office in 1976 and upset an eight-term incumbent Democrat for Indiana's Fourth Congressional District seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. After winning re-election by the largest margin every in the District in 1978, Quayle decided to make a run for the Senate in 1980.

His opponent was a formidable one indeed—three-term Senator and two-time presidential candidate Birch Bayh. Although outspent by nearly $500,000, Quayle surprisingly prevailed as part of the Reagan landslide. His was one of the 16 GOP victories in 1980 that gave the Republicans control of the Senate for the first time in 26 years.

CURBING SPENDING

Since moving across the Capitol to the Senate, Quayle has proven himself an able legislator and guardian of traditional Republican values. Quayle has worked hard in his role on the Senate Budget Committee to curb federal spending. He has been an advocate of a freeze on discretionary domestic spending and voted in 1982 for a constitutional amendment to require a balanced federal budget. For his commitment to economy in government, Quayle has been named a "Taxpayer's Best Friend" by the National Taxpayers' Union.

In 1982 Quayle also first introduced his SELF-tax plan (for Simplicity, Efficiency, Low tax rates, and Fairness), which is designed to eliminate most deductions except the personal exemption and those for home mortgage interest payments charitable contributions and some savings incentives. The tax schedule would also be simplified so most taxpayers could complete the forms themselves, and the tax ceiling for individuals would be reduced from 50 to 30 percent.

"What we really need in this country is dramatic tax reform," Quayle said in a recent interview with the NARD Journal. "We need to undo the complications of the tax code. Those that itemze, 60 percent of them need professional help. They have to get it to understand the tax code. I think there is a perception that that is unfair. We all know the story of the guy who lives in the big house and doesn't pay any taxes or very few. He is doing that with tax dodges, shelters, and loopholes. Then you take the guy down the street who works 40 to 50 hours a week with sweat on his brow, who is paying his fair share of taxes."

But Quayle's plan would do more than make the system more equitable, he says. "If you have a simplified tax system, you also have a far more efficient system. Efficiency would attack as well the problems we are having with revenues in the underground economy, which are estimated at $100 billion a year. If you get a more efficient system, you're going to get to that underground economy, and in the long term you're going to save revenues rather than expand them," said Quayle.

Quayle has also recently been named co-chairman of the new committee formed by the Senate to study its committee system. Besides seeking ways to limit the current overload of committees and subcommittees on which senators are asked to serve, Quayle is hoping to use his position on the committee to institute reforms in the federal budget process. The current system is not only "very clumsy and awkward," he said, "it makes it very difficult to get business done in a meaningful way." For starters, Quayle would like to replace the present annual budgeting cycle with a two-year budget. That change alone, he said, would make the system more stable and make it easier on pharmacists and others who have to deal with the government frequently.

AN "INCREMENTAL" APPROACH

In keeping with his interest in tightening the government's purse strings, Quayle has also devoted considerable energy to health costs as a member of the Senate's Labor and Human Resources Committee. This past March he unveiled a package of four bills aimed at containing health expenditures. These bills reflect Quayle's cautions, "incremental" approach to the health costs problem. He prefers market incentives to federally imposed caps on costs.

"The incremental approach I advocate," the Senator said in a recent speech, "includes market-oriented policies designed to encourage consumers, hospitals, physicians, and insurers to be more cost conscious in their health care expenditures. These market-oriented initiatives should promote a healthy competition between hospitals and physicians on the delivery level and third-party payers on the financing level, while making consumers more aware of the economic implications of their health care purchasing decisions."

Two of the bills Quayle has introduced promote the use of alternative delivery systems, in particular, preferred provider organizations (PPOs). His intent, he told the Journal, is to instill "as much competition as possible in the health care system." As for the problem some independents have had in gaining access to the bidding for pharmacy services under PPOs, Quayle agreed that access should not be denied.

"If we just move from one closed door operation to another closed door operation, then we haven't made much progress," said Quayle. "What we are trying to do is open up the system. The system is too closed right now." Ideally, Quayle said, PPOs should enhance pharmacists' business opportunities rather than diminish them.

Another of Quayle's health initiatives is S. 2503, the Health Care Consumer Information Act. "For health care to be competitive," said the Senator in commenting on the bill, "consumers and insurers must have access to easily understood and relevant data on both the cost and quality of services." Quayle's bill would mandate the Department of Health and Human Services to study the effects of current consumer price information on the health care marketplace and evaluate ways to provide price and quality of service data to consumers and third-party payers.

PHARMACIST LEGEND

Along with NARD, pharmacists in Qualye's home state of Indiana have been among those in the forefront of the fight for a pharmacist-legend class of drugs to protect the public from the potentially dangerous consequences of certain Rx-to-OTC switches. "The idea of pharmacist legend is worth exploring," Quayle told the Journal. What is needed now, he said, is "a full airing of the issues" in a congressional hearing. Appropriate input from pharmacists, physicians, consumers, and others should all be part of that process, he said.

No matter what the issue, Quayle can be expected to be attuned to the interests of independents. For three consecutive sessions of Congress, he has been honored by the National Federation of Independent Business as a "Guardian of Small Business.●

RECOGNITION FOR UNUSUAL EDUCATOR—ETTA GERO

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

● Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to note that the Board of Education in Passaic, NJ, recently took a highly unusual step in naming a

school after someone who is still living. Never before in the history of Passaic has this ever been done. But rarely has there been a person more deserving of this honor.

The Passaic Board of Education named its newest high school for Etta Gero, who served as an attendance officer for more than 40 years and also served for three terms as a member of the Board of Education. After her impressive career in the public schools, she served without pay for another 14 years in the city's parochial schools. Miss Gero's lengthy and dedicated service is an example to all of her colleagues in the educational community and to all the students whose lives she has touched.

But Miss Gero's accomplishments have been widely recognized for a long period of time. During World War II, she was among 10 women in the country cited for her outstanding work in special services. She headed the 40 member Voluntary Girls Service Club. Miss Gero has also received the NAACP Award, the B'nai B'rith Award and the Community Service Award of the Jaycees.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join the Passaic School Board in recognizing the truly exemplary record of Etta Gero. She is an inspiration to us all.●

CLEAN WATER ACT

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, in prior floor statements I have discussed the severe difficulties facing two pulp mills located in Sitka and Ketchikan, AK. I have spoken at length about the need for a Clean Water Act in 1984 and the need for those two isolated communities in my State to find some way of retaining the largest taxpaying industry in Southeast Alaska.

As many of my colleagues are aware, the Environmental Protection Agency informed Senator STEVENS and me on September 19, 1984, that it had denied variance requests for our pulp mills. In the course of discussing the EPA decision, the Assistant Administrator for Water told our staffs that the EPA had not considered the adverse economic impact that the closure of the mills would have on Sitka and Ketchikan. EPA apparently felt that no testimony or proof had been offered on the community economic impact issue, and that it therefore could not consider the matter.

On this, as on other matters, the EPA was wrong. I have reviewed the final EPA decision that denied the variance requests. Also, I have read the comments and testimony that EPA is bound, by law, to review before issuing a decision. The record clearly shows that the communities forcefully and unequivocally responded on the issue of adverse economic impact. For example, in Sitka alone, the pulp mill accounts for one-third of the city's entire tax base. It takes no magical insight for a decisionmaker to realize that Sitka would be devastated if one-third of its financial base evaporated.

I have asked the EPA to reconsider its assertion that it could not have evaluated data on the economic impact issue. I hope that EPA will come to its senses and accept the inescapeable conclusions of the proffered facts.

Mr. President, in recent days I have made numerous attempts to facilitate movement on the Clean Water Bill. My staff and I, along with experts from Alaska, have met several times with my colleague from Rhode Island, Senator CHAFEE, in an attempt to describe in detail our proposed solution to the problems faced by the mills. Through these discussions, I have learned that enactment of the Clean Water Act has not been held up because of our problem in Alaska. Rather, there are serious differences between the Senate and House versions of the bill, especially in the matching grant formula and construction grant provisions of the House bill. In fact, aside from the Alaska pulp mills, there are over 40 significant differences between the bills.

As I have noted, I have gone to Senator CHAFEE on many occasions asking how I can be of assistance in furthering progress on the clean water bill. In fact, I have gone to my friend so many times recently, that if Senator CHAFEE were less of a gentleman I'm sure he would run the other way when he sees me coming.

I have also spoken recently to Congressman ROE, chairman of the Public Works and Transportation's Subcommittee on Water Resources, to see if progress can be made.

By October 3, 1984, I realized that Senator CHAFEE had concerns with my amendment to compel EPA to perform a comparison study of the Alaska mills against the model mill. That amendment would have resolved, as I have stated previously, the air, energy, and water quality problems of the Alaska mills by determining that the Alaska mills had spent as much as the model mill and issuing the mills a permit at present permit limits. Alternatively, if the Administrator found that the Alaska mills had not spent as much as the model mill the Administrator would require that the Alaska mills immediately spend that amount and issue a permit at alternative effluent levels.

Because Senator CHAFEE had problems with my initial amendment, I proposed an alternative. The new approach provides a study by the EPA Administrator of 3 years' duration to determine appropriate innovative technology for resolution of the air, energy and water quality problems impacting the Alaska mills. During the study present permit limits would remain in effect.

I am now informed, however, that my alternative will not be further considered. Therefore, despite my efforts, it appears that all alternatives we have presented to Senator CHAFEE and to commitee staff will not be acted upon this session.

This is astounding to me, Mr. President. The Clean Water Act is important to this Nation, and it should be enacted. By failing to compromise spending differences, and not assisting two communities in Alaska, those who are responsible for sheparding the clean water bills through Congress have failed to achieve an important environmental goal this session. Not accommodating our concerns in Alaska is especially ironic considering the favorable treatment given to a most serious pollution problem involving New York City where raw sewage is being dumped daily into rivers and streams.

It must not go unnoticed the few pieces of major environmental legislation have been enacted this session, including the Superfund, and the Clean Water Act. This is most disturbing because I fear that this important legislation has not progressed because of a failure to engage in meaningful negotiation and compromise. Legislating is not an "all or nothing" process, and I sincerely hope that when we revisit these issues in the next Congress, there will be a greater effort to engage in worthwhile negotiation.

Mr. President, two communities in my State are in serious economic trouble because of actions of the Environmental Protection Agency. I am exceptionally distressed over this matter because the mills have tried to meet EPA's guidelines, but they appear never to be able to satisfy the Agency unless they close down their operations. This kind of misguided Federal action only serves to enhance the mills competitors, which are located in British Columbia and South Africa and are unfettered by any environmental regulation.

Mr. President, because the House and Senate Clean Water bills cannot be reconciled, we will have no Clean Water Act this year. The Alaska pulp mill problem will, therefore, confront the Senate once again in 1985. It must be resolved, for if the mills suffer economically, then all of southeast Alaska will suffer. My colleagues must realize that the mills are supported by a variety of other enterprises, some of which are logging operations owned by native corporations.

I give notice now that I will not stand by and continue to watch economic terror grip an entire region of my State. A solution to this problem must be found in the next Congress.

When we next convene, I will once again seek to negotiate with staff of

the Environment and Public Works Committee, and with Senator CHAFEE. I will expect them to work with me to resolve this nagging problem in southeast Alaska through the art of compromise.●

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ANTITRUST ACT OF 1984

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

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, last night this body passed and sent to the President H.R. 6027, the Local Government Antitrust Act of 1984. I wholeheartedly supported that bill and applaud the Senate for its action.

I would like to address briefly one very important provision of this bill: Section 3—the section setting forth the circumstances in which the treble damage protections of the bill apply to a municipal defendant in a pending case. During last night's debate, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] made a passing reference to section 3. His remarks implied that section 3 of H.R. 6027 directs a court in a pending case to look only at two factors—the stage of the litigation and the availability of alternative relief—in determining whether it would be inequitable not to apply the legislation to a pending case.

A careful reading of section 3 of H.R. 6027 and the statement of the managers which accompanied the conference report suggest that this is not a proper interpretation of the statute. Section 3 expressly directs the court to make its determination "in light of all the circumstances" surrounding any particular pending case. The statement of the managers makes it absolutely clear that "the court is to consider all relevant circumstances"—not only the stage of the litigation and the availability of alternative relief—in determining whether to preclude a treble damage award against a city defendant in a particular pending case.

This distinction is critically important to local units of government who are defendants in pending antitrust cases, because it entitles them to bring to the court's attention equities which would argue in favor of the bill's application to a pending case. These would include: The adverse impact a treble damage award might have on a local unit of government and its citizens, whether the local unit of government acted in good faith while exercising its normal regulatory, executive, administrative, or judicial powers or providing traditional public services, and the degree to which the city's action was directed by, or predicated on, Federal law or regulation.

In short, section 3 directs a court to take into consideration all relevant circumstances before deciding that a plaintiff will be allowed to seek treble damages from a local unit of government. This will ensure that cities who are defendants in pending cases have a fair opportunity to secure the treble damage protections affored by this legislation.●

COSTS AND BENEFITS OF IMPORT PROTECTION

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an article written by Donald May of United Press International on August 17, regarding the costs and benefits of import protection.

Mr. May describes the efficiency loss to the American economy of import restrictions of a number of kinds—autos, sugar, steel, textiles. In a series of interviews with economists and others, he establishes that the costs of such protection to the economy are great. He reminds us of a sobering statistic; 20 percent of manufactured goods consumed by Americans in 1980 were covered by some kind of import restriction. This was estimated by one economist to cost consumers $58.5 billion in 1980, or a hidden tax of $1,200 each year for the average American family of four. Certainly the impact of import restrictions is now even greater: Consumers for World Trade estimates it take about $2,000 per family.

As Mr. May points out, the costs and benefits to the entire economy of proposed import restrictions are simply not given adequate consideration.

This led me to offer an amendment to the Omnibus Trade bill, H.R. 3398, when considered in the Senate several weeks ago. The amendment requires that the Council of Economic Advisers make a report to Congress and the President on the broad economic impact on American jobs and consumers of import restraint recommendations of the International Trade Commission. The amendment was accepted, then dropped in conference, partly because the Council of Economic Advisers objected on grounds that the requirement for a public report would violate its confidential relationship with the President. Recognizing the validity of this concern, we suggested to Senate conferees on the trade bill that the provision be modified to require that the International Trade Commission make the required study.

The idea had received significant support from the two economists whom Mr. May interviewed: J. Michael Finger, economist at the World Bank, and Robert Baldwin, economist at the University of Wisconsin, both well recognized experts in international trade. Each suggested that the law be changed to require that the International Trade Commission spell out both the costs and benefits to the entire economy of proposals to restrict imports. Unfortunately, the conferees did not agree with their judgment.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD the article I referred to.

The article follows:

THE WEALTH OF NATIONS

(By Donald H. May)

WASHINGTON.—Have Americans forgotten Adam Smith's homespun advice on the benefits of international trade, written in the year of our national birth?

Consider the plea of the domestic steel industry. It wants Congress to limit steel imports to 15 percent of the U.S. market for five years. This, it contends, will provide jobs for American steelworkers and bring the industry the cash needed to modernize and become more competitive.

The potential benefits have received wide national publicity; the costs have received less notice.

A recent report by the Congressional Budget Office estimates those costs.

Average steel prices in this country, it calculates, would be 10 percent higher with quotas than without. This would raise the price of all goods made of steel. In the fifth year of protection, CBO estimates the cost to American consumers of steel quotas would be $7.8 billion.

Would this be a good bargain for the nation? Would the economy as a whole gain or lose? How would it affect other industries that use steel? How do we weigh gains for steelworkers against losses for consumers?

Those questions are at the heart of current debate over restrictions of trade not only in steel but in autos, textiles, copper, wine and many other products.

Adam Smith's simple idea that nations, like households, gain from specializing in the goods they make best, is where the debate starts.

In the 19th century, David Ricardo refined this into the theory of comparative advantage—when two nations, one good at making wine, the other at cheese, each produce the one at which they are relatively best, both countries end up with more wine and more cheese and a higher standard of living through increased efficiency of production.

He showed this gain comes even to a nation with no absolute advantage at either wine or cheese, but which exports the one in which it has least disadvantage.

CBO's steel report illustrates how most economists believe the benefits and costs of restrictions trade come about.

The proposed quotas on steel imports would cause their price to rise. This would increase demand for domestic steel, and its price also would rise.

Because of the higher price, Americans would use 4 percent or 5 percent less steel. But, even so, domestic producers would sell about 6 percent more steel to fill the gap by reduced imports.

In the fifth year, 1989, there would be 34,000 more U.S. steel industry jobs as the direct effect of quotas—although CBO said other factors could be at work at the same time causing a net job decline.

The domestic industry would gain in pretax profits by $1.7 billion in the first year, rising to $4.5 billion in the fifth. Under likely tax conditions, this would give it $1.5 billion to $2.5 billion a year (in 1983 dollars) in extra cash that it could invest to modernize.

All this, CBO says, would cost American consumers $7.8 billion in the fifth year of quotas alone. This money would flow from their pockets in three different ways:

$4.5 billion of the total would go from American consumers to domestic steel producers because these firms not only would sell more steel but also collect higher prices for the steel they already sell.

$2.2 billion would, as quotas normally are administered, go to foreign steel producers who would hold the quota rights to sell steel in this country. Quotas are in effect licenses to sell a fixed amount of goods at a higher price.

$1.1 billion would simply evaporate, an efficiency loss from the fact that steel that could be bought more cheaply abroad now would be produced in this country. This is the mirror image of what Smith and Ricardo were talking about. It is the efficiency gain from trade that protection takes away.

All three are losses to consumers, but only the last two are costs to the nation. The first, and biggest, is a shift of income from consumers to the steel industry and its workers.

The Federal Trade Commission, estimating the effects of a similar 15 percent quota that Bethlehem Steel Corp. and the United Steelworkers of America want President Reagan to impose on his own authority, cited the same kinds of costs—but not nearly as big.

The FTC said the total cost to consumers would be $605 million a year. The quotas it studied would apply to only 70 percent of U.S. steel imports. Many other technical differences explain the wide range of figures.

Both of these studies indicate the consumer cost per job saved would be high. CBO's figures amount to $200,000 per job in the fifth year, the FTC's to $99,000 a year per job saved.

The FTC compared the financial cost of quotas to consumers over five years with their financial benefit to steelworkers—the earnings these workers otherwise would lose over the same period. It found that for every $1 saved by steelworkers, consumers would lose $30.

In a 1980 study, the FTC measured these costs and benefits in other U.S. industries of various kinds of trade restriction during the late 1970s.

Comparing just the efficiency loss to the economy—not the full consumer cost—against the earnings benefits to workers, over four years, it calculated the costs of protection were 3.5 times the benefits in the sugar industry, seven times the benefits in clothing and 25 times the benefits in shoes.

Other studies in this and other countries have been made:

Robert Crandall of the Brookings Institution estimated that Japan's voluntary restraint of auto exports to the United States cost American consumers $4.3 billion in 1983, or about $100,000 a year for each job saved in the auto industry.

William Cline of the Institute for International Economics, in a study for footwear retailers, said quotas proposed by the domestic shoe industry earlier this year (since rejected by the U.S. International Trade Commission) would have cost American consumers $2 billion a year or $62,400 a year per job for five years.

Based on studies of textile protection in the United States and Canada in the late 1970s, the World Bank recently reported that, if made permanent, such restrictions would cost the United States $1 for every 7 cents gained by workers. In Canada, "for every one and a half cents by which the worker would be better off, one Canadian dollar would be wasted."

The World Bank estimated in 1981 that European consumers were paying $11 billion a year extra to support domestic agricultural prices rather than import food.

Although economists agree on the nature of these costs, there is no one answer to how big they are. They depend on assumptions, which are open to dispute.

For example, if—as the U.S. steel industry argues—quotas would not raise prices as much as CBO says, while domestic production increased more, then the cost to consumers would be less, the gains to the industry and workers would be bigger.

James Collins, executive vice president of the American Iron and Steel Institute, says CBO failed to include in the balance the full "cost of imports."

Last year, he contends, steel imports in excess of 15 percent of the U.S. market—the amount the industry now wants to stop—cost the domestic industry $2.3 billion in lost sales.

He calculates that when this loss had rippled through the economy, the total effect was a $5.1 billion smaller gross national product, 62,000 jobs lost directly and indirectly, $1.1 billion in taxes lost to the government and $350 million paid out in unemployment benefits.

That assumes money Americans spent last year to import steel was "lost" to the economy. CBO analysts say much of this money would come back in orders for U.S. export goods. These, in turn, would produce jobs and economic growth.

Smith and Ricardo said money spent on imports comes back with a bonus. They were arguing against a theory called mercantilism, widely believed in their times, which held that imports were in general bad, only exports were good.

The U.S. Trade Representative's Office estimates 20 percent of manufactured goods consumed by Americans in 1980 were covered by some kind of import restriction.

Attempts to find out how much all forms of protection cost Americans have been just as subject to debate as the separate industry studies.

Michael C. Munger at Washington University in St. Louis, Mo., estimated that protection cost American consumers $58.5 billion in 1980 and said even this was not a full accounting. He called it a "hidden tax" of $1,200 a year for the average American family of four.

Consumers for World Trade, an educational group, estimates that restrictions added since 1980 and inflation may have increased Munger's figure to as high as $2,000 a year per family.

In general, all these studies look only at those costs most easily measured in computers.

They do not count the loss of benefits from international trade that many believe are even more important. For example, international competition, which forces domestic firms to invest in new products and be more efficient. They do not include possible retaliation by other countries against U.S. exports.

"The smallest costs are those that can be easily identified," U.S. Trade Representative William Brock said in an interview.

"How do you prove how much money is not being spent on research and development? . . . The more protected an industry is, the less they spend on their own future."

Another, perhaps bigger, cost not found in computers has to do with the fact that trade is part of the process by which the world economy grows.

World trade and world output always have been linked. Both spiraled down after the Smoot-Hawley tariffs of the 1920s and have mushroomed during the last 50 years of international liberalization, which brought the world unprecedented rises in living standards.

The voice of American consumers is not often heard in the debates.

One reason is plain. The benefits go to a small group—an industry and its workers. The costs are spread among millions of consumers.

A steelworkers, whose job is at stake, has a big incentive to lobby his congressman. A consumer, who may be paying pennies more for a product made of steel, doesn't take the trouble.

Doreen Brown, president of Consumers for World Trade, which has been trying since 1978 to arouse consumer awareness of the issues, says consumers often just do not know the costs.

"They have not been hearing enough about the impact on consumers of trade restrictions to feel they have an interest," she said. "What they have been hearing is the other side from well organized groups."

The benefits of protection also sometimes get a better hearing within the federal government.

The International Trade Commission, a U.S. agency that handles trade relief petitions from industries, recently recommended to Reagan import restrictions for both steel and copper.

The ITC's sole function under the law is to examine whether a domestic industry has been injured and, if so, to recommend a solution. It does not advise the president on possible costs of its recommendations.

The President is required by law to consider both benefits and costs when such cases reach his desk.

The Federal Trade Commission supplies cost-benefit figures to an inter-agency Trade Policy Committee advising the President. But the FTC is not formally a member of that panel. Normally, the administration's cost-benefit analysis is not published.

J. Michael Finger, economist at the World Bank, and Robert Baldwin, economist at the University of Wisconsin, proposed in separate interviews that the law be changed to require the ITC to clearly spell out both costs and benefits.

Brock welcomed the idea, but said he wasn't sure what agency should do the analysis.

Finger said if the United States and other nations began formally considering costs and benefits in cases to limit trade under the "escape clause" of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, it could have a major effect on the amount of protection in the world.

He suggested changing GATT rules to allow such trade restrictions only if applied through procedures that weigh both the costs and the benefits.

If Americans finally decide the costs of protection as a way to deal with threatened industries are more than the benefits, they have several options.

One lies in what economists call adjustment, shifts of capital and workers from one industry to another.

These shifts are taking place in the economy all the time. Studies indicate they occur to a great extent for domestic reasons, such as changes in technology.

When imports threaten an industry, capital and workers can move to another industry that is more competitive. If it really is, free market economics says they will be rewarded with higher profits and pay.

It was exactly in this way that Adam Smith and David Ricardo saw the gains they described coming about.

These changes do not happen without time and pain. A steel worker in his 50s whose plant is closed may not find another job. One in his 40s may find work only at much less pay.

Those are the same costs the FTC measured when it calculated the earnings losses quotas could save for workers—which it found less than the costs of protection.

If the FTC is right, the costs of adjustment may be less than the cost of protection.

In other words, it could be cheaper to reimburse idled workers for the wages they lose and train them for other jobs than it would be to protect their industries.

There are big problems in this solution. Past trade adjustment assistance programs have been little more than temporary unemployment pay and have been abandoned.

Today's unemployment levels make it hard to change jobs. High pay levels in the steel and auto industries make it particularly difficult for workers to find other jobs at comparable salaries.

Despite these problems there are signs the nation may be starting to look down the adjustment road.

Congressional sponsors of proposed five-year steel quotas would require as a condition that the domestic industry take steps to become more competitive.

The ITC proposed that Reagan, if he approves steel restraints on his own, impose similar conditions. It was the first time the ITC has recommended in effect that adjustment be a requirement for protection.

Brock, a strong critic of steel quota legislation, nevertheless agrees in principle that if temporary protection is granted it should be linked to adjustment steps.

"We should," he said, "take into consideration, when an industry asks for relief, their willingness to do the tough things to guarantee that they can be competitive at the end of the relief."●

THE AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, last evening's edition of Baltimore's News American contains an editorial supportive of the American Conservation Corps legislation, which was passed by the House of Representatives earlier this week and by the Senate last week.

Very soon, the ACC bill, H.R. 999, will be before the President. I hope he heeds the words of the editorial, which is entitled "Close to a New CCC." I ask that the text of the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Baltimore News American, Oct. 11, 1984]

CLOSE TO A NEW CCC

It was back in 1981 that Senators Charles McC. Mathias and New York's Daniel Patrick Moynihan introduced a bill to establish an American Conservation Corps, similar to the popular Civilian Conservation Corps that did so much good during the Depression for the country and for the young men enrolled in it. Now, after what has been called a "long and tortured" history, the bill has been passed by both the Senate and the House and will go to the White House for the President's signature.

The legislation authorizes $225 million to be spent over the next three years to improve and upgrade the country's natural and cultural resources. In Sen. Mathias' words:

"Millions of acres of public rangeland are in substandard condition, and millions more are experiencing severe soil erosion. Furthermore, national state and city parks are suffering from the effects of vastly increased public use, while the manpower and funds to deal with these effects are not available due to tightened budgets at all levels of government."

The America Conservation Corps will attempt to reverse the trend, concentrating on reforestation, erosion and flood control, reclamation of strip-mining lands, rangeland management in rural ares and harbor and port management, repair and maintenance of city parks and energy conservation in urban areas.

The bill stipulates that the vast majority of the workers employed by the corps be between the ages of 16 and 25, and special efforts will be made to enroll youths who are economically disadvantaged.

Although, because it is a money bill and, incidentally, the only important social legislation to come out of the current Congress, the administration has opposed it. That does not mean a veto is likely. It has solid support from the Republican senators and members of the House. In addition, the Interior and Agriculture departments, which will manage the corps, have recommended that the president approve the bill.

We regard the formation of the corps with enthusiasm. While providing jobs for an element of the population that desperately needs them, it should do much over the years to solve major environmental problems. The president would be making a major mistake if he fails to give the project a green light.●

WALTER MONDALE, GERALDINE FERRARO, JERRY FALWELL, AND THE SELECTION OF FEDERAL JUDGES

● Mr. GARN. Mr. President, the Democratic ticket of Walter Mondale and GERALDINE FERRARO keeps talking about the Reverend Jerry Falwell appointing Federal judges, particularly justices of the U.S. Supreme Court. The Democrats think they can gain by attacking Mr. Falwell, and they have made no secret of their purpose in doing so. The Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, October 9, 1984, page 64, outlines the Mondale-Ferraro strategy:

The Mondale people also plan to target the Rev. Jerry Falwell, founder of the Moral Majority and a Reagan supporter, as an important "enemy." They say he has very high negative ratings in their polls.

Mr. Falwell, the Mondale-Ferraro enemy, was used again last night in the debate between the Vice Presidential candidates. Congresswoman FERRARO said that "the intrusion of politics into religion or religion into politics * * * started in 1980 when this administration was running for office the Reverend Jerry Falwell became very, very involved in the campaign."

The Vice President found it necessary to respond to this continuing canard:

I notice that Mr. Mondale keeps talking in the debate, and now it's come up here about Mr. Falwell, and I don't know where this canard could have come from about Mr. Falwell picking the Supreme Court justices.

Ronald Reagan had made one superb, outstanding, the only one he's made, appointment to the Supreme Court. And that was Sandra Day O'Connor. And Mr. Falwell opposed her nomination. We still have respect for him, but he opposed it.

And so I hope this lays to rest this slander against the president. We want justices who will interpret the Constitution, not legislate.

Notwithstanding the Vice President's hopes, the slander against the President will probably continue through the remainder of this campaign because Mr. Falwell has high negatives in the polls of the Democratic contenders.

After Sunday's debate between the President and the former Vice President, Mr. Mondale, I asked a number of researchers to help me find the evidence for Walter Mondale's numerous assertions that Reverend Falwell was going to get or pick justices of the Supreme Court. My researchers were unable to locate any evidence. They even called the Mondale-Ferraro headquarters but got no help there.

This morning's Washington Post provided the clue we had been looking for when it cited a February 4, 1984, article in the Post on the convention of the National Religious Broadcasters. Mr. Falwell addressed the convention, and here is the Post's account of Mr. Falwell's remarks on the Supreme Court:

Falwell and others at the convention cited the expected vacancies on the Supreme Court, through retirement of several justices, as a key reason to work for Reagan's reelection. He expressed the hope that "in Ronald Reagan's next five years in office we will get at least two more appointments to the Supreme Court who could swing the balance to produce a 5-4 decision against legalized abortions."

Let us make two assumptions: Let us assume that Mr. Falwell was quoted accurately and let us assume that this is the evidence that Mr. Mondale relied on for his statements in the first debate.

Now: Who was Mr. Falwell referring to when he said, "in Ronald Reagan's next 5 years in office we will get at least two more appointments to the Supreme Court?" Walter Mondale tells the Nation that the utterance means that Jerry Falwell gets two justices. A fair reading of the sentence shows that Walter Mondale is misleading the country. A fair reading of the sentence supports the interpretation that the country will get two new justices, and that Ronald Reagan will appoint them.

Suppose Reverend Falwell had said, "in Ronald Reagan's second term we will get an arms reduction agreement" or "we will get new Commissioners of the FCC" or "we will get inflation down to 1 percent". Would Walter Mondale be running around the country telling the American people that Jerry Falwell was going to be writing arms control agreements, selecting FCC Commissioners, or setting monetary and fiscal policy? Well, he might, since Mr. Falwell has high negatives in the Mondale polls, but if he did, his statements would be no more true than his ongoing statements about Mr. Falwell and the Supreme Court.

Reverend Falwell's remarks were totally inoffensive, but Mr. Mondale has twisted them, and linked them to an event that followed them by more than 6 months. The result is that Mr. Mondale is seriously, and apparently intentionally, misleading the American people.

Look at what Mr. Mondale said in the first Presidential debate:

> When the Republican platform says that from here on out we are going to have a religious test for judges before they are selected for the Federal court, and then Jerry Falwell announces that that means they get at least two justices on the Supreme Court, I think that's an abuse of faith in our country.

Faith in our country was not being abused, the truth was being abused and I think Mr. Mondale knew it. But Mr. Mondale was not through:

> The platform to which the President refers, in fact, calls for a religious test in the selection of judges. And Jerry Falwell says that means we get two or three judges.

The platform does not call for a religious test, in fact, and Walter Mondale knows it. Walter Mondale was still not finished with his "high negatives" "enemy," however. Mr. Mondale asked the country,

> Does every woman in America have to present herself before some judge, picked by Jerry Falwell, to clear her personal judgment [to have an abortion]?

Walter Mondale links the Republican platform which was adopted in August with Mr. Falwell's remarks which were made in February. It sounds like cause and effect, but isn't. There is no religious test in the platform. Jerry Falwell has never said that "they"—meaning, presumably, the Moral Majority—or he would "get" or "pick" Federal judges. And Jerry Falwell's statement, such as it was, was not made with reference to the platform.

Walter Mondale's statements are wrong separately and they are wrong jointly.

Mondale is wrong about Falwell. He is wrong about the platform. He is wrong to try to connect the two. He is wrong to say that he is running a campaign of decency.

What he is running is a campaign of error and deceit with a twist of bigotry. But of course, Jerry Falwell has very high negatives in "his" polls.●

OPPOSITION FIGURES IN SOUTH AFRICA

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

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last week I had the opportunity to have lunch with the Reverend Dr. Alan Boesak, a Dutch Reformed minister and president of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, and Bishop Desmond Tutu, an Anglican bishop and general secretary of the South African Council of Churches.

These individuals are two of the most courageous and distinguished men I have ever met. They spoke vividly of the injustices they have experienced and witnessed under the apartheid system in South Africa. They told me of the adverse effects of the Reagan administration's constructive engagement policy.

By following that disastrous policy, as Reverend Boesak emphasized, "the U.S. Government is supporting an undemocratic, oppressive government and creating a climate in which people begin to believe that Western democracy is important only as far as white people are concerned."

I share the concerns and sorrow of Reverend Boesak and Bishop Tutu over the shift in U.S. policy, and I am confident that these two men and others like them promise a bright future for South Africa once majority rule is established. While rejecting the use of violence, they recognize that lasting peace will never come to South Africa until the institutionalized racism and violence of apartheid are abolished. It is to men like Reverend Boesak and Bishop Tutu that the United States should now be turning.

Reports from South Africa in the past few days suggest that the authorities are planning to move against the United Democratic Front, the multiracial alliance of labor unions, students, community organizations, and political parties that has become the most powerful opposition force in South Africa. Under Reverend Boesak's dynamic leadership, the UDF has attracted several million supporters in little more than a year, and it succeeded in organizing an effective boycott of the August 1984 elections. Because of the UDF's influence, the South African Government has viewed it with increasing hostility, and the authorities appear to be setting the stage to impose a ban on the organization.

There have already been rumors that, in banning the UDF, the South African Government may also intend to arrest Reverend Boesak. If these reports prove true, that would be a severe setback to hopes for peaceful change in South Africa. At no time has Reverend Boesak or the UDF advocated or condoned violence; the organization's only crime is its obvious effectiveness in opposing the new constitution and in working for the peaceful elimination of apartheid. I would hope that any move by the South African Government to ban the UDF or to arrest Reverend Boesak would be met with the strongest possible response from the United States.●

NICARAGUA

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, in the last week or so, we have witnessed the spectacle of Sandinista Companeros cavorting in the very best salons of New York and Los Angeles in order to sway the gullible that their revolution is truly a Democratic and pluralistic effort. Nearly 60 years ago, Lenin stated that so-called useful fools were essential to the success of the Bolshevik movement in the Soviet Union. Mr. President, sad to say, this appears to be the case with many sympathizers of the Sandinista movement in this country and in Europe. The lengths to which these people will go to justify Sandinista abuses and policies are truly breathtaking at times. For example, some of these people will admit to you that the Sandinistas made some minor errors in dealing with the Miskitos, the Sumus, and the Rama Indians in eastern Nicaragua, but that now things are improved. I think that a few facts are in order to understand how large these errors were. In a recent report, the International League for Human Rights has documented the scale of the conflict between the Sandinistas and the indigenous peoples of eastern Nicaragua:

> Despite the fact that there remains a major need for accountability from the Government * * * facts publicly acknowledged or supplied by the Nicaraguan Government alone are sufficient to make the case that Indian rights have been badly violated:
>
> The entire Indian leadership was arbitrarily arrested, imprisoned, and interrogated.
>
> The Indians' organization (Misurasata) was disbanded by the government.
>
> Indian rights to self-government, to land, and to resources were denied by new government policies.
>
> Up to 14,500 Indians (out of a total regional population of 150,000 people) were forcibly relocated to camps where they have been detained or denied freedom of movement.
>
> Some 16,000 additional Indians fled to refugee camps in Honduras to avoid being relocated to the camps in Nicaragua.
>
> 39 Indian villages, including livestock, personal effects, crops, fruit trees, and so forth, were completely destroyed by Nicaraguan government forces in January and February 1982.
>
> The entire Indian region has been under strict military rule, even at the village level.
>
> Many hundreds of Indians have been killed, injured, or arrested and imprisoned in an ever-deteriorating Indian crisis.

While the Sandinistas have punished some of those who were responsible for atrocities in eastern Nicaragua, the conflict between indigenous forces and the Sandinistas has, if anything, escalated. A recent article by Prof. Bernard Nietschmann of University of California at Berkeley places this conflict in better perspective. Professor Nietschmann is recognized as one of the leading specialists on indigenous peoples in Central America; Nietschmann has been involved in intensive research with Miskito, Sumu, and Rama Indians over the past 15 years. I think that his article provides a good description of the Indians' perspective on their own struggles in Nicaragua.

Mr. President, in recent weeks, we have also been able to follow the progress in the negotiations between the Sandinista junta and the leaders of the democratic opposition forces over the Presidential elections, which are scheduled for November 4. An article in today's Washington Post indicates that the democratic coordinator has tentatively agreed to the terms of the Sandinista electoral board. Nevertheless, the Sandinista junta will not postpone these elections so that the opposition might have a legitimate opportunity to campaign freely. Gioconda Belli, a high-ranking Sandinista election official, stated yesterday:

The Sandinista front has given these people ample chance to participate. We think it is obvious that they are only trying to put the whole electoral process in jeopardy.

In other words, Arturo Cruz and the democratic coordinator have 3 weeks to create their campaign organization, raise some funds, nominate candidates, and all of the other procedures which are required in order to get elected.

Mr. President, I suppose that one can believe in miracles but I am not going to hold my breath for this one. Instead, I would urge my colleagues to take a moment to read several articles which convey a clearer perspective on the true intentions of the Sandinistas for the electoral process. Two of these articles are taken from the Economist's Foreign Report of London and include the full text of Comandante Bayardo Arce's secret speech of late June concerning the November elections. The third article is taken from today's Wall Street Journal and offers the perspective of a well-informed Venezuelan, Carlos Rangel, on this electoral process.

Mr. President, I ask that these articles as well as the article by Bernard Nietschmann on the Sandinistas conflict with the Indian peoples be printed in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Economist's Foreign Report of London, Aug. 23, 1984]

A SECRET SANDINIST SPEECH

The Sandinist government in Nicaragua has been seriously embarrassed by the publication in the Barcelona newspaper La Vanguardia of a secret speech by one of Nicaragua's nine comandantes, Bayardo Arce, to the central committee of the small Nicaraguan Socialist party (PSN)—a pro-Soviet Communist group—in Managua at the end of June. The co-ordinator of the Sandinist Junta, Daniel Ortega, has admittedly the authenticity of the speech, which was discreetly tape-recorded.

Arce's speech is reminiscent of some aspects of the secret speech of Maurice Bishop abou the goals of the revolution in Grenada (Foreign Report May 17th). Arce told the PSN representatives that the objective of Nicaragua's revolution was to establish a one-party state on orthodox Marxist-Leninist lines: he stressed the need for unity between the Sandinists and the PSN; and he suggested that the result of the presidential election on November 4th was entirely predictable. Arce said:

We believe that the election must be use—secure a vote for Sandinism, which is being questioned and stigmatised by imperialism, in order to demonstrate that the Nicaraguan people . . . are for Marxism-Leninism. They will not overturn this vote by force, as they did in Chile.

If it were not for the state of war forced on us . . . the electoral problem would be something completly out of step in terms of usefulness. What the revolution truly needs is the power to take action. And this power in take action is what constitutes the essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat . . . So the election is, from this point of view, a hindrance, like a number of other things . . . But, from a realistic point of view, these things are weapons of the revolution in forwarding the building of socialism. So it is useful for us, for example, to point to an entrepreneurial class and private production in a mixed economy, while we get on with the strategic aspects . . . The important areas (of the economy) are under state control.

We are discussing . . . first, the idea of putting an end to all this artifice of pluralism, that there is a Socialist and Communist party, a Christian Socialist and a Social Democrat party etc, which has been useful to us up to now. Now that has come to an end.

Let the people vote for all the things the revolution has done. Let them vote for literacy, adult education, confiscation, nationalisation of the banks and foreign trade, free education; let them vote for Soviet-Cuban advisers, for revolutionary internationalism. Let them vote for all that.

The important thing for us about the election is the working out of the new constitution . . . which will enable us to form the judicial and political principles for the construction of socialism. We are using an instrument, demanded by the bourgeoisie, which disarms, the international bourgeoisie, in order to form our own strategic objectives.

[From the Economist's Foreign Report of London, Sept. 6, 1984]

A SECRET SANDINIST SPEECH (2)

In our last issue (Foreign Report, August 23rd), we published extracts of a secret speech by a member of the Sandinist junta, Bayardo Arce, explaining the Sandinist strategy for Nicaragua. Arce is coordinator of the political commission of the Sandinist Front. He asked the allied Socialist party, a Marxist-Leninist group, to unite with the Sandinists after the election in November. Here are some more tape-recorded extracts of Arce's speech:

Imperialism asks us three things: that we abandon interventionism; that we abandon our strategic ties with the Soviet Union and the socialist community; and that we should be democratic. We cannot stop being internationalists without stopping being revolutionary. We cannot stop our strategic relations. This does not enter into any consideration . . .

But democracy, as they call it, bourgeois democracy, contains an element which we can manage and obtain positive elements for the construction of socialism in Nicaragua . . . The most important . . . is the elaboration of a new constitution because . . . (it) will allow us to shape judicial and political principles for the construction of socialism . . . This new judicial framework will let us adopt a new rhythm, more dynamic. That is the project which we will obtain from the electoral process.

So in this context, in which the elections will let us be more clear in a series of things, we ask what role will our allied forces play? The Socialist party is a Marxist-Leninist party . . . We have not declared ourselves in a public and official way as Marxist-Leninists . . . We say: Do we have strategic differences with the Socialist party, or does the Socialist party have differences with us? Isn't it times to make a single party? Why are we communists putting on different shirts?

We ourselves have started to discuss this, but we invite you to discuss it too. Because, if we wish, well, after the elections, we are going to drop the fiction that there is a Socialist party which is Marxist-Leninist and there are those of the Sandinist Front, who still have not taken off their shirt. The problem of identity in the electoral processs is absolutely secondary . . . We are trying to avoid changing faces too much, avoiding confusions: we don't talk about the aspect in depth . . .

This is going to be the first experience in the construction of socialism with the dollars of capitalism.

We still have not started to move the crowds (turbas)—Because the moment has not yet arrived. We are concentrating our efforts on military matters . . .

We must take advantage of this change, which the electoral press represents, to draw positive profits: the unity of the Marxist-Leninists of Nicaragua. Thank you.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 12, 1984]

THE DOUBLE LIVES OF NICARAGUA'S COMANDANTES

(By Carlos Rangel)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—As Comandante Daniel Ortega and his Sandinista companeros flirt with Hollywood stars, cavort with New York's jet set at the Russian Tea Room and take in baseball games, they still have found time to make their case that the Sandinistas stand for pluralism and peace in Central America. They back up this claim by referring to their coming elections and their verbal acceptance of the Contradora treaty. This verbal approval alone has been heralded by many of the U.S. as proof that the Sandinista elite are in earnest. However, the comandantes' assertions concerning

elections and the peace process made on their home turf rip apart the current public-relations fascade that has taken in so many naive Americans.

Publicly, leaders of the Contradora countries—Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Panama—voice satisfaction with the new draft treaty. Privately, those same leaders admit that the letter-perfect Contadora treaty is hardly worth the paper it is written on. The painstakingly conceived document would encourage Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Costa Rica to be models of democracy and practitioners of good neighborly behavior. Actually, none of those countries, and least of all Nicaragua, have the slightest intention of abiding by those angelic rules.

Seen in this light, the Contadora draft treaty could be likened to all other arrangements that seek to buy "peace in our time" at the cost of one of two slices of what is seen as somebody else's flesh, when it is really our own. In the case at hand, the supposedly alien flesh is that of the Nicaraguan people. And those ready to allow the slicing are pretending to perceive the Sandinistas' verbal adherence to the Contadora draft treaty as somehow disproving the evidence that next month's Nicaraguan elections are rigged from top to bottom.

Besides everything else that is public knowledge, Sandinista cynicism about the whole electoral exercise stands revealed in a remarkable speech last spring by Bayardo Arce, one of the nine Sandinista comandantes. Mr. Arce is the director of the Sandinista political commission that is overseeing the electoral process in Nicaragua. His speech was delivered to the Central Committee of the Nicaraguan Socialist Party (NSP), an aggressively Marxist-Leninist ally of the Sandinista Front. There is no doubt about the authenticity of the speech; a tape recording exists, on which Mr. Arce's voice and manner of speaking are plainly recognizable. No denial has been issued by Managua, doubtless because of the solid proof of the recording.

Mr. Arce's speech is long, rambling and conversational. I will condense and quote the most flavorful parts. By the drift of the speech, it appears that the NSP and Mr. Arce remains unconvinced of the wisdom of holding elections at all. He starts by acknowledging that the NSP has requested an explanation as to why the Sandinista government became embroiled in the bothersome business of elections, and about "the perspective that we Communists must have on the electoral process." Mr. Arce continues:

"* * * let me remind you that back in 1979 the Organization of American States was trying to find a non-revolutionary solution [to the fall of Somoza]. In that context, we [the Sandinistas] came up with a program that made us acceptable, based on three points that we knew we could manage in a revolutionary way. These were nonalignment, a mixed economy and political pluralism. Without these negative commitments, it is true that the elections would be absolutely untimely. What a revolution needs is the executive expediency which is the essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and from that point of view the elections are a hindrance.

"But from the point of view of the reality we have, the elections are a tool of the revolution and a way of advancing in the building of socialism. . . . It is, for example, useful for us to be able to point out that there remains a private entrepreneurial sector, while we advance in all strategic (economic) aspects. That entrepreneurial class no longer counts. The Nicaraguan economic project is entirely in the hands of the state. In the same way, the elections have become an expedient in order to deprive our enemies of an argument.

"Imperialism asks three things of us: that we should forsake revolutionary internationalism, that we should cut our strategic links with the Soviet Union, and that we should be domocratic. Now, the formal aspects of what they call democracy, we can handle, and the elections are that. *But we could not stop being internationalists or cut our strategic relations with the U.S.S.R. and remain revolutionary. That is out of the question.* Elections, yes, because in them we have an instrument that will disarm the international bourgeoisie while we keep on going forward with the essential and strategic aspects of the revoluton" (emphasis added).

Mr. Arce goes on to explain how with the Nov. 4 elections it will appear that the Nicaraguan people (and not just the Sandinista government) "are in favor of Soviet-Cuban advance, are in favor of totalitarianism, are in favor of Marxism-Leninism, are in favor of Soviet-Cuban military advisers, are in favor of revolutionary internationalism."

In another part of his speech, Mr. Arce says that after the elections "the time will have come to think about a single party. Why should we Communists go on wearing different shirts, if anyhow socialism is being built [in Nicaragua] through the strategy of the Sandinista Front? We should think now about doing away with all this fiction of pluralism."

There is much more in Mr. Arce's secret speech to the NSP than can be gleaned in this space, but lest one believe that Mr. Arce is merely the one bad egg in the Sandinista basket, we offer the views of presidential candidate Daniel Ortega, presented in a speech two weeks ago to a crowd of supporters in Managua. Mr. Ortega warned opposition leaders that if they continued to call the growing conflict with the anti-Sandinista rebels a civil war, "they might just end up with such a civil war on their hands, and then whole classes of people will disappear. The people will obliterate some classes and then these classes will know the fury of the public."

That statement ties ominously with Mr. Arce's call to patience to the NSP: "We haven't moved the mobs [las turbas] yet, because the time is still not ripe."

It should be kept in mind that Mr. Ortega and Mr. Arce are regarded by their supporters in the U.S. as "moderates" when compared with "hard liners" like Sandinista Interior Minister Tomas Borge, who is much more open about his Marxist-Leninist expansionist ideals. What bothers Latin Americans is that gringos seem less concerned with what the comandantes are saying and doing in Nicaragua than with the stories they relate to liberal jet setters over cups of cappuccino in New York and Hollywood.

(Mr. Rangel is a Venezuelan journalist, author and television commentator. A related editorial appears in Review and Outlook.)

NICARAGUA'S OTHER WAR—INDIAN WARRIORS VS. SANDINISTAS

(By Bernard Nietschmann)

Last January I visited Nicaragua's Miskito, Sumo, and Rama Indians in refugee camps in Costa Rica and inside Nicaragua, where they are fighting the Sandinista government. This was my third unofficial trip inside Nicaragua since mid-1983 to talk with villagers and Indian military leaders. The Indian perspective is seldom sought and almost totally absent from discussions of the Indian-Sandinista conflict. I would like to share the rationale and goals of the Indians who are actively resisting the Frente Sandinista de Liberacion Nacional (FSLN), and to place these within the context of other interpretations that are often given by the media, the United States, the Sandinistas, and the Indians' supposed allies, the Fuerza Democratica Nicaraguense (FDN) and Alianza Revolucionaria Democratica (ARDE).

Miskito, Sumo, and Rama Indians have been fighting the Nicaraguan government for three years. The Indians were the first group to militarily oppose the FSLN, beginning in February 1981 (a year before the FDN and two years before the ARDE). Their resistance is widespread, long term, and determined, and operates throughout Indian territory in eastern Nicaragua and from border areas near Costa Rica and in Honduras. The Indians do not see themselves as *contras* (counterrevolutionaries) but as Indian revolutionaries fighting for Indian objectives. Their struggle is in many ways part of the overall anti-Sandinista war, but their reasons and goals are not. They are fighting to establish their rights for self-determination, to regain their traditional lands, and for autonomy. They are fighting for Indian control of Indian territory, not to overthrow the Sandinista government or to make it more democratic. As one Indian leader told me: "The *contra* groups like the FDN and ARDE are fighting for democracy and representative free elections. We are fighting for something else. We are not fighting for democracy—we never had it from any government. We are fighting for something that was taken away from us. We are fighting for our land. For an Indian, freedom is land, not democracy."

From the Indians' perspective, all governments in the Americas are anti-Indian. Indians are dying in Guatemala and in Nicaragua. Indian lands and cultures everywhere are under attack by the state, be it right wing, left wing, military junta, democratic, Marxist, or whatever. However, the Nicaraguan Indians have decided to resist rather than passively accept decisions forced upon them.

The Miskito have centuries of resistance experience and are prepared for a prolonged war. Since the sixteenth century they held off efforts to colonize Indian territory, culminating in 1800 when they expelled a Spanish force more than 20 years before other anti-Spanish wars of independence established free states in Latin America. The Treaty of Managua (1860) gave autonomy to what was called the Miskito Reservation, the eastern coast of Nicaragua, but in 1894 a Nicaraguan military force invaded the area to "reincorporate" it into the nation. During the twentieth-century dictatorships, the Miskito, Sumo, and Rama maintained control over their village communal lands and resources, but government leases given to foreign companies bypassed Indian determination over land and natural resource use in many areas of their territory. After 1979, FSLN agrarian reform aimed to expropriate under state control land deemed to be underused or misused. The Indians' ecologically adapted land use system depends on having large amounts of land lie fallow while small amounts are cultivated. Forest reserves, pasture land, and surplus land for

future population growth are integral parts of each community's territory. What the FSLN saw as surplus land was transferred to state control for eventual development and redistribution. The Indians saw this as outright theft of their lands backed by a massive military presence and foreign advisors. The FSLN believed that the revolution gave them the right to "integrate" Indian lands and peoples into Nicaragua; the Indians saw that the revolution gave the FSLN the power to do so but not the right. Decisions over Indian land and peoples were an Indian right.

The Indians seek to maintain communal ownership of their village lands, which collectively constitute Indian nations, and to continue their primary allegiance to those nations as distinct peoples. The FSLN seeks to incorporate what they see to be ethnic minorities into the revolution as citizens whose allegiance is to the revolution and whose territories are to be brought under national sovereignty.

Professor John Bodley of Washington State University writes in *Victims of Progress*, a worldwide survey of programs and peoples to control and transform indigenous peoples: "It has become fashionable to describe tribal peoples as national minorities, and as such to even speak of them as obstacles to national unity and sources of instability. Newly independent nations have been eager to politically incorporate zones that former colonial governments had left relatively undisturbed, on the theory that such zones had been deliberately perpetrated in order to create division within the country."

The war between the Indians and the Sandinistas began over who was going to control indigenous territory and peoples. As such, it is one of the many fourth World wars currently being waged on every continent. At present there are some 20 resistance movements involving indigenous peoples against states, including the Nagas, Sikhs, Misoran, and Kachims in India; the Kalinga and Muslim groups in the Philippines; the Papuans, Timorese, and Mollucans in Indonesia; the Mujahedin in Afghanistan; the Maya, Zapotec, and Mixe in Guatemala and Mexico; and the Ovimbundu, Harrah, and Bantu in South Africa and Namibia. The Miskito, Sumo, and Rama are fighting for an autonomous region similar to what the San Blas Cuna have won by force in Panama, the Naga in Assam, and the Nilotic and Sudanic peoples in Southern Sudan.

One Miskito warrior inside Nicaragua asked me, "Why do Sandinistas want to take over Indian land and my people? We don't want to go to the west coast to force our ways on them. They should have helped us develop our Indian land and people, not compel us to their ways. They started this war by coming here with their policies and military. We will end the war at the borders of our land."

The Indian resistance is hidden and misinterpreted due to the larger international situation involving Nicaragua, Cuba, the Soviet Union, the United States, and Honduras. Beneath the political rhetoric the Indian-Sandinista war is a conflict between the power of the state to impose and the capacity of the indians to resist. The Nicaraguan wars are a boxes-within-boxes conflict—Indians against state control, Nicaraguans against Marxist-Leninist control, the United States against FSLN control—which conveniently and simplistically have been interpreted as one war, one conflict, one source, one goal. The FSLN has attempted to attribute the goals of the U.S., FDN, and ARDE to the Indians, and the U.S., FDN, and ARDE have tried to align the Indian resistance to their goals.

Because the Indians' limited goals do not fit into the two-dimensional "right vs. left" analyses of the Nicaraguan conflict, they are made to fit. At the international level the Indian resistance is usually referred to paternalistically as "U.S.-backed disaffected Indian contras," as if the Indians were not fighting for their own reasons. (This is the equivalent of saying "French-backed disaffected colonists" to describe the forces that opposed the British during the American Revolution.) The United States uses the violations of Indians' human rights to discredit the Sandinista government, conveniently ignoring what the Indians are fighting for and focusing only on what has happened to them. A strong pro-indigenous stance is hardly part of U.S. domestic or international policy. The FSLN, while maintaining that the Indian opposition is externally provoked and manipulated as part of CIA-directed destabilization efforts, recently has admitted mistakes and errors in their Indian policies and has released many Indian political prisoners and announced a general ill-defined amnesty that is to date unattractive and being ignored by Indians fighting, in exile, and in refugee camps. (Although the amnesty is an important first step toward political negotiations, the Indians do not see anything to come home to. In fact, since the December '83 amnesty, Indians have continued to flee Nicaragua. To counter this embarrassment, the Nicaraguan government has falsely accused the ARDE and FDN of prohibiting Indian refugees from leaving Costa Rica and Honduras.) And the Indians' military allies—the FDN and ARDE—are unsupportive of the Indian goal of autonomous control over Indian territory, resources, and peoples. In the face of the still-unresponsive Sandinista government, the Indian resistance must continue these alliances to obtain weapons and logistical aid. Yet the Indians realize that their supposed allies are limiting support to reduce the Indians to small-scale guerrilla activities and to prevent them from becoming a well-armed army of Indian nationalists. Even if the current conflict were "solved" politically or militarily, the Indians will continue to fight if they don't regain their land and achieve self-determination. In the midst of this struggle, they actively plan for what unfortunately may be the next war, Indians versus non-Indians, eastern Nicaragua versus western Nicaragua.

As hopeless as their situation may appear, the Indians are determined to continue and they do have many advantages. Like the Afghanistan rebels, they base their resistance on the cohesive yet decentralized structure of their village societies which are cemented by strong cultural and religious identities and the centuries-old warrior tradition of the Miskito, who have never been dominated militarily in their extensive and rugged territory. This is the situation that fuels their determination to fight on: (1) one-fourth of the coast's 165,000 Indians are in military-controlled "relocation camps" or in refugee camps in Honduras or Costa Rica; (2) one-half of the Miskito and Sumo villages have been destroyed; (3) Indian rights to self-government, traditional land, and resources have been abolished; (4) subsistence cultivation, fishing, and hunting are strictly controlled, and access to staple foods is so limited that hunger is an everyday problem and starvation a probability in many communities; (5) many villages have had no medicine or doctors for over two years; (6) freedom of movement is denied or severely restricted; (7) more than 35 Indian communities have suffered massive Sandinista invasions during which civilians have been arbitrarily arrested, interrogated, tortured, killed, raped, and robbed, and had livestock and crops destroyed. These attempts to force the villages to divulge the locations of the Indian warriors' secret base camps and to terrorize them into not supporting the warriors have been unsuccessful. As bad as it was under the 43 years of Somoza dictatorships, however, the Indians have suffered much more in the four and a half years of the Sandinistas.

During their three years of armed resistance to the FSLN, the Indians have not lost a military confrontation. In addition to numerous guerrilla skirmishes, they have fought several major head-to-head battles against Sandinista forces, including the battles of San Carlos (January 1982), Seven Bank (July 4, 1982), Limbaika (August 1982), La Tronquera (May 13, 1983), Gunpoint (June 23, 1983), Haulover to Puerto Isabel (October 1983), and Waspam and Leimus (March 1984).

The October 1983 Indian-Sandinista battle in the Haulover to Puerto Isabel area was the biggest of the war and one of the major confrontations waged by anti-Sandinista forces. Sandinista soldiers who came to the warrior-controlled village of Haulover on October 1 to forcibly relocate the civilian population were met by a large resident force. Surprised by the scale of the resistance, the Sandinistas brought in several thousand more soldiers and used "push and pull" airplanes and helicopters to bomb Indian warriors and civilians (65 bombs were dropped during an 11-day period). Eleven civilians died from the bombings and 27 more died from sickness and hunger when the villagers fled for a month into the mangrove swamps to escape the bombings, strafing from coastal patrol vessels, and land battles. Running low on ammunition after several days of widespread battles, the warriors retreated into the mangrove. The Sandinista forces suffered heavy casualties. The Indians lost seven warriors.

Keeping in mind that the Indian struggle is dedicated to Indian goals, let us consider some of the possible future alternatives for the Indian-Sandinista conflict. First, the Sandinista military solution to control the Indians has not worked. After several years of fighting the Indians it should be evident to them that they cannot defeat the Indian forces permanently established inside Indian territory. Furthermore, so-called Indian "leaders" working with the Managua government do not represent Indian interests or the vast majority of Indian noncombatants, certainly not the Indians who are fighting. While these "leaders" may be important to the FSLN for seeking international support of their Indian policies, they do not represent a solution for the actual domestic conflict. Meanwhile, the Indian forces are limited by the quantity of arms they can obtain from their FDN and ARDE allies or from Sandinistas they engage in battle. As limited as they might be, however, they are willing to continue for years if necessary. But they also see that their current position—though marginal because of the military superiority of the FSLN and the control exerted by their supposed allies—actually gives them considerable leeway in future decisions.

Based on my discussions with Indian leaders about their struggle, I want to present four hypothetical situations for future actions:

1. The Indians could continue as they are, underarmed and undersupported by their allies, and simply try to wear down the Sandinistas militarily and ecomomically until the war becomes too costly for the FSLN and some sort of resolution is achieved, either independently of the FDN and ARDE position or as part of it.

2. The Indians' FDN and ARDE allies could take a strong, pro-Indian position, sign and support treaties for Indian control of Indian land, and provide greater logistical and arms support to help the Indians push the Sandinistas from eastern Nicaragua. The Indians have a potential force of 10,000 warriors and they represent the quickest way to massively expand military pressure on the FSLN.

3. Another outside interest—China, for example—could step in and provide arms and logistical support to the Indians to establish a political beachhead in the Americas.

4. Or, the FSLN could evolve a much-needed pro-Indian policy, recognizing that Indian land and self-determination aspirations are not "counterrevolutionary," and begin negotiating with authentic Indian leaders to adapt some of the revolution to the Indians, not just the Indians to the revolution. If the FSLN were to guarantee Indian control of traditional Indian land, help rebuild the destroyed villages, and arm the Indians, they would solve a military problem, isolate FDN and ARDE forces by breaking the connecting guerrilla link in eastern Nicaragua, allow the Indians to defend their territory from *contra* incusions, and thus be able to concentrate their FSLN forces on the northern and southern borders.

Of the three anti-Sandinista wars—the FDN, the ARDE, and the Indians—the Indian conflict would be for the FSLN the easiest to resolve. On the other hand, it would also be the easiest to expand. These options to shut down or open up Indian resistance will be accepted by the Indians to the extent that they see the possibilities to achieve their goals of self-determination and Indian control of Indian land.●

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT'S CENTENNIAL

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, yesterday, we celebrated the 100th anniversary of the birth of the "First Lady of the World," Eleanor Roosevelt. We also celebrated the official opening of Val-Kill as the first and only national historic site dedicated to the memory of a First Lady. Eleanor Roosevelt loved the cottage at Val-Kill, where she could enjoy "the peace of nature." And the furniture factory, where she later lived, is emblematic of her unwavering commitment to helping those in need.

I had the great good fortune to know this remarkable woman. In December 1961, President Kennedy established a President's Commission on the Status of Women, which he asked Mrs. Roosevelt to chair. I was an assistant to the Secretary of Labor at the time, and I represented him on the Commission. Mrs. Roosevelt, who chaired the Commission until her death on November 7, 1962, was energetic and gracious. And, she was firm-minded: she steered the Commission to its conclusion that the role of women in American economic affairs was unfairly and unwisely circumscribed. A conclusion, I might add, not without basis still.

At the suggestion of Lucille Pattison, the county executive in Dutchess County—in which Val-Kill and Springside are located—I introduced legislation on July 28, 1983, to establish an Eleanor Roosevelt Centennial Commission for the purpose of coordinating the commemorative activities of this centennial year. The number and scope of these activities have been staggering—a tribute to her influence.

Senate Joint Resolution 139 was passed by the Senate on November 2, 1983, and by the House of Representatives 2 days later. I have been honored to serve on the Commission, which has been chaired by Trude Lash. We owe a debt of gratitude to Frederica Goodman, on loan from Governor Cuomo, for dedicating so much of her time and energy to serve as the Commission's Director.

Eleanor Roosevelt set the standard for the modern political wife, and, in her own right, had an enduring impact on domestic and international affairs. Often called the "eyes and ears" of her husband, Franklin, she was more than that; she was the spirit that powered the New Deal, that built a new society. No one championed the cause of the disenfranchised and the oppressed better than she, whether at home, or the United Nations—where, as a member of the U.S. delegation, she was singulary responsible for the drafting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was adopted unanimously by the U.N. General Assembly on December 10, 1948.

Eleanor Roosevelt's idealism knew no bounds. And, she had the energy to match. She lived to do things for other people, always to do something useful and important—for in no other way, she was convinced, "can true happiness be attained." She believed that institutions existed for similar purposes.

The era of expansive, affirmative government, which she helped to usher in, is over. Existing social programs are under siege; new ones, virtually without exception, will not be established. One exception, perhaps, will be the creation of an American Conservation Corps, patterned after the Civilian Conservation Corps of the New Deal era. But I note that the Senate required 3 years to pass ACC legislation. Half a century ago, the Senate, at President Franklin Roosevelt's request, passed legislation to authorize the CCC in 1 week.

Government has changed; so, too, has our perception of its purpose and functions. But we imperil ourselves if we consign Eleanor Roosevelt's vision of government to irrelevancy. We imperil ourselves if we fail to share Eleanor Roosevelt's vision of the private citizen, his rights, and his responsibilities. As Joseph Rauh, Jr., remarked, her "golden footprints" will "always remain a compass for the caring, a compass never more needed than today."

At the age of 74, she remarked, "When you cease to make a contribution, you begin to die." I don't believe that Eleanor Roosevelt ever ceased to make a contribution. Her spirit is with us, on this centennial celebration, prodding—even goading—us to affirm the good works that individuals and institutions can—and should—do.●

WHAT THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1984 (S. 2568) MAY MEAN FOR THE PRIVATE SECTOR

● Mr. GARN. Mr. President, fortunately, for the good of this country, the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1984 was defeated on a procedural motion in the Senate. However, I'm sure we will face this issue again in the next Congress. Hopefully, at that time we will go through the proper process and have committee hearings before the Senate as a whole considers such important and far-reaching legislation.

I supported title IX legislation when it passed Congress many years ago. I applaud the strides that have been made by and for women because of this legislation and hope next year we can pass legislation that will continue this effort. However, the bill that was before this body went way too far. In that light, I wish to refer my colleagues to an excellent analysis of this legislation prepared by Lincoln Oliphant of the Senate Republican Policy Committee. It is a detailed report of just what effect this bill would have had on the private sector. And this is just one of the problems with this bill. The long arm of the Government has been stretched far enough. It doesn't need to reach into more areas of our lives through legislation of this type.

The analysis follows:

WHAT THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1984 (S. 2658) MAY MEAN FOR THE PRIVATE SECTOR

I. THE INTERRELATIONSHIP OF THE STATUTES

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000d, *et seq.*, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1681, *et seq.*, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 U.S.C. 794, and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6101, *et seq.*, each prohibit discrimination in "any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Respectively, the statutes prohibit discrimination on the basis of "race, color, or national origin," "sex," "handicap" ("otherwise qualified handcapped individual"), and "age." Title IX is limited to education programs.

Title VI, which is the model for the later enactments, provides:

"No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." 42 U.S.C. 2000d (1976).

The courts have consistently held that the statutes are interrelated—that comparable language evidences a common meaning and intent. A judicial construction of one statute is often used to interpret another. *See, e.g, Northcross v. Bd. of Education*, 412 U.S. 427, 428 (1973).

In the *Grove City* case, *infra*, the Supreme Court construed the "program or activity" language of Title IX. This authoritative interpretation of Title IX is likely to control Title VI, Section 504, and Age Discrimination Act (ADA) cases as well, although we can only speculate on the precise effects.

II. THE "GROVE CITY" CASE

Grove City is a private, coeducational, liberal arts college located in Pennsylvania. It describes itself as having "both a Christian world view and a freedom philosophy" and it maintains that these positions are "interrelated."

At the time of the lawsuit, Grove City had about 2200 students. About 140 students were receiving Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOGs) and about 340 students had Guaranteed Student Loans (GSLs). The grants were made directly to the students (the grants were not funneled through the college) through the Department of Education's (ED's) Alternate Disbursement Systems (ADS). (Institutions participating in ADS must make certain certifications to ED, but the Department itself calculates the awards and makes disbursements directly to eligible students. ED also operates the Regular Disbursement System (RDS). Under RDS, ED estimates the amount of money that an institution will need for grants and advances that sum to the institution, which then selects recipients, calculates, the amount of the grants, and disburses the funds.) Student loans are guaranteed by the federal government.

"Apart from this indirect assistance, Grove City has followed an unbending policy of refusing all forms of government assistance, whether federal, state or local. It was and is the policy of this small college to remain wholly independent of government assistance, recognizing—as this case well illustrates—that with acceptance of such assistance one surrenders a certain measure of the freedom that Americans always have cherished." *Grove City College v. Bell*, — U.S.—, 104 S. Ct. 1211, 1223 (1984) (Powell, J., concurring).

ED concluded that Grove City was a "recipient" of "Federal financial assistance" as those terms are defined by Title IX's regulations, 34 CFR Part 106. Grove City was informed that as a recipient it must execute an Assurance of Compliance form. Grove City refused to execute the document, and ED began administrative proceedings which resulted in an order terminating assistance to Grove City's students. The Administrative Law Judge concluded that student grants and loans constituted indirect federal financial assistance to Grove City.

The Administrative Law Judge also found that, "[T]here is not the slightest hint of any failure to comply with Title IX, save the failure to submit [the compliance form]. This refusal is obviously a matter of conscience and belief." *Id.* at 1224.

The District Court

Following the adverse administrative ruling, Grove City and four of its students commenced an action in federal district court. The district court held that the BEOGs were federal financial assistance, but it refused on several grounds to terminate the student's aid. *Grove City College v. Harris*, 500 F. Supp. 253 (1980).

Interestingly, ED had sought to terminate the students' BEOGs *and* their GSLs. The district court held that GSLs were "contract[s] of insurance or guaranty" that could not be terminated because of the express exclusion of such contracts under sec. 902 of Title IX. ED did not challenge this conclusion on appeal. However, ED's initial attempt to have GSLs declared "Federal financial aid" has important implications that will be discussed below. (Note that between the district court decision and the appellate court decision there was a change of national administration. *See also*, 104 S. Ct., at 1216 n. 10.)

The Court of Appeals

The court of appeals reversed. 687 F.2d 684 (3rd Circ. 1982). The court held that Title IX was triggered by indirect as well as direct aid and that ED could withhold grants from Grove City's students, despite the fact that Grove City had never discriminated. The appeals court recognized that Title IX is program specific, but held that the entire institution is the program:

"Where the federal government furnishes indirect or non-earmarked aid to an institution, it is apparent to us that the institution itself must be the "program." Were it otherwise, and if it had to be demonstrated that each individual component of an integrated educational institution had in fact received the particular monies for a particular purpose, no termination sanction could ever effectively be imposed." Id. at 700.

The Supreme Court

The Supreme Court held that Grove City, through its students who receive BEOGs, is a recipient of federal funds:

"The linchpin of Grove City's argument that none of its programs receives any federal assistance is a perceived distinction between direct and indirect aid, a distinction that finds no support in the text of section 901(a)" 104 S. Ct., at 1217.

[W]e have little trouble concluding that Title IX coverage is not foreclosed because federal funds are granted to Grove City's students rather than directly to one of the College's educational programs." 104 S. Ct., at 1220.

The Court also held that ED could terminate the BEOGs if Grove City failed to execute the Assurance of Compliance. Termination need not be proceded by a finding of discrimination. *Id.* at 1222.

Grove City's First Amendment defense was summarily rejected. *Id.* at 1223.

The Court was unanimous in each of the holdings above.

Six members of the court held that Title IX is indeed program specific, and that "program" does not mean an entire school:

"We conclude that the receipt of BEOGs by some of Grove City's students does not trigger institution-wide coverage under Title IX. In purpose and effect, BEOGs represent federal assistance to the College's own financial aid program, and it is that program that may properly be regulated under Title IX." *Id.* at 1222.

The reasoning of the majority's opinion is noteworthy:

"To the extent that the Court of Appeals' holding . . . rests on the possibility that federal funds received by one program or activity free up the College's own resources for use elsewhere, the court of Appeals' reasoning is doubly flawed. First, there is no evidence that the federal aid received by Grove City's students results in the diversion of funds from the College's own financial aid program to other areas within the institution. Second, and more important the Court of Appeals' assumption that Title IX applies to programs receiving a larger share of a school's own limited resources as a result of federal assistance earmarked for use elsewhere within the institution is inconsistent with the program-specific nature of the statute. Most federal educational assistance has economic ripple effects throughout the aided institution, and it would be difficult, if not impossible, to determine which programs or activities derive such benefits. Under the Court of Appeals' theory, an entire school would be subject to Title IX merely because one of its students received a small BEOG or because one of its departments received an earmarked federal grant. This result cannot be squared with Congress' intent.[11] *Id.* at 1221 (White, J., writing for the majority).

It is precisely this result that S. 2568 will reverse.

If S. 2568 is enacted, an entire school will be subject to Title IX merely because one of its students receives a small BEOG or because one of its departments receives an earmarked federal grant.

The *Grove City* majority addressed itself to a recurring question in the debate about S. 2568: Can a line be drawn between BEOGs, for example, and food stamps and similar benefits? Said the court:

"Grove City's attempt to analogize BEOGs to food stamps, Social Security benefits, welfare payments, and other forms of general-purpose governmental assistance to low-income families is unavailing. First, there is no evidence that Congress intended the receipt of federal money in this manner to trigger coverage under Title IX. Second, these general assistance programs, unlike student aid programs, were not designed to assist colleges and universities. Third, educational institutions have no control over, and indeed perhaps no knowledge of, whether they ultimately received federal funds made available to individuals under general assistance programs, but they remain free to opt out of federal student assistance programs. Fourth, individuals' eligibility for general assistance is not tied to attendance at an educational institution." *Id.* at 1218 n. 13.

The court also said, "Student financial aid programs, we believe, are *sui generis*." *Id.* at 1221.

The court's four-part test, as useful as it is, cannot answer many of the questions that S. 2568 raises. To begin with, S. 2568 will introduce new legislative history and new statutory language. This new language treats "indirect recipients" and "ultimate beneficiaries," for just two examples, more expansively than did the old language. Second, many of the questions raised by S. 2568 do not concern food stamps, Social Security, and similar programs. Part VI of this letter discusses ten areas of the private sector that may feel the effects of S. 2568. Not one of these areas involves of a food stamp recipient or a Social Security beneficiary. Third, since student aid programs are

sui generis, the test may also be unique. Fourth, the court's formula depends on the particular facts and purposes of the federal financial aid. In *Grove City*, by means of the four-part test, the court was able to differentiate special-purpose aid (BEOGs) from general-purpose governmental assistance. Using the same test, but applying it to different special-purpose programs (airport construction assistance, research grants, on-the-job-training programs, etc.) which have their own facts and legislative history that will be augmented by the language and legislative history of S. 2568, a different result may be reached.

III. S. 2568

Senators Kennedy and Packwood introduced S. 2568 on April 12, 1984. It was referred to the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. There has been one day of hearings in a Labor subcommittee, and two days of hearings in a Judiciary subcommittee. This week, the Agriculture Committee considered its application to the farming community. The full Labor Committee may mark-up the bill this month. S. 2568 has more than 60 cosponsors.

In the House, the companioin bill (H.R. 5490) was jointly referred to the Judiciary Committee and the Education and Labor Committee. Joint hearings were held and both committes have, by unanimous votes and without amendment, ordered the bill reported. As this letter is being written, the reports are not available.

The most authoritative guide to the purposes of S. 2568 (other than the bill itself, which is not here ignored, see below) is a "Joint Explanation by Senator Kennedy and Senator Packwood of Civil Rights Act of 1984," 130 Cong. Rec. S. 4585-87 (daily ed. April 12, 1984) [hereinafter cited as "Joint Explanation"]. The quotation below is from the "Joint Explanation" and titled, "What the Bill Does":

"This bill makes three limited changes designed to restore Title IX, Title VI, Section 504, and the ADA to their intended force and coverage. Congress always intended that these crosscutting antidiscrimination statutes, and the various other federal funding statutes which contain additional prohibitions on discrimination in the particualr federally assisted programs or activites created by each law, be interpreted to have broad coverage. The changes in all four laws are consistent, to preserve the existing parallels among them.

"First, the general prohibition language in each statute is modified to delete 'program or activity' and substitute the term 'recipient.' The effect of this change is to prohibit an entire institution or entity from discriminating if any of its parts receives federal funds. With respect to Title IX, the limitation to education is retained.

"Second, a definition of the term 'recipient' is added to the four statutes. This definition is modeled on the definition currently contained in the regulations issued under these laws. These statutes have consistently been interpreted to exempt from coverage as 'recipients' the landlord whose tenant pays the rent with federal public assistance funds, the clothing store that is paid for a shirt with money from a Social Security check, and others similarly situated. This bill makes no change in this regard.

"Third, the enforcement section of each of the laws is modified to delete "program or activity" language . . . ." *Id.* at S. 4586.

The third purpose of the bill, modification of the enforcement mechanisms, will not be analyzed in this letter.

Nor will this letter dispute the frequent claim that S. 2568 "restore[s]" the statutory "force and coverage [that] Congress always intended," although this claim is doubtful. As measured by the Federal constructions of the federal courts, Congress' intent seems to have been for the phrase "program or activity" to mean program or activity, not institution. *See, e.g., Grove City College v. Bell, supra* (sex discrimination); *N. Haven Bd. of Ed. v. Bell*, 456 U.S. 512 (1982) (sex discrimination); *Hillsdale College v. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare*, 696 F.2d 418 (6th Cir. 1982), *vacated and remanded in light of Grove City*, 52 U.S.L.W. 3700 (U.S. Mar. 26, 1984) (sex discrimination); *Rice v. President & Fellows of Harvard Coll.*, 663 F.2d 336 (1st Cir.1981), *cert. denied*, 456 U.S. 928 (1982) (sex discrimination); *Bd. of Instruction of Taylor County v. Finch*, 414 F.2d 1068 (5th Cir.1969) (race discrimination); and *Simpson v. Reynolds Metals Co*, 629 F.2d 1226 (7th Cir.1980) (handicap discrimination). The cited cases all teach that the relevant statutory language is indeed program specific. *See also*, the unsuccessful amendment of Senator Bayh, no. 398 (requiring instituoin-wide coverage), 117 Cong. Rec. 30156 (1971). The unsuccessful 1971 amendment was of course succeeded by the successful 1982 amendment, the program-specific Title IX.

"Recipients" Under S. 2568

For each of the four statutes, S. 2568 proposed to omit "program or activity" language and replace it with language broad enough to wholly encompass any recipient. For example, section 3(a) of the bill will produce the following changes in Section 504, (and the three other statutes are changed similarly) [Omit the langauge that is in brackets and insert the language that is underlined]:

"[29 U.S.C. 794] *(a)* No otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States, as defined in section 706(7) of this title, shall, solely by reason of [his] *such individual's* handicap, be excluded from the participation [in], be denied [the] benefits [of], or be subjected to discrimination [under any program or activity receiving] *by any recipient of* Federal financial assistance or [under any program or activity conducted] by any Executive agency or by the United States Postal Service. . . ."

There is very little dispute about the meaning of the proposed changes from "program or activity" to "recipient." Some think the change is unwise, or that it needs redrafting to solve this or that problem, but its meaning is relatively clear: It will mean at least that "an entire school would be subject to Title IX merely because one of its students received a small BEOG or because one of its departments received an earmarked federal grant." 104 S. Ct., at 1221.

There are other changes that S. 2568 proposed to make that are not so clear.

For each of the four statutes, S. 2568 proposed to define "recipient" within the statute itself. Until now, "recipients" have been defined only in the regulations. S. 2568 proposes a uniform definition of "recipient" for each of the four statutes although the regulatory definitions have differed somewhat. S. 2568 proposes:

"(b) For the purpose of this section, the term "recipient" means—

"(1) any State or political subdivision thereof, or any instrumentality of a State or political subdivision thereof, or any public or private agency, institution, or organization, or other entity (including any subunit of any such State, subdivision, instrumentality, agency, institution, organization or entity), and

"(2) any successor, assignee, or transferee of any such State, subdivision, instrumentality, agency, institution, organization, or entity or of any such subunit, to which Federal financial assistance is extended (directly or through another entity or a person), or which receives support from the extension of Federal financial assistance to any of its subunits."

S. 2568, 98th Cong., 2d Sess., sec. 3(b) (1984). *See also*, S. 2568's secs. 2(b), 4(e)(3), and 5(c) with differ slightly only in the words preceding " 'recipient' means—".

Note that "recipient" includes "any . . . *private* agency, institution, or organization" which receives federal support, directly or indirectly. (Emphasis added.) S. 2568's effects on private institutions are the theme of this memorandum.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AND CONGRESSIONAL DEFINITIONS ARE NOT INTERCHANGEABLE

It is incorrect to assume that there would be no juridicial changes even if S. 2568's proposed statutory definition were identical to the existing administrative definitions. The same words, when uttered by different authority, do not have the same meaning. Judges know the different between administrative words and words that Congress has passed and the President has signed. A court has substantially more authority to invalidate or restrict regulations than to narrow or void a statute.

A discussion of the authority of administrative rulemakers is beyond the scope of this paper, but for some of the general rules, see Davis, Administrative Law Treatise, sec. 7:8 (2d ed. 1979), quoting *Skidmore v. Swift & Co.*, 323, U.S. 134, 140 (1944) ("We consider that the rulings, interpretations and opinions of the Administrator under this Act, while not controlling upon the courts by reason of their authority, do constitute a body of experience and informed judgment to which courts and litigants may properly resort for guidance. The weight of such a judgment in a particular case will depend upon the thoroughness evident in its consideration, the validity of its reasoning, its consistency with earlier and later pronouncements, and all those factors which gave it power to persuade, if lacking power to control.").

For a particularly exuberant application of the general rules to a relevant case, see *Univ. of Richmond v. Bell*, 543 F.Supp. 321, 330 (1982) (invalidity of Title IX regulations).

See, also, Cooper, Administrative Agencies and the Courts, 294-297 (1951) (regulations are invalid if they exceed conferred authority, conflict with the statute, extend or modify the statute, have no reasonable relationship to the statutory purpose, or violate due process of law).

But see, Guardians Assn. v. Civil Service Comm. of the City of New York, — U.S. —, 103 S Ct. 3221 (1983) in which five justices upheld *disparate impact* regulations under Title VI although three of those justices found that proof of discriminatory *intent* is required by the statute itself. For divergent views on regulatory authority under Congressional grants of power, see the *Guardians Assn.* opinions of Justice O'Connor (concurring) and Justice Stevens (dissenting).

If we get a new statute, we are also likely to get new regulations. And new regulations will extend the new statute as the old regulations extended the old statute.

V. THE KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CURRENT REGULATORY DIFINITIONS OF "RECIPIENT" AND THE PROPOSAL IN S. 2568

The language of S. 2568 is "modeled on the definition currently contained in the regulations issued under these [four] laws." "Joint Explanation," *supra*. S. 2568's definition *is* "modeled" on the regulations, but it is not identical to them (as I have heard some people say). Indeed, the regulations themselves differ so it would be impossible for S. 2568 to use one definition of "recipient"—as it does—and be identical to differing regulations.

S. 2568 takes regulatory definitions and makes them statutory. This action alone is not without juridical effect (see Part IV). But S. 2568 also changes the regulatory definitions, raising doubts about the intended effect of S. 2568: If S. 2568 is intended to do no more than return us to the status quo ante, why is the definition of "recipient" being changed? This question is at the heart of the controversy over S. 2568.

The material differences between the current definitions and the proposed definition are considered in this section. A side-by-side comparison of the definition of "recipient" as found in the current law and regulations and in S. 2568 can be seen in Appendix A. (Throughout this letter the regulations referred to are always those of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) or the Department of Education (ED) unless otherwise indicated. However, all federal agencies that provide federal financial assistance are responsible for enforcing nondiscrimination requirements and many have issued regulations.)

A. Deleting "program or activity"

In each of the four statutes, "program or activity" will be changed to "recipient." This single action does not by itself change the definition of "recipient," but it does change the context in which the word is found. Since words are often construed by reference to their contexts, we can expect this change, which at first glance seems not to be definitional, to affect the word's meaning:

"The first thing one has to do . . . in construing words . . . is not to take those words in vacuo, so to speak, and attribute to them what is sometimes called their natural and ordinary meaning. Few words in the English language have a natural or ordinary meaning in the sense that they must be so read that their meaning is entirely independent of their context. The method of construing statutes that I prefer is not to take particular words and attribute to them a sort of prima facie meaning which you may have to displace or modify. It is to read the statute as a whole and ask oneself the question: 'In this state, in this context, relating to this subject-matter, what is the true meaning of the word?'" *Re Bidie*, Ct. of App., 1 All E.R. 995, —— (1948).

C. Omitting "ultimate beneficiaries"

The three H.H.S. regulatory definitions, but not ED's definition, excluse from the meaning of "recipient" the "ultimate beneficiary of the assistance" (ADA and Sec. 504) and "any ultimate beneficiary under any such program" (Title VI). S. 2568 omits this phrase.

I do not believe the omission is anywhere explained.

Does the omission mean that under S. 2568 "ultimate beneficiaries" will be included within the definition of "recipient" and prohibited from discriminating? An "ultimate beneficiary" is a tenant paying a landlord with public assistance funds or a person buying a shirt with a Social Security check. *Cf, "Joint Explanation," supra.*

Regarding the meaning of "ultimate beneficiaries," the courts have said, "There are clear congressional statements that discrimination on the grounds of race, color, national origin or handicap against the ultimate beneficiaries of federal financial assistance is unlawful." *N.A.A.C.P.* v. *Wilmington Medical Center*, 453 F. Supp. 330, 339 (D. Del. 1978), *rev'd on other grounds*, 599 F. 2d 1247 (3rd Cir. 1979). The footnote to the quoted sentence cites the H.H.S. regulations and says, "An 'ultimate beneficiary' is not to be confused with a 'recipient'." *Id*, at n. 34.

"The 'ultimate beneficiary' of federal financial assistance within the meaning of Section 504, and the . . . regulations promulgated thereunder, is the intended class of beneficiaries under the Section, handicapped individuals." *Nodleman* v. *Aero Mexico*, 528 F. Supp. 475, 489 n. 21 (C.D. Calif. 1981) (handicapped person, not airline, is "ultimate beneficiary" of federal aid to airports). *See also, United States* v. *Baylor U. Medical Center*, 564 F. Supp. 1495, 1498 (N.D. Tex. 1983) (eligible Medicaid and Medicare patients, not hospital, are "ultimate recipients").

Three of the four sets of regulations have made it clear that ultimate beneficiaries, i.e., the intended class of beneficiaries, were not to be regulated. But S. 2568, which is "modeled" on the regulations, does not exclude the classes of intended beneficiaries. Does this mean they are included?

This is the kind of question that has raised serious doubts about the meaning of S. 2568.

(See also, subpart D, *infra*, receiving federal financial assistance "directly or through another entity or *a person*.")

C. Incorporating the "trickle up theory"

Under past practice, a "recipient" was any entity that received federal financial assistance either "directly or through another recipient." S. 2568 will expand this definition such that "recipient" will mean any entity receiving direct or indirect assistance "or which receives support from the extension of Federal financial assistance to any of its subunits."

Under past practice, subunits have been covered whenever the main recipient has received federal financial assistance. S. 2568 will maintain that practice (albeit enlarging the coverage from programatic to institutional) *and* cover the main recipient whenever any subunit receives federal financial assistance.

The implications of this change can be seen in cases such as *Miller* v. *Abilene Christian U. of Dallas*, 517 F. Supp. 437 (N.D. Tex. 1981), which is discussed in greater detail below. *Miller* asked whether the Dallas campus of a private university was covered under Section 504 when it had received no federal funds but the Abilene campus had. *Miller's* answer was "no."

The "trickle up theory" of S. 2568 may produce an opposite answer.

D. Redefining "indirect recipients"

In the cases that follow, no concept is more important than "indirect aid." Indirect aid is what goes to indirect recipients, and the new definition for "indirect recipient" will perhaps broaden the definition of indirect aid.

Currently, a "recipient" will receive federal financial assistance "directly or through another recipient." Under the bill, "recipients" will receive federal financial assistance "directly or through another entity or a person." Since an entity is anything that exists, the possibilities for expansive interpretations are endless.

Judges have been asked to draw lines between direct and indirect aid, between direct and indirect recipients. In the cases that follow, judges have answered with remarkable skill. They have held that a baseball team is not a recipient merely because it leases a stadium from a city that is. They have held that an airline is not a recipient although the federal government pays for air traffic controllers and airport improvements. Such questions will be problematic indeed if S. 2568 is enacted.

E. Omitting "persons"

Under current regulations, "persons" receiving federal financial assistance are covered by nondiscrimination rules; under S. 2568 they are not. This omission seems incongruous.

". . . The absence of the word "person" from the definition of recipient could reduce the scope of coverage of the statute. If a person, not incorporated as a business or as another entity, and entirely unconnected with a recipient as defined by the bill, receives federal financial assistance to conduct activities, those activities presumably are not covered by the bill. Because so much federal aid is provided to entities falling within the bill's definition of 'recipient,' this omission may not have very much practical significance. Congressional intent with respect to such 'persons' receiving federal aid, however, should be clear." Testimony of Linda Chavez, Staff Director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, before the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Senate Judiciary Committee, 98th Cong. 2d Sess. 4-5 (May 30, 1984) (mimeo).

It may be that this omission has something to do with the issue of "ultimate beneficiaries," outlined in subpart B, *supra*. If so, the connection is obscure.

Or it may be that the omission has something to do with the *Soberal-Perez* cases. *Soberal-Perez* v. *Schweiker*, 549 F. Supp. 1164 (E.D.N.Y. 1982), *aff'd Soberal-Perez v. Heckler*, 717 F. 2d 36 (2d Cir. 1983) (Title VI does not cover direct federal aid programs such as Social Security).

It may be that the omission concerns something else. Or it may be that it concerns nothing at all.

VI. IMPLICATIONS OF S. 2568 FOR 10 AREAS OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Recent decisions under Section 504, the ADA, Title VI, and Title IX are reviewed in this Part in order to understand the changes that might occur after passage of S. 2568. This review concentrates on cases dealing with the definition of "recipient" because S. 2568's primary effect is to change the meaning and operation of that word. As might be expected, several other issues also appear in the cases.

Nearly all of the following cases arise under Section 504. The great bulk of litigation in the relevant areas (Who is a recipient? What is federal financial aid?) is taking place under Section 504.

There is an interrelationship between the definitions of "federal financial assistance" and "recipient". Under the statutes, and the regulations, coverage is extended to agencies and institutions which receive federal financial assistance, directly or indirectly. Therefore, coverage can be enlarged by redefining *either* agencies and institutions *or* federal financial assistance *or* indirect aid, or by using any combination of redefini-

tions. For example, in *Angel v. Pan American Airlines, infra*, the court was asked to find that Pan American was a "recipient of federal financial assistance" because it benefits from federally-employed air traffic controllers and other federal aid. The court answered the question in the negative. An opposite result would have been reached if *either* federal aid were redefined to include the undeniable benefits obtained by airlines from air traffic controllers *or* recipients were redefined as agencies or institutions which do not receive direct federal grants but which do benefit from indirect federal expenditures which, for example, constitute unique aid to an identifiable industry. The interplay among these definitions can be seen throughout the cases.

Two regulatory definitions of "federal financial assistance" can be seen in Appendix B.

A majority of the holdings in the following cases probably would have been impossible, or at least highly unlikely, had the cases been decided under the statutory language of S. 2568. The holdings in the remaining cases are less likely to have been changed by S. 2568, but the bill will change the development of the law even in these areas. If I am right about the potential effects of S. 2568 on these cases, then the bill's impact on the private sector will be vast.

A. Professional societies, "Bachman v. Am. Soc'y of Clinical Pathologists" (577 F. Supp. 1257 (D.N.J. 1983)

The Society is a non-profit medical society organized under the laws of Illinois. The Society's Board of Registry periodically gives an examination to those candidates who have completed the educational requirements established by the Board. Successful candidates are certified by the Board. Certificates must be renewed annually.

Bachman sought certification as a medical technologist. She requested a reader and extra time for the examination because of her dyslexia which made reading difficult. The Board denied her request.

Bachman sued the Society alleging a violation of Section 504. In 1977 and 1978 the Society had received two federal grants to conduct seminars on alcohol abuse, and to publish the proceedings. The grants came during the time that Bachman complained of discrimination.

The court held that "past recipients of federal financial assistance . . . are liable for violations of the Rehabilitation Act which occurred during the time that they were recipients." *Id.* at 1262.

The court also found that the Society was a "recipient of federal financial assistance," but that the program which allegedly discriminated against Bachman was not in any way related to the program receiving federal funds. Even in the face of the Third Circuit's decision in *Grove City* (the entire institution is the program or activity), the *Bachman* court held that the seminar funds did not constitute institutional aid because "the federal grants were directly awarded for and applied to specific activities of [the Society] and were not used generally to support the organization." *Id.* at 1263.

The court emphasized that the grants were earmarked for certain purposes, that those purposes were unrelated to the alleged discrimination, and that Section 504 was program-specific.

S. 2568, which would apply Section 504 to the organization as a whole, would probably overturn *Bachman*.

(The *Bachman* court also refused to define tax exempt status as indirect federal financial assistance within the meaning of the regulations. *Id.* at 11263-65.)

See also, Nat'l Collegiate Athletic Ass'n v. Califano, 444 F. Supp. 425, 430-31 (1978), *rev'd*, 622 F. 2d 1382 (1980) (private athletic association).

B. Private education, "Miller v. Abilene Christian Univ. of Dallas" (517 F. Supp. 437 (N.D. Tex. 1981)

Miller claimed that his employment with the University's Dallas campus was ended in violation of Section 504. The University enrolled students who received various federal grants and loans, but neither Miller's department nor the Dallas campus received any direct federal aid. (The University's Abilene campus had received six federal grants for biology research, math training and social work.)

The Court held,

". . . Miller has failed to allege or raise an issue of fact that would establish that he was a participant in a program or an intended beneficiary of a program or activity that receives federal assistance. [F]ederal funds were not used to employ Miller. Nor does he allege that the discriminatory employment practices allegedly directed at him (a nonbeneficiary) affected any participants in or beneficiaries of the federal assistance." *Id.* at 439.

The *Miller* court rejected the argument that federal funds in one part of an institution "free up" funds for use elsewhere. *Cf, Id.* at 440 *with Grove City Coll. v. Bell, supra* at 1221.

S. 2568's institution-wide coverage and the "trickle up theory" implied by S. 2568's language would make a holding like *Miller's* unlikely after the bill's enactment.

Caution: The result in *Miller*, and all other Section 504 employment cases, will be affected by *Consolidated Rail Corp. v. Darrone*, — U.S.— 104, S. Ct. 1248 (1984), which held that in Section 504 employment suits the federal financial assistance need not have been provided for the primary purpose of providing employment. Still, *Darrone* seems less likely than S. 2568 to reverse *Miller*.

See, also, Garrity v. Gallen, 522 F. Supp. 171 (1981) (defining the "recipient" of federal aid as the public school which housed the federally aided program, not the entire school system) and *Ferris v. Univ. of Texas at Austin*, 558 F. Supp. 536 (W.D. Tex. 1983) (public university which received federal aid, but not its shuttle bus system which did not, was a "program" within the meaning of Section 504).

Private sector educators have raised an alarm about S. 2568. For example, Bruce C. Hafen, President of Ricks College and the American Association of Presidents of Independent Colleges and Universities; George Roche, President of Hillsdale College; and Charles S. MacKenzie, President of Grove City College have all testified against the measure. (The educators have been primarily, but not exclusively, interested in Title IX.) *See, also*, Oaks, "A Private University Looks at Government Regulation," 4 *Jn. Coll. & Univ. Law* 1 (1976).

Considering that Title IX regulations control such decisions as abortion coverage under school-provided health plans, whether a school can have separate men's and women's athletic teams, and, until recently (47 Fed. Reg. 32526 [July 28, 1982]), student dress codes, it is not surprising that private educators are showing such interest in the bill.

C. Manufacturing, "Simpson v. Reynolds Metals Co." (629 F. 2d 1226 (7th Cir. 1980))

Simpson worked at a Reynolds plant in McCook, Illinois. Simpson admits that he has an alcoholism problem that dates back to 1948. The problem was known to Reynolds.

Simpson was suspended for missing three days of work because of his drinking. He was conditionally reinstated after he reached an agreement with his employer. The agreement required Simpson to regularly attend Alcoholics Anonymous meetings and specified that any future unexcused absences would be cause for dismissal.

Plaintiff was again absent for three days because of his alcoholism and Reynolds suspended him. Simpson appealed the suspension but lost his appeal and was discharged. He sued under Section 504.

Reynolds maintained that it was not a recipient of federal financial assistance. However, Reynolds has entered into procurement contracts with the federal government and the company operates certain apprenticeship or on-the-job training programs at its McCook plant with federal funds. (Simpson was never a participant in these OJT programs.) Reynolds further said that the OJT program did not provide a benefit to it, but are benefits to the trainees. Reynolds stated that it has followed a strict policy of refusing federal financial assistance because of "the onerous reporting requirements accompaning such federal assistance." *Id.* at 1229.

Simpson asked the court to embrace what he called a "unified entity approach" in defining what constitutes "the program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Under the "unified entity approach," "once some part of an entity becomes involved in a program or activity receiving federal financial assistance, the employment practices of the entire institution would be subject to the coverage of Section 504." *Id.* at 1233 n. 12. The court rejected the "unified entity approach," an approach that sounds remarkably like the approach of S. 2568.

The court sustained the dismissal of the action against Reynolds because the plaintiff had failed to show a connection (a nexus) between his discharge and the federal assistance. *Id.* at 1232. Therefore, the court did not reach the question of whether the OJT programs or procurement contracts constitute federal financial assistance. Presumably, this obstacle has now been removed, *Consolidated Rail Corp. v. Darrone, supra*, and a court will have to reach the question of "recipient." S. 2568 will likely remove any additional obstacles.

Reynolds Metals shows that S. 2568 may have the unintended effect of decreasing opportunities for the very populations it seeks to serve. On the basis of the *Reynolds Metals* evidence, it appears that the company will not participate in OJT programs if such programs make the company a "recipient of Federal financial assistance."

D. Professional Sports, "Disabled in Action v. Mayor & City Council of Baltimore" (685 F. 2d 881 (4th Cir. 1982))

The City of Baltimore and the Baltimore Baseball Club (the Orioles) were sued by the certain disabled persons for failing to make modifications in Memorial Stadium. The Orioles are the primary lessee of the stadium. The modifications affected seating, ramps, parking, restroom facilities, drinking fountains and telephone booths.

The parties reached a negotiated settlement with the Maryland Commission on Human Relations. All issues were settled before the commission save one: attorneys fees. The federal court had to resolve that issue.

Defendants sought attorneys fees from the City and the Club, claiming that the Orioles were an indirect recipient of federal financial assistance under Section 504, and the district court agreed:

"The court concludes that defendant Club is included within the scope of [Section 504], as amplified by the applicable regulations, with respect to some, at least, of the facilities in question in this case. While defendant City is a direct recipient of federal financial assistance, defendant Club is an immediate indirect beneficiary of the assistance received by defendant City. The regulations state that the federal financial assistance can be received 'directly or through another recipient.' It is clear that since the Club is the major tenant of the Stadium it is the greatest and most immediate beneficiary of federal aid given to the City which is used for Stadium improvement. Therefore, defendant Club is included within the scope of [Section 504]." *Disabled in Action v. Mayor & City Council of Baltimore*, civil no. T-79-1749, at 15 (D.Md., July 14, 1981).

The Orioles are not, of course, the exclusive lessee of the stadium. (In happier times the Colts used it.) The stadium is used for other activities, public and private. Are only "major tenants" such as the Orioles "indirect recipients"? Or are other tenants "indirect recipients," too?

For now, the question is academic because the court of appeals reversed the district court.

"[I]t is plain that the City is no mere conduit of federal assistance to the Club. [T]he benefits of federal assistance has accrued both to the direct recipient . . . and to another entity . . . which shares in those benefits by virtue of business dealings with the direct recipient. If the Rehabilitation Act extends to such indirect beneficiaries of federal largesse, consistency would demand that it apply to every customer of every enterprise subsidized by the federal government. Nothing in the language or legislative history of the Act indicates a congressional intention to reach so far." 685 F., 2d, at 884-85.

Conversely, the language of S. 2568, which perhaps will be the language of a new statute, indicates that a recipient is a "private . . . organization . . . to which Federal financial assistance is extended (directly or through another entity . . .)." And while it is unlikely that S. 2568 will be construed to "apply to every customer of every enterprise subsidized by the federal government," it does not seem unlikely that it will be extended to lessees or "major tenants," for example.

E. Transportation, "Angel v. Pan American World Airways" (519 F. Supp. 1173 (D.D.C. 1981))

"Angel sued Pan American when the airline refused to transport Mr. Angel, who has cerebral palsy and is confined to a wheelchair, from Germany to the United States because he was not accompanied by an attendant.

The complaint stated three causes of action including a violation of Section 504. The airline maintained that it had not received direct federal financial assistance since 1956 when it received a mail-related subsidy.

Plaintiff claimed that Pan American receives numerous indirect federal subsidies which are sufficient to trigger the prohibitions of the Act. These indirect subsidies include air traffic controllers provided by the Federal Aviation Administration, airports constructed with the aid of federal funds, and certain technical assistance.

The court held:

". . . Subsidies to airports, to be sure, subject those locales to the broad proscription of Section 504, but this does not translate into binding law upon the users of the airports, whether they be commercial airlines or individual passengers. To hold that commercial airlines fall within Section 504 merely because of assistance provided to airports would expand improperly the accepted proposition that Section 504 is *limited to Id.* at 1178 (emphasis added) (citations omitted).

Of course, the current regulations implementing section 504 do not restrict its application to *direct* recipients. And S. 2568, which is "modeled" on the current regulations, does not restrict the definition to direct recipients, either. In fact, S. 2568 expressly *includes* indirect recipients.

See also, Nodleman v. Aero Mexico, 528 F. supp. 475, 488-89 (C.D.Cal.1981).

Insofar as BEOGs and Title IX are concerned, *Grove City* has denied any distinction between direct and indirect *aid*. 104 S. Ct., at 1217. This is not the same as denying a distinction between direct and indirect *beneficiaries*.

F. Food processing, "Rogers v. Frito-Lay, Inc." (433 F. Supp. 200 (N.D.Tex. 1977), aff'd 611 F. 2d 1074 (5th Cir. 1980), cert. denied, 499 U.S. 889 (1980))

A handicapped former employee brought suit against Frito-Lay alleging that her termination had been in violation of Section 504. Frito-Lay is a government contractor.

The district court held that the company was not a "recipient" of federal financial assistance because "[t]he term 'federal financial assistance' as used in [Section 504] does not comprehend government procurement contracts but rather refers to the form of grant assistance that goes primarily to public entities." 433 F. Supp., at 204.

The court of appeals affirmed on other grounds.

Government procurement contracts are treated more thoroughly in the next case.

G. Automobile rentals, "Cook v. Budget Rent-A-Car Corp." (502 F. Supp. 494 (S.D.N.Y. 1980))

Cook is handicapped, but says that his impairment does not affect his ability to drive. He has been a licensed driver since 1970. A franchisee of Budget Rent-A-Car refused to rent Cook an automobile, allegedly because of Cook's handicap. Cook sued under Section 504.

Budget receives federal funds only through rental contracts that it has with five federal agencies. The contracts for Budget's goods and services are negotiated at fair market value. Plaintiff alleges that these payments make Budget a "recipient" within the meaning of Section 504.

The court conducted a thorough inquiry into the language, and history of Section 504 and its regulations and concluded that procurement contracts do not constitute federal financial assistance within the meaning of the Act. The regulations explicitly exclude procurement contracts and the court relied heavily on this interpretive aid.

Said the court:

"As the Court reads the DHEW regulation, Budget's government contracts do not constitute 'Federal financial assistance.' Budget's agreements with federal departments and agencies are undoubtedly 'contracts' within the meaning of the regulation means by the term 'procurement contract.' The regulation makes it clear that the important question is whether Budget's contracts are arrangements by which the government 'provides or otherwise makes available assistance' to Budget. 'Assistance' is the crucial word, and is explained by the regulation in a manner which is most illuminating with respect to the present controversy. The regulation says that assistance can include a lease of government property for less than its fair market rental valued. [Citation.] Plainly, the inference to be drawn is that assistance does not include transactions where government property is leased for an amount equivalent to its fair market rental value. Since there is no 'assistance' under the regulation where the government *lets* property at its fair market rental value, it is plain to the Court that there is no 'assistance' where the government *hires* property at its fair market rental value. In view of the fact that the instant case is precisely one where the government hires property from Budget at its fair market rental value, Budget is not a recipient of Federal financial assistance under the DHEW regulation." *Id.* at 497-98 (footnotes omitted).

Budget Rent-A-Car is one of the few cases where the regulations are relied on to exclude a transaction.

In future cases similar to *Budget*, the outcome will probably depend on new regulations, if any, issued under authority of S. 2568.

H. Medical insurance, "Bernard B. v. Blue Cross & Blue Shield" 528 F. Supp. 125 (1981), aff'd mem., 679 F. 2d 7 (2nd Cir. 1982)

Bernard B. and his wife Shirley B. were covered by Blue Cross health insurance as a fringe benefit of the husband's employment. The insurance did not cover psychiatric care in a government hospital. When Shirley B. was admitted to a government hospital for psychiatric treatment, Blue Cross refused to pay her bills which were substantial.

Mr. and Mrs. B. sued Blue Cross, alleging that the failure of the insurance company to cover such psychiatric care was a violation of Section 504. Blue Cross receives Medicare, Part A funds.

Blue Cross had requested permission to include such psychiatric coverage in its contracts, but the request was denied by the Superintendent of the New York State Insurance Department who explained his decision as follows:

"Serious questions arise as to whether community-rated subscribers should be forced to shoulder these additonal burdens [for expanded maternity benefits, psychiatric coverage, and hemophiliac care when the cost of all necessities, including health insurance, has already placed a severe strain on subscribers with low and medium incomes. The problem is further complicated by the fact that there are many other important and beneficial types of medical care that are not now covered by Blue Cross. [Alcoholism treatment and pre-natal care are cited in a footnote.] Since the existing source of available financial resources—the consumer's pocketbook—is not limitless, priorities must be established. . . ." 528 F. Supp., at 128 n. 7.

There is a tendency to think that only civil rights plaintiffs act in the interests of

the underprivileged. Here, of course, and elsewhere, the very action of which the plaintiffs complaint was taken to protect the interests of low and medium income subscribers.

Blue Cross moved for summary judgment on the ground that it was not a recipient. On this ground, the motion was denied.

Said the court:

"We cannot say that Blue Cross has established that no genuine issues of material fact remain on this point and that it is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Blue Cross acts as a conduit for Medicare funds, performing various functions and ultimately distributing the funds. Blue Cross additionally receives payment for administrative expenses. Plaintiffs have raised a genuine issue of material fact concerning the intermingling of Medicare and other Blue Cross funds and lumping of expenses such that federal Medicare funds may play a part in enabling Blue Cross to carry on both Medicare and non-Medicare activities. . . ."*Id.* at 132.

Cf, United States v. Baylor Univ. Medical Center, 564 F. Supp. 1495 (N.D. Tex. 1983) (Medicare and Medicaid funds to a university hospital constitute federal financial aid not excluded by the "contracts of insurance" exemption in the statute).

Blue Cross did win summary judgment on the ground that what it had done was not "discrimination." The court said, "Reasons other than handicap account for the exclusion of the risk[,]" and the exclusion was "substantially justified." 525 F. Supp., at 132.

The court did not have to find that Blue Cross was a recipient to resolve the issues in the case. But in a future case, the court will have to say whether an insurer that receives Medicare funds is a "recipient." S. 2568 is more likely to make the answer "yes."

(For a comment on the treatment of Medicare, Parts A and B under the Age Discrimination Act, see Schuck, "The Graying of Civil Rights Law: The Age Discrimination Act of 1975," 89 *Yale L. J.* 27, 59n. 165 (1979).)

I. Broadcasting, "Gottfried v. Federal Communications Comm'n." (655 F. 2d 297 (D.C. Cir. 1981) rev'd in part, sub nom., Community Television of S. Calif. v. Gottfried —— U.S. ——, 103 S. Ct. 885 (1983))

Gottfried is hearing impaired. She petitioned the Federal Communications Commission to deny the license renewal applications of eight Los Angeles area television stations. (Seven commercial licensees and one public station.) Gottfried said that the stations had failed to meet the needs of the hearing impaired and, "as recipients of valuable federal licenses, had failed to satisfy obligations imposed on them by Section 504." The Commission denied her petitions and Gottfried appealed to the circuit court.

The court concluded that section 504 applied to the public station, and remanded that issue to the FCC for an appropriate remedy. Section 504 was held not to apply to the commercial stations "[a]lthough the Commission may still be obliged to weigh the national policy of [Section 504] within the public interest standard. . . ." 655 F. 2d., at 305.

Said the court:

"Section 504 directly imposes legal obligations only on recipients of "Federal financial assistance." Appellants correctly argue that a license to broadcast on the public airwaves is a commodity of great value. But this does not resolve the question of congressional intent: Did Congress intend broadcast licenses to count as "financial assistance" within the meaning of Section 504? We are unable to conclude that it did." *Id.* at 312 (footnote omitted).

In the footnote which is omitted, the court refers to the value of a broadcast license in Los Angeles, the country's most profitable market. (In 1964, it was estimated that the value of an *average* VHF license was $1.5 million.) The court also quotes Justice Brennan (in dissent), that a free license is functionally equivalent to "Government subsidization of broadcasters." *Id.* n. 55.

Gottfried will probably be limited to its facts, i.e., broadcasting licenses. *Cf. Hafer v. Temple University,* 524 F. Supp. 531, 540 n. 12 (1981) (*Gottfried* "not relevant" to a Title IX athletic department case).

Over the questions of two of its members, the Supreme Court reversed in part, holding that Section 504 does not require a public television station's license renewal application to be judged under a different standard than applies to commercial licensees.

J. Agriculture

"As a general rule, Farm Bureau has not become involved in civil rights legislation. However, we are concerned that the broad, vague, and all-encompassing language contained in S. 2568, particularly in the definition of 'recipient' of federal financial assistance, may be an open invitation to the federal bureaucracy and the courts to bring virtually every public activity at all levels of government under the jurisdiction of the several statutes that would be amended by this legislation.

"[T]he language in the bill may be interpreted to bring under the regulation of civil rights statutes a large portion of all private sector activity. Even individual farmers and ranchers who are recipients of various forms of public assistance or who 'receive support' from government programs may be affected.

". . . The broad language in this bill raises questions as to what impact anti-discrimination regulations would have on such benefits as loan guarantees, commodity loans and price support payments." Statement of the American Farm Bureau Federation before the Senate Comm. on Agriculture regarding S. 2568, 98th Cong., 2d Sess. 1-2 (June 12, 1984) (mimeo).

VII. CONCLUSION

Notwithstanding the length of this letter, this analysis has been very narrow. After presenting some of the background of *Grove City* and S. 2568, we looked at a very small group of cases, namely those that dealt with the meaning of "recipient of federal financial assistance" *and* that had private sector defendants *and* in which the defendants prevailed. These particular defendants prevailed in these particular cases, but would they have prevailed under S. 2568? This question provides a useful approach to an understanding of S. 2568.

The nine cases in Part VI showed applicants, employees, sports fans, travelers, renters, insured persons, and television viewers suing professional societies, employers (including universities), Orioles, common carriers, franchisors, insurance companies and federal licensees for readers and extra test time, jobs, handicapped seating and airplane seats, cars, particular health insurance coverage, and captioned television. The defendants were said to be "recipients of Federal financial assistance" because they had unrelated grants, aid at another campus, OJT programs, a stadium lease from a city, airport construction aid and air traffic controllers, procurement contracts, Medicare, and broadcast licenses. Congress is now being asked to readjust the laws that governed those cases.

The civil rights statutes are pervasive (they were intended to be), and they reach deep into the private sector. S. 2568 will extend their reach. This letter has attempted to show how, and how far, that reach might be extended.—Lincoln C. Oliphant, Counsel.*

*I wish to thank Katherine B. Smith of the Oklahoma City University School of Law and Michael A. Rosenauer of the Willamette University College of Law for their research assistance.

Appendices attached.

TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Present statutory language	Present regulation definition	Proposed definition—S. 2568, 98th Congress, 2d session
42 U.S.C. § 2000d (1982) Prohibition against exclusion from participation in, denial of benefits of, and discrimination under federally assisted programs on ground of race, color, or national origin. No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.	45 C.F.R. § 80.13(i) (1983). The term "recipient" means any State, political subdivision of any State, or instrumentality of any State or political subdivision, any public or private agency, institution, or organization, or other entity, or any individual, in any State, to whom Federal financial assistance is extended, directly or through another recipient, for any program, including any successor, assign, or transferee thereof, but such term does not include any ultimate beneficiary under any such program. [Department of Health and Human Services regulations].	Sec. 5(c). "For the purpose of this title, the term 'recipient' means— (1) any State or political subdivision thereof, or any instrumentality of a State or political subdivision thereof, or any public or private agency, institution, or organization, or other entity (including any subunit of any such State, subdivision, instrumentality, agency, institution, organization, or entity), and (2) any successor, assignee, or transferee of any such State, subdivision, instrumentality, agency, institution, organization, or entity or of any such subunit, to which Federal financial assistance is extended (directly or through another entity or a person), or which receives support from the extension of Federal financial assistance to any of its subunits."

TITLE IX OF THE EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972

Present statutory language	Present regulation definition	Proposed definition—S. 2568, 98th Congress, 2d session
20 U.S.C. § 1681 (1982). (a) Prohibition against discrimination; exceptions. No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. * * * (c) "Educational institution" defined. For the purposes of this chapter an educational institution means any public or private preschool, elementary, or secondary school, or any institution of vocational, professional, or higher education, except that in the case of an educational institution composed of more than one school, college, or department which are administratively separate units, such term means each such school, college, or department.	34 C.F.R. § 106.2(h) (1983). (h) "Recipient" means any State or political subdivision thereof, or any intrumentality of a State or political subdivision thereof, any public or private agency, institution, or organization, or other entity, or any person to whom Federal financial assistance is extended directly or through another recipient and which operates an education program or activity which receives or benefits from such assistance, including any subunit, successor, assignee, or transferee thereof. [Department of Education regulations]	Sec. 2(b). "For the purpose of this title, the term 'recipient' means— (A) any State or political subdivision thereof, or any instrumentality of a State or political subdivision thereof, or any public or private agency, institution, or organization, or other entity (including any subunit of any such State, subdivision, instrumentality, agency, institution, organization, or entity), and (B) any successor, assignee, or transferee of any such State, subdivision, instrumentality, agency, institution, organization, or entity or of any such subunit, to which Federal financial assistance is extended (directly or through another entity or a person), or which receives support from the extension of Federal financial assistance to any of its subunits."

SECTION 504 OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973

Present statutory language	Present regulation definition	Proposed definition—S. 2568, 98th Congress, 2d session
29 U.S.C. § 794 (1982) Nondiscrimination under Federal grants and programs; promulgation of rules and regulations. No otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States, as defined in section 706(7) of this title, shall, solely by reason of his handicap, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance or under any program or activity conducted by any Executive agency or by the United States Postal Service. * * *	45 C.F.R. § 84.3(f) (1983). (f) "Recipient" means any state or its political subdivision, any instrumentality of a state or its political subdivision, any public or private agency, institution, organization, or other entity, or any person to which Federal financial assistance is extended directly or through another recipient, including any successor, assignee, or transferee or a recipient, but excluding the ultimate beneficiary of the assistance. [Department of Health and Human Services regulations].	Sec. 3(b). "For the purpose of this section, the term 'recipient' means— (1) any State or political subdivision thereof, or any instrumentality of a State or political subdivision thereof, or any public or private agency, institution, or organization, or other entity (including any subunit of any such State, subdivision, instrumentality, agency, institution, organization, or entity), and (2) any successor, assignee, or transferee of any such State, subdivision, instrumentality, agency, institution, organization, or entity or of any such subunit, to which Federal financial assistance is extended (directly or through another entity or a person), or which receives support from the extension of Federal financial assistance to any of its subunits."

THE AGE DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 1975

Present statutory language	Present regulation definition	Proposed definition—S. 2568, 98th Congress, 2d session
The Age Discrimination Act of 1975, Pub. L. 94-135, title III, § 301 et seq., (Nov. 28, 1975), 89 Stat. 728 as amended by Pub. L. 95-478, title IV, § 401(a), (Oct. 18, 1978), 92 Stat. 1555. § 302 Statement of Purpose. It is the purpose of this title to prohibit discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance, including programs or activities receiving funds under the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 (31 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.). [see note.] § 303 Prohibition of discrimination. Pursuant to regulations prescribed under section 304, and except as provided by section 304(b) and section 304(c), no person in the United States shall, on the basis of age, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under, any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. [Note: In the codification, at 42 U.S.C. § 6101 et seq. (1982), "Chapter 67 of title 31" was substituted for "the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 (31 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.)" on authority of Pub. L. 97-258, § 4(b), (Sept. 13, 1982), 96 Stat. 1067.]	45 C.F.R. § 90.4 (1983). "Recipient" means any State or its political subdivision, any instrumentality of a State or its political subdivision, any public or private agency, institution, organization, or other entity, or any person to which Federal financial assistance is extended, directly, or through another recipient. Recipient includes any successor, assignee, or transferee, but excludes the ultimate beneficiary of the assistance. [Department of Health and Human Services regulations.]	Sec. 4(e). "[T]he term 'recipient' means— (A) any State or political subdivision thereof, or any instrumentality of a State or political subdivision thereof, or any public or private agency, institution, or organization, or other entity (including any subunit of any such State, subdivision, instrumentality, agency, institution, organization, or entity), and (B) any successor, assignee, or transferee of any such State, subdivision, instrumentality, agency, institution, organization, or entity or of any such subunit, to which Federal financial assistance is extended (directly or through another entity or a person), or which receives support from the extension of Federal financial assistance to any of its subunits."

"FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE" AS DEFINED IN REGULATIONS

45 C.F.R. § 84.3(h) (1983)

(h) "Federal financial assistance" means any grant, loan, contract (other than a procurement contract or a contract of insurance or guaranty), or any other arrangement by which the Department provides or otherwise makes available assistance in the form of:
(1) Funds;
(2) Services of Federal personnel; or
(3) Real and personal property or any interest in or use of such property, including:
(i) Transfers or leases of such property for less than fair market value or for reduced consideration; and
(ii) Proceeds from a subsequent transfer or lease of such property if the Federal share of its fair market value is not returned to the Federal Government.
[Department of Health and Human Services regulations implementing Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973].

34 C.F.R. § 106.2(g) (1983)

(g) "Federal assistance" means any of the following, when authorized or extended under a law administered by the Department:
(1) A grant or loan of Federal financial assistance, including funds made available for:
(i) The acquisition, construction, renovation, restoration, or repair of a building or facility or any portion thereof; and
(ii) Scholarships, loans, grants, wages or other funds extended to any entity for payment to or on behalf of students admitted to that entity, or extended directly to such students for payment to that entity.
(2) A grant of Federal real or personal property or any interest therein, including surplus property, and the proceeds of the sale or transfer of such property, if the Federal share of the fair market value of the property is not, upon such sale or transfer, properly accounted for to the Federal Government.
(3) Provision of the services of Federal personnel.
(4) Sale or lease of Federal property or any interest therein at nominal consideration, or at consideration reduced for the purpose of assisting the recipient or in recognition of public interest to be served thereby, or permission to use Federal property or any interest therein without consideration.
(5) Any other contract, agreement, or arrangement which has as one of its purposes the provision of assistance to any education program or activity, except a contract of insurance or guaranty.
[Department of Education regulations implementing Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972].●

SENATOR HOWARD H. BAKER

● Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, as the 98th Congress draws to a close, my colleague and good friend, Senator HOWARD H. BAKER, the majority leader is embarking on the next phase of an exceptionally distinguished career. All of us here in the Senate know that he will be successful in his new endeavors. He possesses a rare combination of personal qualities—courage, common sense, fairness, integrity, Southern courtesy, and intelligence—that guarantees success.

HOWARD has guided the Senate through one of the more difficult periods in its history. During his "watch," we have begun to deal with the complex issue of the national debt. Senator BAKER's deep understanding of the problems and policies associated with the debt have made him an extraordinarily effective leader. He has insisted that we keep the needs of those dependent on Federal programs foremost in our minds as we have changed the course of the Federal Government.

It has been a privilege for me to serve as assistant leader with HOWARD, and I will miss working with him each day the Senate is in session. I expect to see him often, however, and rather than saying goodbye, I prefer to say that I look forward to seeing him again soon. So, I'll just change this to a personal message:

Catherine and I and the rest of our family wish you and Joy the best, HOWARD HENRY. We Alaskans aren't given to public displays of our affection, but I want you to know that we honor you as a good friend. We are grateful to the people of Tennessee for sending you to the Senate.

HOWARD HENRY BAKER, you have served your home State, our Nation, and our party with great distinction. Thank you for sharing your talents with us. May God bless you and your family in the years to come.●

HOWARD BAKER

● Mr. ARMSTRONG. Gene Millikin, one of Colorado's most distinguished Senators, once said.

The qualities that make a man respected in the U.S. Senate are the same qualities that make him respected up and down the main street of his own home town.

HOWARD BAKER, as much as any Senator I have ever known, has demonstrated the truth of that statement throughout his distinguished career in the U.S. Senate. The qualities of integrity, leadership, vision, dedication to principle, sensitivity, respect for others, fairness, humility, and good humor are attributes that we admire, and we find them in abundance in the person of HOWARD BAKER.

To say that we will miss HOWARD BAKER is totally inadequate to express the consequence of his retirement from this body. The people of this country will be without the leadership talents of a man who loves the Senate, who knows how it works and how to make it function. As all of us who serve here know, this great deliberative body is a complex institution that relies heavily on leaders who know the Senate's history, its rules, its precedents, and its subtleties in order to perform its historic role in our system of checks and balances. This is not the kind of knowledge that comes quickly and easily, so the extensive understanding and deep appreciation of the Senate that HOWARD BAKER carries with him will not be readily replaced.

I join my colleagues in wishing HOWARD BAKER the best in his future endeavors. We know that his service to this great country will continue and that we will all be better off because of his devotion to our self-governmental system. HOWARD BAKER has strengthened the quality of our democracy and has enriched the proud tradition of the U.S. Senate.●

TRIBUTE TO HOWARD BAKER

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I should like to take a couple of moments to speak about our distinguished majority leader.

I first saw HOWARD BAKER as a member of an audience, watching part of the Watergate hearings.

I first met the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, years ago, at the Lake of the Ozarks in Missouri. I assumed, again, because I was a starry-eyed prosecutor from a small State meeting this famous person for the first time, that he would not remember. But I found that he does, indeed, remember that meeting.

The National District Attorneys Association was meeting at the Lake of the Ozarks, and he was asked to speak. We originally had invited Vice President Gerald Ford. Shortly before that meeting the Vice President suddenly became the President, and we said we wanted someone at least of that stature. President Ford said:

I will send you someone far better than the Vice President; I will send you HOWARD BAKER.

I told Senator BAKER at that time that he was one of my heroes in Washington. I also said, in a letter I sent to him shortly after he announced he was going to retire from the Senate, that I came here with only a handful of heroes, and not all are still in that same handful. One who was a hero to me when I came to the Senate in January 1975 was HOWARD BAKER; one who remains a hero to me today is HOWARD BAKER.

I know of no person who epitomizes more of what I think a U.S. Senator should be, the ability to stand strongly for his principles, stand strongly for his party, but also at the same time to make sure that the U.S. Senate works as the conscience of the Nation. We should be the conscience of the Nation. We were intended to be the conscience of the Nation, and periodically we are, because HOWARD BAKER is one who has made it possible for us to do so.

I have seen him put aside his own personal political fortunes, time and time again, to make sure that the Senate does what is right and that the Senate allows those varying voices to be heard and to allow voices that may well disagree with him to be heard. He makes sure that all sides, conservative, liberal, Republican, and Democrat are heard. He worked to make the U.S. Senate function as the conscience of the Nation.

Mr. President, the Senate will be diminished by the loss of HOWARD BAKER, but at the same time the Senate has been improved for all time by his service as majority leader.

Each of us, again Republican and Democrat, who have had the chance to serve with him have been enhanced and improved by that service. I am gratified that I have had the chance to serve with a man who was a hero to me before I came to the U.S. Senate, remained a hero to me while I was here, and always will be a hero.●

WILLIAM F. HILDENBRAND

● Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, there have been 98 Congresses and 196 sessions of Congress since our National Legislature was established. During that time, there have been 1,760 U.S. Senators. But—consider this amazing fact—there have only been 23 Secretaries of the Senate in the entire history of the Senate.

These statistics underscore something that is obvious to all of us: The Secretary of the Senate is one of a rare breed.

In the person of William F. Hildenbrand, the Office of the Secretary of the Senate has found an occupant who is rare indeed. Secretaries of the Senate are "rare" in the sense of being few and far between. But Bill Hildenbrand is a rare Secretary of the Senate in another, more arcane, sense of the word.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary gives, as the secondary meaning of the word "rare," the following definition:

2. (a) marked by unusual quality, merit, appeal or capacity to please: DISTINCTIVE, EXCELLENT.

(b) superlative or extreme of its kind: FINE, GREAT, REAL.

No one who has had the pleasure of working with Bill Hildenbrand can fail to see the appropriateness of that definition as applied to him. Certainly, Bill is "distinctive"—indeed his like may not pass this way again. Certainly, he is an "extreme of (his) kind"—what other Secretary of the Senate could return to his duties with his feistiness unimpaired after a triple bypass operation?

Admittedly, estimates of Bill Hildenbrand's "capacity to please" lie in the eye of the beholder; the nature of his job militates against a perfect score on that.

But that he is a man of "unusual quality, merit, and appeal" there can be no doubt. When Bill Hildenbrand retires as Secretary of the Senate at the end of the 98th Congress, his loss will be keenly felt. Mrs. Mathias joins me in wishing this rare human being every success in the future and in thanking him for many kindnesses and courtesies in the past.●

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, no Senator is more deserving of tribute than JENNINGS RANDOLPH of West Virginia, who retires this year after 40 years of service in the Congress of the United States. This month marks the 52d anniverary of JENNINGS RANDOLPH's first election to the House of Representatives in 1932. As the only Member of the 98th Congress, just ended, who also served in the 73d Congress, which enacted the programs of the New Deal in the first 100 days of the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, JENNINGS RANDOLPH's contributions to American society have spanned the decades, and his adherence to the principles of fairness and opportunity for all has never wavered. We will miss his legislative skill, his unfailing courtesy, and his steadfastness of purpose.

Over the last half century, JENNINGS RANDOLPH's record of remarkable legislative achievement reflects important progress in making the principles of fairness and opportunity a reality in America. From his first days as a 30-year-old freshman Congressman, to the enactment of the Randolph-Sheppard Act in 1936, which provided and still provides opportunity for thousands of blind persons to operate their own businesses, to the creation of the National Institute of Peace in 1984, which will provide resources for the study of the peaceful resolution of conflict on which the future depends, JENNINGS RANDOLPH has been an effective and dedicated leader.

As chairman for 14 years and as ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, JENNINGS RANDOLPH worked diligently and successfully to establish the Federal aid and interstate highway systems, opening opportunity for growth to all regions of the country. Likewise, he led the way for airport and inland waterway development, and for aviation safety. Without JENNINGS RANDOLPH, transportation in America would be vastly different.

Senator RANDOLPH also played an important role in the creation of the Economic Development Administration and the Appalachian regional development programs, which have been enormously constructive in his own State of West Virginia and its neighbors, one of which is my own State of Maryland. Through the years, EDA and ARC programs have provided opportunities in areas which otherwise would have been unable to tap their potential to contribute to America's growth and progress. The purpose of these programs, which are slotted for elimination by the Reagan administration, remains as valid today as when they were created; In Senator RANDOLPH's words, "* * * to strengthen the economy of the area so that it can become prosperous and contribute not only to the local tax base but to the tax base of the Nation."

During the 1970's, through his leadership on the Environment Committee, Senator RANDOLPH was indispensable to the enactment of our Nation's basic environmental statutes intended to protect our land, water and air from hazardous pollution.

As an active member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Senator RANDOLPH was in the forefront of the fight for education programs and especially for programs to expand opportunities for handicapped and disabled persons. The Education of the Handicapped Act, the Developmental Disabilities Act, and the Vocational Rehabilitation Act all bear the stamp of his leadership and cooperation. Senator RANDOLPH also applied his legislative skill to enactment of fair labor standards and measures to promote safety in the workplace. In 1969, he authored legislation creating the Black Lung Program; through his efforts, thousands of former miners with this disabling and often fatal, work-related disease, and their dependents, have received assistance.

One of Senator RANDOLPH's most significant achievements was the enactment of legislation, later ratified as the 26th amendment to the Constitution, extending to 18-year-olds the right to vote. He first proposed such legislation in 1942; through his efforts it was finally approved by the Congress and ratified by the States in 1971.

"I'm not going to retire," JENNINGS RANDOLPH has said. "I'm just changing jobs." I hope he will continue to speak out and to remind us of the true spirit of the New Deal, which has been a consistent thread running throughout his career: To bring all people into the effort to make the Nation grow, and to bring to all people the opportunity to share in the benefits of that growth.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH has served West Virginia and the country with great distinction. I am honored to have served with him and to have learned from him. I join my colleagues in expressing deep admiration and thanks for his unstinting efforts over a remarkable length of time, on behalf of all the people of this Nation.●

SAILOR JOHN TOWER

● Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, the Navy crew is going ashore. The number of World War II Navy veterans serving in the Senate who shared the experience of sea duty, "the United States then being in a state of war," is reduced yet again by the retirement of the Senator from Texas, Mr. TOWER.

JOHN TOWER enlisted in the U.S. Navy in 1942 and served for 4 years.

There is a special perspective that is gained by life at sea that is valuable throughout our lives. It is the sense of isolation, even on a crowded deck, the hours of contemplation enforced by distance from land and the sharing of a common fate with shipmates. It is more than Dr. Samuel Johnson suggested when he said that being on a ship was like being in prison with the additional danger of being drowned. There is the sense of confinement and the possibility of danger, but there is something further. It is a spirit of adventure that no other way of life affords and which survives after the end of a cruise.

I hope the spirit of adventure will last for JOHN TOWER as long as he lives and will carry him to sunny shores and safe harbors.●

A DAY OF PRAYER AND REMEMBRANCE

● Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, we are approaching the first anniversary of a numbing, sorrowful tragedy—the terrorist truck bombing of the U.S. military barracks in Beirut which killed 240 American servicemen.

One cannot ignore the enormous bloodshed and suffering which the Lebanese people have experienced in their recent decade of civil strife. But we must pay special tribute to those brave Americans who went to Lebanon to help and then lost their lives.

A day of prayer and remembrance will be held in my home city of Wilmington, DE, on October 23, 1984, and, I would expect in many other locations around our country.

Mr. President, I ask that the full text of correspondence outlining the plans and details of that planned remembrance be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The material follows:

OCTOBER 3, 1984.

To: Senator William V. Roth, Jr., Senator Joseph R. Biden, Congressman Thomas R. Carper.

From: Thomas L. Little.

Re information for immediate release.

DEAR BILL, JOE AND TOM: Tuesday, October 23, 1984, marks the first anniversary of the Lebanese massacre and will also be our day of mourning and remembrance for all service connected death or injury due to war.

This is not a political event. No politicking will be allowed. No public officials will be recognized nor mentioned. This issue is simply war and peace in prayerful remembrance, honoring our fallen American patriots and expressing our faith in God.

The agenda is as follows:

7:00-7:30 P.M.: Assemble at Rodney Square.

7:30 P.M.: Call to the colors—U.S. Marine Corps Color Guard.

Pledge of allegiance.

Introduction, Thomas L. Little (2 minutes).

Peace on earth, Sue Pine (2 minutes).

Four homilies (5 minutes each).

Rifle Salute, U.S. Marine Corps.

Taps in honor of all servicemen who were killed or injured in war (2 minutes).

Hymn—"Let There Be Peace on Earth" (4 minutes).

Close and Goodnight, Thomas L. Little (1 minute).

There will be no partisan references or comments. This does not mean that political persons are not invited, as are all citizens of Delaware and surrounding areas. We ask only that those who attend bring one candle, which will be lit during the ceremony at the appropriate time; after taps, will be the hymn.

I request you use your good office; submit this letter as an immediate release through your press secretary and use all your powers of persuasion to have it included in the Congressional Record and publicized as much as possible so that: Every village, town, city and other institutional setting, including churches, synagogues and other places of worship, universities, schools, et al., may follow the same pattern and example in a local setting. In this manner, we will give the lives of the marines and sailors who died some meaning, some real, honest meaning—for their death may now contribute to world peace.

Last year, you all asked what you could do to help. I now ask you to help by submitting this letter as an immediate release with my complete permission and enthusiastic encouragement, before the United States Senate and Congress, and announce this event wherever possible.

Please find enclosed a "Lest We Forget" button, should you wish to refer to it.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS L. LITTLE.

LAW OFFICES OF
AGOSTINI & LITTLE,
Wilmington, DE, September 20, 1984.

Re October 23, 1984.

PAUL X. KELLY,
Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps, Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, DC.

DEAR SIR: My son survived the Beirut bombing, October 23, 1983, but 260 other young men were killed in the Beirut area during the Lebanon War last year.

I served as a Drill Instructor in the 50's, and encouraged my son to enlist. I am proud to be a member of the best fighting organization that ever existed.

With that out of the way, I am quite disturbed at the lack of recognition these boys are receiving, especially the ones who were killed or injured. I have every intention of holding a day of prayer and remembrance on October 23, 1984, at Rodney Square in the City of Wilmington, Delaware. Enclosed is a button that I have been passing around our community. I hope the Marine Corps under your leadership has some plan to recognize these young men.

Semper Fi,

THOMAS L. LITTLE.

SEPTEMBER 26, 1984.

Mr. THOMAS L. LITTLE,
Attorney at Law, Agostini and Little, Wilmington, DE 19899.

DEAR MR. LITTLE: Thank you for your letter of September 20, 1984 regarding your plans for observing the first anniversary of the bombing of the Battalion Landing Team Headquarters in Beirut.

Plans are being formulated to hold an appropriate ceremony at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina on October 23, 1984. Additionally, there will be local observations in many military and civilian communities.

Thank you for your support and interest. You may be assured that the indomitable spirit of all the Marines who served in Beirut will be recalled this October, and always.

Respectfully,

P.X. KELLEY,
General, U.S. Marine Corps,
Commandant of the Marine Corps.●

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ANTITRUST ACT

● Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I have followed with great care the development of H.R. 6027 and S. 1578, the legislation which is now the Local Government Antitrust Act. As I have earlier said, I strongly believe that the protection afforded by this legislation should be made to apply to all local governments which might otherwise be subject to a claim for damages under the Federal antitrust laws. I am pleased to see that the Committee on Conference has explicitly dealt with the question of how to apply this legislation to cases now pending. I am particularly heartened that the bill reported out of conference provides that a court should consider all the circum-

stances of a particular case in deciding whether the section should apply and that the Statement of the Managers directs that "a court is to consider all relevant circumstances."

I participated in the discussions which led up to the adoption of this language in the bill which passed the Senate, and I was particularly concerned that such a provision be included in the final bill—so that a court of equity might consider all the circumstances in determining whether section 3 should apply. This language directs the court in making its determination to weigh the important factors, including the stage of litigation, the availability of alternative relief under the Clayton Act, the need to protect units of local government and their taxpayers from the considerable financial liability that could result from a damage award, and the degree to which the local government's action was directed by, or predicated on, Federal law or direction, among other equitable factors which may apply in a particular case.●

TRIBUTE TO PAUL TSONGAS

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I first came to the U.S. Senate in the same year that my neighboring State of Massachusetts sent PAUL TSONGAS from its Fifth District to the House of Representatives. PAUL has served with distinction in his home State, first as a Middlesex County commissioner and then as a Lowell city councilor.

I think the people of Massachusetts sent to the House one of their most qualified and most sensitive people. Subsequently, he came to the U.S. Senate, and again Massachusetts sent a Member who has made a vital contribution to this body.

This is the feeling, shared on both sides of the aisle, about this man of sensitivity, brilliance, dedication, compassion, and concern for his country, for his State and, most of all, concern for those who have really no voice in this body.

Senator TSONGAS made a decision a few months ago to go home to Massachusetts, with his wife Niki, and children Ashley, Katina, and Mollie, because of his concern, one, for his health, but also his concern of what the Senate does to those who want to have a family life, a real life, the kind of life that all of us feel entitled but so few of us actually have.

I, for one, applaud Senator TSONGAS' decision for the reasons he made it. He has done his share. He has done far more for his State and his country than most people ever have the chance to do.

Having done this, though, he realizes that his highest and ultimate duty is to his family and thus to himself.

The other duties that we try to fulfill to country, to State, and to this body, the Senate, pale if we do not fulfill our first duty to ourselves and our families. Many times when our commitments to our families have been lacking, so have our commitments to our country and State and to the Senate.

I applaud PAUL for his service. I applaud him for his accomplishments during the time he spent in the House and Senate.

I do not think anyone, Republican or Democrat, doubts that PAUL TSONGAS would have returned to the Senate had he chosen to run again this year. The fact that he chose not to run, though, gives him greater credit because of his reasons.

He is a good friend and a good Senator. But, most importantly, he is a good person who has proved it by his actions. Like all others, I wish him Godspeed and the very best.●

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING SENATORS HOWARD BAKER, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, JOHN TOWER, AND PAUL TSONGAS

● Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, the closing of the 98th Congress marks the end of service by four of our Nation's greatest assets, Senators HOWARD BAKER, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, JOHN TOWER, and PAUL TSONGAS. Each of these fine men have unselfishly contributed to the good of this body. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to my colleagues for their accomplishments, and to thank them for their friendship.

PAUL TSONGAS' contributions did not begin with his election to the U.S. Senate, and I do not believe they will end with his retirement from the Senate. Senator TSONGAS served as a Peace Corps volunteer in Ethiopia and the West Indies. He offered his services to the public while Deputy Assistant Attorney General and as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives prior to his arrival in the Upper Chamber. Senator TSONGAS has served the Nation while representing the fine State of Massachusetts in Congress since 1975. His congressional career has been highlighted by his foreign relations and resource management activities. He has been a thorough, determined, creative Member with unwaivering conviction. I wish him success in the future.

Next, I would like to say a few words about the distinguished Senator from Texas, JOHN TOWER. JOHN has given of himself for nearly 24 years in this arena. He has maintained a loyal, hard-working, responsible demeanor throughout his terms, while remaining strongly consistent in his support of our country's national defense. As chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator TOWER's knowledge and understanding of military preparedness is unsurpassed. He has been a true leader of the Senate in this area of concern. In describing JOHN TOWER, one word comes to mind which, although desired by many, is applicable to very few. JOHN TOWER is an American patriot. A patriot that shall be missed as we continually struggle to preserve a way of life so dear to us all.

The stay of JENNINGS RANDOLPH has been one filled with many legislative accomplishments too numerous to mention. He first ran for office in 1930 and has been a fixture here ever since. The citizenry of West Virginia, in reelecting Senator RANDOLPH to over a half century of service, has paid him the greatest of all compliments.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH has pioneered legislation benefiting the handicapped—the Randolph-Sheppard bill. He introduced the Trans-Continental Act in 1937 which later became the National Highways Act. Senator RANDOLPH has been a leader in the area of environmental protection. He had the insight to deal with energy issues long before its continued supply was of any concern. And he has led the way in support of aviation advancements. Throughout his career, Senator RANDOLPH has continually fought for what he believed to be best for his home State and the country, always looking to the future with optimism and fairness.

While a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have had the opportunity to experience Senator RANDOLPH's unique qualities first hand. I have witnessed his equal-handed dealing with those of opposing views. I have seen the sensitive, caring side of Senator RANDOLPH, striving to help individuals better themselves. Yet, while amassing these many achievements, he has never compromised the high standards of the Senate. Today, the Senate has lost one of its most valuable treasures. I only hope that he will see fit to offer us his guidance when in the future his friends and colleagues are in need.

Finally, Mr. President, I turn to the retirement of the distinguished majority leader, HOWARD BAKER. What tribute could be recorded that would justly describe the accomplishments of Senator BAKER's efforts? He has served as Senator from the great State of Tennessee for 18 years, representing his constituents with an intellectual compassion found in very few men. He has worked hard and long to better the Nation he so loves, while putting his personal political fortunes aside. HOWARD BAKER is a party man, but one who has the wisdom to work with members of the minority on bipartisan issues. Senator BAKER has often been referred to as "level headed" and "evenhanded" by representatives from either side of the aisle, willing to work with, rather than against those with

opposing viewpoints, always respectful of another's position. He is a man gentle in nature, while firm in conviction. HOWARD BAKER is a gentleman among men, a statesman among politicians, and a leader among leaders. I wish him God's speed and happiness in all his future endeavors. The U.S. Senate will truly miss HOWARD BAKER.●

COLORADO WILDERNESS BILL

● Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I regret that we have now reached a point in this session where it no longer appears feasible to pass a Colorado wilderness bill. Many long hours of very productive work have been invested in the development of a compromise bill by all of the members of the Colorado congressional delegation and their staffs. Major progress has been made in an undertaking which is of great importance to the future of our State and the Nation. However, it is now apparent that the limited number of remaining differences are too important to Colorado's vital interests to make passage in this session advisable.

Before discussing the differences that are still to be resolved, I would like to sketch out the truly remarkable progress that has been achieved by the Colorado delegation. We started with a series of very disparate proposals that ranged in acreage from a low of 372,483 acres in Congressman KOGOVSEK's bill to a high of 735,815 acres in Senator HART's proposal. My own bill, which was based upon the Forest Service study recommendations, proposed 443,131 acres of national forest land plus 435,624 acres of national park for wilderness designation.

A myriad of issues are involved in these vast tracts of land, including: existing ditches and roads, private inholdings, livestock grazing, conflicting recreational uses, mining claims, oil leases, game habitat management, timbering conflicts, local firewood needs, power line corridors, State-owned lands and mineral interests, adjudicated water rights, major water and hydroelectric development, jeep and ski mobile tour routes, insect and fire control, scientific study areas, endangered species protection, ski area expansion, avalanche control and helicopter access to fishing lakes; as well as some important unknowns such as oil and mineral potential in areas that have not been fully explored.

Some of the proposals included large tracts of land outside of the wilderness study and further planning areas which had previously been released to multiple use management in 1980. These areas had to be studied particularly closely by the delegation's staff, since the Forest Service had not been directed to study them for wilderness designation, and for at least the past 4 years they have been managed under all the multiple use criteria—including resource development, such as mining and logging. There was also the important question of whether the new legislation would amend the 1980 Colorado Wilderness Act and adopt the policy decisions of that legislation, such as release language, buffer zones, grazing guidelines, etc.

Despite all of these conflicts a compromise agreement was effectively reached in the Senate that proposes wilderness protection from 624,300 acres of national forest and BLM lands as well as 435,624 acres of national park and monument lands. In addition, through national recreation and scenic area designation, protection would be afforded to an additional 25,000 acres for the Spanish Peaks and Oh-Be-Joyful wilderness study areas. Essential agreement on boundaries was reached on 1,084,000 acres, encompassing a major portion of each of the 18 national forest areas, 1 Bureau of Land Management areas, and the 3 national park/monument areas.

The studies conducted by the U.S. Forest Service over the past 4 years at the direction of Congress are a major contribution to this effort by providing a solid basis of information and analysis for congressional deliberations. In addition the cooperation of the Forest Service in facilitating inspection tours of the proposed areas have afforded Members and staffs first-hand, on-the-ground information of the lands being considered. My staff, and I am sure the staffs of others in the Colorado delegation, have posed thousands of questions to Forest Service personnel and have received timely and thorough responses. For these many reasons, I wish to commend the Department of Agriculture and the National Forest Service. I believe that their involvement has materially enhanced the quality of the Colorado wilderness proposal and has made it possible for the delegation to reach the boundary agreements it has to date.

I am very optimistic that a solid foundation has now been laid for this expansive Colorado wilderness compromise bill to be passed early in 1985. The intervening months between now and the next session can be used in a very productive way to arrive at solutions to the remaining issues and to involve an even broader spectrum of Colorado citizens in the decisionmaking process.

This now brings me to the most important and fundamental issue involved in the long months of discussion—water. Despite a very intensive effort in both Washington and Colorado, experts in Colorado's water and environmental communities were unable to resolve the issues and uncertainties that surround the question of water rights relating to the designation of wilderness areas.

Over the past 20 years there has been a general assumption that the designation of wilderness does not create any new or additional water rights in the Federal Government. This assumption has been given in all wilderness discussion and designation until this year. A suit filed by the Sierra Club resulted in a preliminary ruling by the Federal district court that refused to rule out the possibility of a new Federal reserved water right being created by designation of wilderness.

Consultation with Colorado's leading water experts revealed a deep concern that new reserved rights could cause havoc in Colorado's water rights system and result in years of litigation and uncertainty. For this reason, I included a provision in my wilderness bill—S. 2916—to clearly spell out congressional intent not to create a new reserved right through the designation of wildness areas. The provision does not affect any existing reserved water rights that now exist by virtue of the original creation of national forests or national parks and monuments. My purpose in including it was to preserve the status quo with regard to Federal reserved rights and to remove water as an issue in the designation of wilderness.

At my request, the reserved water rights working group of the Colorado Water Congress studied the matter closely and prepared a carefully researched memorandum for the congressional delegation which concluded that—

> . . . no Colorado wilderness areas be designated henceforth without language similar to that contained in Senator ARMSTRONG's bill. . . .

Through extensive discussions with virtually all of the States leading water authorities, I am convinced the memorandum accurately reflects the judgment of the overwhelming majority of them. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that Colorado's Legislative Interim Committee on Nontributary Ground Water held hearings on this question and voted to support water language in the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1984:

> Protecting water rights established pursuant to Colorado's constitution and statutes and water rights under applicable interstate compacts, and creating no new water rights in the United States. . . .

In addition, the Western States Legislative Council voted unanimously in support of the context of the water provision in S. 2916 at their annual meeting in Arizona on September 19, 1984.

Because of an obvious need to address the water issue and to bring the opposing views together, Senator HART and I appointed a committee of four Colorado attorneys representing disparate points of view to work out com-

promise language if possible. After a very conscientious effort, the committee reported back on September 27, that they were unable to reach agreement. The question the committee wrestled with and the one that still confounds the delegation is how to compromise opposite points of view on the issue of whether designation of wilderness creates or does not create a new Federal water right.

Extensive discussion of this issue has precipitated one clear conclusion. Water is an issue in wilderness designation that cannot and should not be glossed over or left to the vagaries of the courts. Colorado's water rights are the most important property right in our State and the most fundamental to our State's economy and future. Any system of wilderness preservation must be established within the frame work of Colorado's water rights system.

The most encouraging aspect of this complex issue is that Colorado has already taken farsighted action to preserve the vital characteristics of wilderness that are directly related to water and the preservation of essential instream flows. Under a Colorado law enacted in 1973, sections 148-21-2 and 148-21-3 of the Colorado Revised Statutes 1963-69 Supp., as amended, the Colorado Water Conservation Board was authorized to file claims for instream flows under Colorado's water rights system. The board, on behalf of the State, has since filed for instream flow rights on over 5,000 miles of Colorado rivers and streams and has acquired minimum lake levels in over 470 Colorado lakes. I am, therefore, very confident that Colorado is not taking lightly the need to protect Colorado's water from over appropriation to the detriment of the surrounding environment and wildlife values.

Although I regret that this matter could not be resolved at this time, I believe that a solution to this wilderness water issue can be found in the coming months, and I believe that it can be done in a way to preserve critical wilderness values that are tied to water within the context of State law and interstate compacts.

I have instructed my staff to give a high priority to continued work on the wilderness legislation in the months ahead and to coordinate continuously with the other with the other delegations. The first objective of this work will be to distill the broad agreements that have been reached into specific legislation so that the investment of time and talent in this process will not be lost. The second objective will be to continue our pursuit of solid agreement in those narrow areas where thus far a consensus has eluded us.

Colorado has clearly led the Nation in designating national wilderness preservation system lands in the State, and we are still far ahead of most other States in this historic process. I am convinced that we can complete this process in a way that balances all of the conflicting interests in the fairest way possible. Colorado clearly has some of the highest wilderness values in the entire Nation, and we recognize our obligation to do the very best we can to preserve these values for all generations to come.

We now have the foundation for the successful conclusion of this phase of wilderness designation, and I intend to press it to a conclusion as soon as legislatively possible. I trust that the rest of the Colorado delegation shares my conviction.●

THE HONORABLE PAUL TSONGAS—THE RIGHT SPIRIT

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, in bidding farewell to PAUL TSONGAS, who today takes leave of his role here on the floor of the Senate and who, next January, goes on to other endeavors, I believe all of us could best describe the impact of his presence here in his own words. "The right medicine for our ailing national spirit," said the Senator from Massachusetts in 1980 when he proposed the establishment of a National Youth Service as a vehicle for involving young Americans in different ways to serve their country.

The vision and the reach of PAUL TSONGAS—which has always looked a little higher, stretched a little further—has indeed been "the right medicine for our ailing national spirit."

Though he leaves us at an age at which many decide to embark upon a career in public service, PAUL TSONGAS leaves us that legacy of vision and reach, combined with a profoundly honest intellect—a combination that made for a model Senator.

He has left his mark on a wide range of environmental and energy-related legislation, in particular the Alaska lands bill in 1979 and in subsequent amendments to that legislation.

PAUL TSONGAS has never stopped reaching a little further or seeing a little farther. Looking beyond the day-to-day misery of apartheid in South Africa, he proposed that the United States provide scholarships to the black youth who were victims of the educational bias of that system.

Looking beyond the legislative battles of the day, he outlined a new vision for his Democratic Party in a 1981 book: "The Road From Here, Liberalism and Reality in the 1990's." He challenged all of us and he continues to challenge us to share a part of his vision which is not limited by the conventions and biases of the past.

I and my colleagues will miss PAUL TSONGAS, but we will be secure in the knowledge that our colleague will always be providing the right medicine for spirits which ail, no matter where he is. We all owe PAUL TSONGAS our gratitude for providing our body with spirit and inspiration during his tenure here.●

ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL CONSULTATIONS ON REFUGEE ADMISSIONS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask that the following materials be printed in the RECORD as the substance of the annual consultations between the representatives of the President and members of the Judiciary Committees of the House and the Senate on refugee admissions for fiscal year 1985, as mandated by section 207(d) of the Refugee Act of 1980.

Mr. President, in order to conserve the printing costs of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am submitting only relevant correspondence and selected excerpts from the much more detailed and more lengthy report of the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, entitled "Proposed Refugee Admissions and Allocations for the Fiscal Year 1985." That report should be considered to be incorporated by reference in full in these remarks. Should any of my colleagues wish to read this report, or should they have any questions about it, I would refer them either to the staff of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy, which I chair, or the office of the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, Department of State, Washington, DC 20520.

The materials referred to follows:

Congress has, in the Refugee Act of 1980, stated that the U.S. resettlement program is intended for refugees of special hunanitarian concern to the United States, in accordance with a determination made by the President after appropriate consultation.

Mr. Chairman, after most careful study and reflection, the President proposes a regional refugee admissions ceiling of 70,000 for fiscal year 1985, a small reduction from the fiscal '84 level.

Within this overall ceiling of 70,000, the President is proposing a new, separate ceiling for admissions under the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees' Orderly Departure Program from Vietnam and some adjustments in geographic ceilings.

I am here representing the President to consult with the Congress about our proposed 1985 admissions program. We are here today not only to present this proposal for your consideration, but also to answer your questions and receive your views.

We hope the 1985 admissions program will receive the same broad bipartisan support that it has enjoyed in past years. The proposed admissions ceilings for fiscal year 1985 are: 50,000 for East Asia, including 10,000 for a separate Orderly Departure Program in Vietnam; 9,000 for Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union; 5,000 for the Near East and South Asia; 3,000 for Africa; 3,000 for Latin America and the Caribbean, for a total of 70,000 worldwide.

In addition, the President is announcing two new initiatives aimed at resolving pressing refugee problems in Southeast Asia. First, the United States will accept all Asian-American children and their qualifying family members presently in Vietnam,

hopefully over the next three years. Because of their undisputed ties to our country, these children and family members are of particular humanitarian concern to the United States.

Second, the United States is proposing a distinct program within the UNHCR's Orderly Departure Program from Vietnam for the resettlement of political prisoners currently and previously confined in the reeducation camp prisons in Vietnam and their qualifying family members.

Various spokesmen for the communist regime in Vietnam have claimed they would be willing to release all of these political prisoners for resettlement. But despite two years of efforts to arrange for their departure under the UNHCR's Orderly Departure Program, the Vietnamese have only released for resettlement a handful of these persecuted people.

This initiative has as its goal the departure from Vietnam of these persons for resettlement in the United States over the next two years. These current and former political prisoners are of particular humanitarian concern to the United States.

Success in both of these initiatives will require the goodwill and cooperation of the Vietnamese government. We hope the Vietnamese now will respond to this new appeal.

Mr. Chairman, there are nearly eight million refugees in the world today. In response to this tragic situation, the United States and the international community actively seek durable solutions.

In order of preference, these solutions are: voluntary repatriation to the refugees' homelands; permanent resettlement in the countries of first asylum; or resettlement in third countries, including the United States.

International refugees assistance programs, for which the United States provides about 30 percent of the funding, help provide basic care and maintenance for the refugees until one of these solutions can be achieved.

We believe that our proposed admissions program for 1985, coupled with the expected admissions programs of the other resettlement countries, should meet the requirements for resettlement in the coming year. We will continue to work closely with the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and with other countries to ensure that the responsibility for resettlement is shared equitably.

This international resettlement effort, along with the planned contributions by the U.S. and other donor countries for refugee relief abroad, should hopefully meet the basic needs of the world's refugee population.

Mr. Chairman, my statement for the record includes an impressive list of accomplishments achieved by the U.S. refugee program over the last ten years, and that is deliberately in there since I think it is important, as we look to what we should try to do in the future, to recognize that all of our efforts and the money we have spent have accomplished a lot. There are genuine achievements.

And also I think that the United States should not be hesitant to say what it has done. That is in the statement that you have for your record. But rather than dwell on these accomplishments here, I will address at this time some of the urgent tasks before us.

I would like now to discuss in detail our proposal for a new, separate ceiling for admissions under the UNHCR Orderly Departure Program. In early 1984, the number of ODP departures from Vietnam for the United States exceeded 1,000 per month for the first time since the program began.

Total departures for the United States and other resettlement countries have reached an average of 2,200 per month, and in fiscal year 1984 ODP departures to all countries will exceed the number of boat arrivals for the first time. Despite continuing problems, the UNHCR Orderly Departure Program is working and is increasingly becoming an alternative to hazardous boat escape from Vietnam.

The reason the President is proposing the establishment of a separate Orderly Departure Program ceiling for fiscal 1985 is to ensure that a growing ODP is not perceived as reducing the number of refugees admitted to the United States from first asylum countries. As you know, there is a great deal of attention, particularly in that part of the world, about the large numbers of refugees.

We estimate that this ceiling of 10,000 would permit the departure from Vietnam of some 18,000 refugees and immigrants in fiscal year 1985, some 7,000 of whom would enter the United States as refugees in fiscal year 1986 following completion of language training and cultural orientation at the Philippine Refugee Processing Center in Bataan.

At UNHCR-sponsored meetings in Geneva in October 1982 and October 1983, we urged the Vietnamese to permit an expansion of the Orderly Departure Program. We expect to meet, under UNHCR auspices, with the Vietnamese in Geneva again this October, and will present to them at that time our revised plans for the future expansion of the Orderly Departure Program.

Our revised plans include, first, a basic restructuring of the U.S. program. Rather than having one ODP program into which we combine all groups of particular concern to the United States, we would propose to divide ODP into three separate sub-programs, and to measure mutual performance against specified processing levels and guidelines for each program.

These three sub-programs would be: first, the Regular Program for spouses and children of American citizens, ex-U.S. government employees, and ethnic minorities of special humanitarian concern; second, the Asian-American Program for Asian-American children and close family members included in the same household as the child; and, third, the Political Prisoner Program for current and former political prisoners and specified family members.

For the Regular Program, we would plan to process and move from Vietnam up to 10,000 persons, refugees and immigrants, during 1985. Within the 10,000 level, we would inform the Vietnamese that we expect them to grant exit visas to a much greater proportion of persons from our special priority lists.

For the other two programs, I have already described the specific new initiatives designed to prompt the processing and movement of these much abused populations. We would set processing and movement levels for these programs sufficient to launch and maintain steady movements for each group during 1985.

Mr. Chairman, I now turn to the proposed admissions ceilings for the geographic regions of the world.

East Asia: To lessen the Indochinese refugee burden on Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, the Philippines and Hong Kong, the U.S. has maintained a relatively high rate of resettlement from the region.

We believe that admission of 40,000 refugees in fiscal '85 is our fair share—a level equal to the number of refugees we expect will be admitted by the rest of the refugee resettlement countries combined. This should encourage other resettlement nations to continue to participate in resettlement from Southeast Asia.

Processing by Immigration and Naturalization Service officers has been smooth and efficient during fiscal '84, thanks in part to improved case work by the voluntary agency representatives in the field and to the effect of the revised INS refugee processing guidelines issued in August 1983.

We should not lose sight of the fact that it is Hanoi's oppressive policies toward its own people and its military occupation of its neighbors that must cease before there can be a lasting solution to the Indochinese refugee crisis. It is these policies which are the root cause of the continuing exodus of refugees and the unwillingness of the people who fled Vietnam, Kampuchea and Laos to return to their homes.

I turn now to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Despite its international obligation under the Helsinki Accords to allow freer immigration, the Soviet Union continues to prevent Jews and other persecuted minorities from leaving.

We have urged the Soviets to honor their agreement and to issue exit permits to those who wish to leave, and I intend to make this point with Foreign Minister Gromyko when I meet with him at the United Nations.

The severe Soviet restriction on Jewish and other immigration regrettably reduces the need again this year for proposing a large refugee admissions ceiling for Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

On the other hand, we want to maintain a sufficiently high ceiling to accommodate the normal flow of refugees from the countries of Eastern Europe. We estimate that a ceiling of 9,000 admissions should be adequate for this purpose.

Near East and South Asia: The Near East and South Asia region has several major refugee-producing situations, particularly in Afghanistan and Iran. In most cases, the refugees coming from this area are able to find continuing asylum in the region.

We estimate that a refugee admissions ceiling of 5,000 will be sufficient to provide for those persons requiring resettlement who are of special concern to the United States, especially persecuted Iranian religious minorities such as the Bahai's and persons from Afghanistan whose positions in former Afghan governments or association with the United States make them particular targets of persecution.

Turning to Africa, the generous hospitality of African countries of first asylum and some limited possibilities for voluntary repatriation have mitigated the need for any significant resettlement outside of Africa. However, there remains a relatively small number of African refugees for whom asylum or integration in the region is not feasible. We are proposing a ceiling of 3,000 for Africa to accommodate these special cases.

Finally, we are requesting 3,000 admissions for potential refugees from Latin America and the Caribbean who might require resettlement in the U.S. This is an increase of 2,000 over fiscal '84 and should be adequate to permit the admission of refugees for whom resettlement in the United States is the most appropriate option.

I will now discuss briefly English language training and medical programs for refugees.

Mr. Chairman, we have dedicated significant time, money and effort to developing programs to help refugees prepare for their new lives in America.

For example, in 1985 we anticipate further improvements in both the English-as-a-Second-Language and Cultural Orientation programs and in the medical screening program. The Department of State is concerned with the quality of refugees' preparation for life in the U.S. and the thoroughness with which medical problems are detected and treated. These programs have a direct impact on the success and cost of refugee resettlement in the United States, and I believe the Japanese have made some very substantial contributions in this effort.

Once refugees arrive in our country, there begins the important task of helping them become self-sufficient. During the reauthorization deliberations for the Refugee Act, it became abundantly clear that the Congress desires a strengthened role for the private sector in assisting refugees to start to build productive, self-sufficient futures in their new country. The Administration concurs wholeheartedly with this goal.

While the proposed admission of refugees in fiscal year 1985 is the focus of this hearing, it represents only one part of the U.S. refugee policies and programs and approximately one-third of the $335 million of the 1984 refugee budget. About two-thirds of that budget, $227 million, is the U.S. contribution to international assistance for the world's estimated eight million refugees.

Most U.S. assistance is channeled through international organizations. As in past years, the U.S. will contribute about 30 percent of the total budget of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees. Other contributions will be made to the International Committee of the Red Cross, the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration, the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees, and the UN Border Relief Operation in Southeast Asia.

We were very pleased that the UNHCR-Thai government anti-piracy program was renewed for another year in June. We will continue to support all efforts to eliminate pirate attacks, and to ensure that the unfortunate victims of these attacks receive necessary counseling and improved medical care.

As in past years, we will provide assistance to the nearly three million Afghan refugees who have been generously given asylum by Pakistan for almost five years. In the Near East, the U.S. will continue to fund about 25 percent of the budget of the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian refugees which provides education and health services to two million refugees.

President Reagan's proclamation of this past July 9th as African Refugees Relief Day symbolized a continuing commitment by the United States to assist the over two million refugees in Africa.

The recent Second International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa set new goals for helping refugees in Africa to achieve self-sufficiency and for assisting African first asylum countries. The U.S. delegation to the conference led by Attorney General Smith, strongly supported these goals.

Our refugee programs in Central America support our overall objective of strengthening the forces of moderation against extremism of both the left and the right. Our assistance for El Salvador's displaced persons helps those who have fled guerrilla-infested villages for areas more firmly under government control, thereby strengthening President Duarte's government.

Our assistance for Nicaraguan refugees in Honduras and Costa Rica keeps the flame of freedom alive for people like the Miskito Indians who have fled Marxist repression. Our assistance also benefits individuals who are potential victims of right-wing violence or who are simply fleeing the depredations of vicious guerrilla conflicts.

By maintaining our first asylum policy and supporting refugee centers located in Central America, we also ease the pressure of more massive illegal immigration the United States.

The U.S. refugee program has enjoyed broad bipartisan support over the years, and under the leadership of President Reagan I can assure you that it will continue to be given high priority within the Administration.

We are indebted to the great work of many dedicated Senators and Congressmen. I would like to salute in particular the leadership of the House Judiciary Committee by Chairman Rodino and the distinguished work in the Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees and International Law by Chairman Mazzoli and Congressmen Fish, Lungren and McCollum. The efforts there have done much to advance the cause of enlightened refugee policy in the United States.

In the Senate, I would like to express my gratitude and deep respect to you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Kennedy, and Chairman Thurmond for your work in the field of refugee affairs.

I know there are many other members of both Houses who have devoted their time and energy to the delicate and difficult task of refugee admissions and assistance, but I think it is fitting that the gentlemen I have mentioned are singled out for special praise.

On behalf of the President, I urge the Congress to continue its strong support for the refugee program and to assist in providing the budgetary and admissions resources which will be required to carry it out.

We believe the 1985 admissions program we are discussing today and the 1986 program which is currently being developed within the Administration will be sufficient to meet anticipated refugee needs and to launch the initiatives I have discussed earlier.

In order that the Congress and the Administration may continue to work jointly on the refugee program, we would be prepared at mid-year to meet with the relevant committees of both Houses to review our progress, particularly with regard to the initiatives with the Vietnamese.

We can all take justifiable pride that the United States is recognized throughout the world for its leadership in humanitarian assistance to and protection of refugees. We have given much to help the refugees of the world, but we have also benefited from the talents and hard work of the many refugees who have been accepted for resettlement in the United States.

I thank the Congress and the American people for making it possible for us to meet the awesome challenge of aiding the world's refugees. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

OVERVIEW OF THE WORLD REFUGEE SITUATION

While there were significant changes in specific refugee situations during the past year, the overall magnitude of the numbers of refugees involved—an estimated 8,165,600 persons requiring either protection or relief and assistance—remained approximately the same. As in the past, however, those countries which have afforded asylum to the largest numbers of refugees and assistance to other displaced persons, principally in Africa, Central America, Southeast Asia, and the Near East, continue to do so as long as they receive support from the international community. Through its food and financial assistance, the United States has played a major role among the donor countries in ensuring that food, medical attention, shelter, and other relief supplies were generally adquate for refugee needs.

Within Africa, while there are encouraging developments pointing toward a resolution of the Ethiopian refugee situation, hundreds of thousands of Africans are endangered by violence. The government of Somalia formally decided to permit 400,000 Ethiopian refugees presently in UNHCR-supported camps to resettle if the international community would provide resources for their eventual self-sufficiency. As for those Ethiopian refugees located in Djibouti, UNHCR's efforts resulted in the voluntary return to Ethiopia of about two-thirds of the estimated 30,000 refugees located in that small country. There was no significant change, however, for the 400,000 Ethiopian refugees in Sudan. As a result of political events in that country, an estimated 34,000 Sudanese have sought refuge in Ethiopia. Uganda is torn by increasing political dissension and violence, and an estimated six percent of the population, about 800,000 persons, are either displaced internally or have become refugees. Similar internal strife exacerbated by drought and famine in Angola and Mozambique has led to the loss of many lives and the displacement of hundreds of thousands of people, including movement of 44,300 Mozambicans to Zimbabwe. Emergency aid from the international community has been sent to these countries.

With this situation as background, the Second International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa (ICARA II) was held in Geneva, Switzerland, July 9 through 11 this year. ICARA II resulted in a declaration and program of action calling for stronger international cooperation to avert new flows of refugees in Africa. Agreement was reached that refugee assistance must be better coordinated with host country development assistance. Except where voluntary repatriation is feasible in the near term, assistance should focus on efforts to make refugees self-reliant and to assist African asylum countries with the social and economic burdens resulting from refugee populations. African governments themselves should work toward decreasing those tensions on the continent which lead to refugee flows. The United States reaffirmed its commitment to continue to respond to the needs of African refugees and asylum countries. The United States representative emphasized the government's desire to focus on establishing a process through which long-term solutions to African refugee problems could be reached and its intention to review for future funding some of the refugee-related development projects proposed in the ICARA II technical document (128 projects in 14 African asylum countries). Although ICARA II was not a pledging conference, participants agreed that it successfully focused attention on lasting solutions and elicited significant comments from both donor and recipient nations.

In East Asia, the dimensions of the Indochinese refugee problem continue to decline, yet international resettlement remains the only currently available means of

reducing first asylum populations. UNHCR efforts to establish voluntary repatriation programs with the Indochinese governments have been successful only with the government of Laos, but relatively few refugees from Laos seek to return to their homeland. Only limited settlement in asylum countries has been possible, due to historic rivalries and antipathies. Within Eastern Europe, there has been a decrease in the political tension in Poland since 1982 and early 1983 when tens of thousands of persons sought asylum and refugee status in Western Europe. Thousands of Poles have been resettled in the United States, Western European countries, and elsewhere, and thousands of others remain temporarily in these countries. Earlier this year, a surge of about 25,000 persons left East Germany for the Federal Republic of Germany, far above the usual 1,000 per month permitted by East German authorities. In Central America, the international community is extending relief and assistance to refugees and to displaced persons within their own countries, El Salvador (450,000) and Guatemala (250,000). In the Near East, the status of Afghan refugees, estimated at 2.9 million in Pakistan and at 750,000 in Iran, remains unchanged, as does that of 2 million Palestinians scattered throughout the area. In Lebanon, civil war and political and religious differences have displaced an estimated 600,000 persons, and countless others have been affected by the violence.

Of the three methods to solve refugee situations—voluntary repatriation, local settlement in neighboring countries, and international resettlement (including resettlement in the United States)—the latter is utilized only when necessary. While the United States government works with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and other cooperating governments in trying to facilitate the first two of these approaches, it also provides resettlement opportunities in this country for refugees of special humanitarian concern as determined by the President after consultations with the Congress.

For FY 1984, a ceiling of 72,000 admissions was authorized for Indochinese, Polish, Afghan, Ethiopian, and other refugees in whom the United States had a special interest. The Department of State estimates that actual admissions will reach 71,000 persons by the end of the fiscal year. As in past years, in order to maintain an effective program of English-as-a-Second-language and Cultural Orientation courses for Indochinese refugees, a number of these refugees approved by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) in this fiscal year will enter the United States in FY 1985. New INS refugee-processing guidelines, which brought greater order and stability to the procedures, became effective on August 15, 1983. These guidelines permit the Attorney General to determine categories of persons who share common characteristics that identify them as targets for persecution in Indochina.

FISCAL YEAR 1984 OVERSEAS IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REFUGEE ACT OF 1980 AND THE MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1962

1. REFUGEE RELIEF AND ASSISTANCE

During FY 1984, the United States continued to work with international organizations and other countries to alleviate the misery and suffering of refugees throughout the world. Although the UNHCR carries the principal responsibility for providing for the care and maintenance of refugees, movements of large numbers of people often outstrip its resources, and it becomes necessary to call upon the support of the World Food Program (WFP), the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinians in the Near East (UNRWA), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration (ICM), other international organizations, and many American and foreign private voluntary agencies. Such assistance ranges from food and medical support which is provided for immediate needs to educational and agricultural services provided to promote refugee self-sufficiency. During the course of the year, major United States support was provided to international food relief programs in Central America, Pakistan, Somalia, Sudan, and Thailand, as well as to education, health, and other services for Palestinians in the Near East.[2]

Relief assistance in Africa has been a major factor in assisting those nations to continue their traditionally generous asylum and settlement policies toward refugees and persons fleeing political violence and civil strife. The principal amount of aid has been directed toward Ethiopian refugees in Somalia (400,000 persons), Sudan (400,000 persons), and Djibouti (13,500 persons). Other significant amounts are directed toward Ugandan refugees in Sudan (200,000 persons) and Rwanda (30,000 persons), and toward other groups of refugees in Tanzania (181,000 persons), and Zaire (301,800 persons). The United States contribution in FY 1984 to UNHCR for its African program is $43,000,000, and to ICRC, $6,300,000. Additional United States' contributions have been made through the Food for Peace program in Somalia. The emergency situations in Angola and Mozambique are handled by international agencies other than UNHCR which also receive contributions from the United States.

In East Asia, the first asylum countries of Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, the Philippines, and the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong continue to provide asylum to 155,300 Indochinese refugees. UNHCR, ICRC, and voluntary agencies provide care and maintenance to those refugees as well as to those refugees in Refugee Processing Centers (up to 26,000 at any one time) undergoing language training and cultural orientation, almost all of whom are destined for resettlement in the United States. Because of the relief assistance provided by the United States and other countries through the WFP and the United Nations Border Relief Operation (UNBRO), the Khmer emergency has stabilized. The emergency assistance phase of the situation within Kampuchea is over, and assistance is now being channeled through regular development agencies. Most of the displaced Khmer on the Thai-Kampuchean border, who currently number approximately 232,000 persons, receive food and medical care as well as protection. This program continues to command widespread international support. The United States provided over $12 million in 1984 for Khmer relief. The international community under the aegis of the UNHCR also funds ($2.7 million in 1983-84) the operation of a Thai government anti-piracy program to deter pirate attacks on Vietnamese boat refugees.

During 1984, UNHCR's expenditures for assistance to refugees in Latin America increased. The bulk of the program, approximately $27 million, of which the United States expects to contribute about one-third, is directed toward Central America. The total number of refugees in that region has not changed that much in the past year, except for relatively small yet significant new flows out of Nicaragua into Honduras and Costa Rica and out of Guatemala into Mexico. The UNHCR program provides assistance to most of the 118,800 Salvadoran, Nicaraguan (including Miskito Indians), and Guatemalan refugees in the area. In addition, the United States has provided other aid to an estimated 450,000 Salvadorans displaced by violence and strife within their country. The Department of State has authorized an expenditure of $7 million for this group as well as $3 million to the ICRC for its work in El Salvador. The United States Agency for International Development has initiated a three year $60 million program as well to relieve their situation. In Guatemala, an estimated 250,000 internally displaced persons are receiving relief assistance from Catholic Relief Services and the Guatemalan government.

In the Near East, the United States contributed $109 million in relief. Much of that amount was used to meet the needs of the diverse groups affected by the 1982 invasion of Lebanon. As in the past, the international community contributes major sums to UNRWA for the education, health, and relief services of 2 million Palestinian refugees under UNRWA's mandate. Eighty-eight countries, as well as the European Community, various special funds, and private organizations contributed to UNRWA's program in 1983.

In South Asia, Pakistan has been host to the world's largest refugee population, an estimated 2.9 million Afghans who have fled their homeland since the Soviet invasion in December 1979. The United States plans to contribute about $21.1 million to the ICRC and the UNHCR's 1984 budget for general care and maintenance. The WFP, in cooperation with UNHCR, is responsible for projecting the food requirements of the program and procuring commodities from donor nations to meet these needs. The United States supplied $42.5 million in food to the WFP program for Pakistan in 1982, and pledged $43 million for 1983. Additionally, 17 international voluntary agencies provide refugee relief supplies and services. During FY 1984, the United States contributed over $3 million to support voluntary agency programs and the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Pending durable solutions to the numerous refugee situations throughout the world, relief and assistance will continue to be needed to address immediate crises, and to meet long-term needs.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, September 26, 1984.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Committee on the Judiciary has now concluded its consultations with your representatives on the proposed refugee admissions for fiscal year 1985.

The Committee feels that the proposed level of refugee admissions for fiscal year 1984—70,000—reasonably reflects the existing international refugee situation, and will

[2] See Table I, "United States Contibutions to International Refugee Situations, FY 1984 and FY 1985."

still well demonstrate this nation's continuing humanitarian commitment to assist victims of persecution throughout the world. We note that of that total, not to exceed 10,000 admissions will be "earmarked" for the first time for the Orderly Departure Program from Vietnam, some of which admissions may be used to facilitate the departure of Asian-American children and those now in "re-education" camps.

The Committee commends the Administration for these new initiatives to deal with those two groups of refugees in Vietnam who are of special humanitarian concern to this country. We assume that these new Orderly Departure initiatives will contain controls sufficient to ensure that the program will meet American objectives rather than primarily those of the sending state.

We note further that the Administration also proposes to make an adjustment to permanent resident status of up to 5,000 asylees during fiscal year 1985, which action will effectively provide a total of 75,000 "slots" for permanent resettlement in the United States for those who have fled political persecution in their own homelands.

Our understanding is that as in the past, these levels represent ceilings on total admissions, not quotas, and that each case will be examined on its merits.

We trust that the Administration will be mindful of the desirability of avoiding the buildup of large backlogs of approved refugees, especially in Southeast Asia. We understand that that processing structure necessarily results in a number of refugees being "in the pipeline" at the end of a fiscal year, but we question the wisdom of intentionally approving and removing to refugee processing centers, numbers in excess of the annual ceilings. This practice has the effect of obligating admissions before they have been the subject of consultation.

These backlogs, and the pressure for additional numbers, are increased when we process in one fiscal year large numbers of refugees who are in the lowest priority category—those designated as "P-6's"—knowing there will be more refugees next year who will fall into the higher categories. This practice, which is occurring in the processing of Khmer refugees in Thailand, actually "mortgages" future resettlement numbers for refugees in high priorities and others who may have a stronger claim to America's attention.

We note finally that the Committee welcomes the opportunity to meet with Administration representatives again at mid-year to review current developments. We deeply appreciated the attendance of Secretary Shultz at the Constitution hearing.

Most sincerely,

Strom Thurmond, Chairman; Alan K. Simpson, Chairman, Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy; Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Ranking Minority Member; Edward M. Kennedy, Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, September 14, 1984.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We have completed the consultative process mandated by P.L. 96-212, the Refugee Act of 1980, with regard to refugee admissions and allocations for FY 1985 as recommended by you and transmitted to us by the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, Ambassador H. Eugene Douglas.

The proposal calls for a ceiling of 70,000 refugees to be allocated as follows: 50,000 from East Asia, of which 10,000 numbers will be used for the Orderly Departure Program from Vietnam; 3,000 from Africa; 9,000 from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union; 3,000 from Latin America and the Caribbean; and 5,000 from the Near East and South Asia.

We are pleased to advise you that we interpose no objections to the number and allocations as recommended.

We note that, as in the past, these numbers are to be considered as ceilings rather than goals. During the course of the fiscal year, should there be a need to reallocate refugee numbers between regions, we respectfully request that we be consulted prior to effectuating any shift in numbers.

This Committee would appreciate being kept advised on a monthly basis by the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs with regard to the progress of the FY 1985 refugee admissions program.

Sincerely,

Hamilton Fish, Jr., Ranking Minority Member, Committee on the Judiciary; Daniel Lungren, Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law; Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary; Romano L. Mazzoli, Chairman, Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law.

U.S. COORDINATOR FOR REFUGEE AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, October 2, 1984.

Hon. ALAN K. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am pleased to provide you with the Presidential Determination on refugee ceilings for FY 1985.

Before the President reached his decision he carefully considered Congressional views expressed during the consultation process.

Thank you for the support extended to me and to my staff. I appreciate your working closely with us in an effort to improve American refugee programs.

Sincerely,

H. EUGENE DOUGLAS,
Ambassador-at-Large.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 29, 1984.

Presidential Determination No. 85-1.

Memorandum for the Honorable H. Eugene Douglas, U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs.

Subject: FY 1985 refugee ceilings.

In accordance with the relevant statutes and after appropriate consultations with the Congress, I have determined that:

The admission of up to 70,000 refugees to the United States during FY 1985 is justified by humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest;

The 70,000 worldwide refugee admission ceiling shall be allocated among the regions of the world as follows: 3,000 for Africa; 40,000 for first asylum from East Asia and 10,000 for the East Asian Orderly Departure Program; 9,000 for Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union; 3,000 for Latin American and the Caribbean; and 5,000 for the Near East and South Asia.

An additional 5,000 refugee admissions numbers shall be made available for the adjustment to permanent residence status of aliens who have been granted asylum in the United States, as this is justified by humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest.

In accordance with provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act and after appropriate consultations with the Congress, I specify that special circumstances exist such that, for the purposes of admission under the limits established above, the following persons, if they otherwise qualify for admission, may be considered refugees of special humanitarian concern to the United States even though they are still within their countries of nationality or habitual residence:

Persons in Vietnam with past or present ties to the United States, including Amerasian children; and

Present and former political prisoners, and persons in imminent danger of loss of life and their family members, in countries of Latin America and the Caribbean.

You will inform the appropriate committees of the Congress of these determinations.

This memorandum shall be published in the Federal Register.

RONALD REAGAN.●

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

● Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is required by paragraph 4 of rule 35 that I place in the RECORD this notice of a Senate employee who proposes to participate in a program, the principal objective of which is educational, sponsored by a foreign government or a foreign educational or charitable organization involving travel to a foreign country paid for by that foreign government or organization.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Mr. Jerry M. Ray of the staff of Senator HOWELL HEFLIN to participate in a program in Taiwan, Republic of China, sponsored by the Chinese Cultural University, from November 9-15, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Ray in the program in Taiwan, at the expense of the Chinese Cultural University, to discuss United States-Taiwan relations, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Ms. Jo-Anne Coe, of the staff of Senator ROBERT DOLE, to participate in a program in the Republic of China, sponsored by the Chinese Culture University from November 9-15, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Mrs. Coe in the program in the Republic of China, to discuss United States-Taiwan relations, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Mr. T. Scott Bunton, a member of the staff of the

Democratic Policy Committee, to participate in a program in Ottawa and Montreal, Canada, sponsored by the Centre for Legislative Exchange of Ottawa, from October 14-17, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Bunton in the program in Canada, at the expense of the Centre for Legislative Exchange of Ottawa, to discuss United States-Canadian relations, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Ms. Sara Thomasson of the staff of Senator CHARLES GRASSLEY to participate in a program in Taiwan, sponsored by the Chinese Culture University from November 9-15, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Ms. Thomasson in the program in Taiwan, at the expense of the Chinese Culture University, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit A. Renee Coe, of the Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity, to participate in a conference in Canada from October 14-17, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Ms. Coe in the conference in Montreal and Ottawa, Canada, at the expense of the Centre for Legislative Exchange of Ottawa, to discuss United States-Canadian relations, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35, which would permit Mr. Ian Butterfield, of the staff of Senator WILLIAM ROTH, to attend the Hal Rosenthal Memorial Seminar in Israel, November 11-21, 1984, sponsored by Project Interchange.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Butterfield in the seminar in Israel, at the invitation of the Leonard Davis Institute for International Relations of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, at the expense of Project Interchange, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Mrs. Mary McGuire of the staff of Senator FRANK MURKOWSKI and Mr. Neal J. Houston of the staff of Senator ROBERT STAFFORD, to participate in a program in the Republic of China, sponsored by the Chinese Culture University, from November 9-15, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Mrs. McGuire and Mr. Houston in the program in the Republic of China at the expense of the Chinese Culture University, to discuss United States-Taiwan relations, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Ms. Polly L. Gault, staff director of the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities, to participate in a program in Bonn-Berlin, West Germany, sponsored by the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung Foundation from November 10-17, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Ms. Gault in the program in West Germany, to attend briefings on the German Government, at the expense of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung Foundation, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Mr. Jim Gould of the staff of Senator LLOYD BENTSEN, to participate in a program in the Republic of China, Taiwan, from November 9-15, 1984, sponsored by the Chinese Culture University.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Gould in the program in Taiwan, at the expense of the Chinese Culture University, to discuss United States-Taiwan relations, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.●

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF MISSISSIPPI FOR 1984

● Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it has been my practice over the years to make a special report to the people of the State of Mississippi at the end of each session. The purpose of this report is to discuss the important issues considered by the Congress and to give an account of my position on these issues. Additionally, I report to my fellow Mississippians on those matters which may be of special interest to them.

First, I express my deepest appreciation to the people of my State for their continued trust and confidence. This 2d session of the 98th Congress was my second year of a seventh term as their Senator. Over these 37 years I have reaped from these generous people a bountiful harvest of wisdom, advice, encouragement, assistance, support, and friendship to build a special reserve that I hope will continue to repay Mississippians.

I am pleased to work with the entire Mississippi congressional delegation. I am honored to serve with this outstanding delegation and appreciate very much the cooperation and assistance they have rendered over the years.

My office staff and the staffs of the committees on which I am honored to serve have been a great source of strength to me. I deeply appreciate their hard work and effective performance. Their skills and diligence, coupled with their loyalty and generous personal support made a special difference to me as I pursued the legislative tasks of this year.

I also express a special thanks to the staff members associated with this body. Their courtesies and support shown to me and my staff have always been outstanding.

A special appreciation goes to my fellow Senators and our leaders. Their counsel, wisdom, courtesies, and leadership have been a great help to me. As I said previously in the closing days of this Senate session, we have been blessed with two good leaders at the same time. Senator BAKER, from Tennessee, the majority leader, and Senator BYRD, our Democratic leader from West Virginia have added great strength to this body. They are two bright, shining lights of achievement, stability, and judgment required for the leadership demanded by their positions. The people of the United States are indeed blessed.

I am especially sorry that Senator BAKER will be leaving us. He has meant much to the country and this institution. He is highly capable. As I have told him and have said publicly on other occasions, I believe he is capable of holding any office of the United States that is within the gift of the people.

As I look back at the year 1984, I was of course not satisfied with all that was accomplished. This was especially true in the area of the budget. Despite the constant attention paid to economic and fiscal problems, it seems that a balanced budget today is as far off as it was 4 years ago.

It greatly concerns me that the Government is so deeply in debt and year after year annual Federal deficits have piled up even more debt. It is a serious situation which I believe threatens our system of government. No person, no household, no business, no government can continue to spend more money than it takes in. The priority purpose of the next Government formed by the 1984 elections should be to put forth and agree to a plan for achieving a balanced budget. The time to agree to this plan is early in the session before the Congress is distracted by other matters of importance. There will not be a better time than the coming year.

When the Congress reconvenes it will be working on the 1986 budget year which starts October 1 of 1985. 1985 will be the third year of the current economic growth period. In the opinion of most financial experts, that current growth cannot continue if Government deficit spending and borrowing continues at a high level.

Achieving a balanced budget will not be easy. The Government budget is huge and complex. It provides for many programs and services which affect most of us. Balancing the

budget will mean giving up a portion of these programs and services. Balancing the budget may also require increasing revenues and, of course, when taxes are increased the question of fairness will be raised. But, as difficult as it may be, we must pull together as a government and as a nation to put our country on a sound fiscal course. The alternative would be to suffer even greater economic consequences.

On the bright side, I believe we have to look at the coming year as a window of opportunity. Inflation is down. Employment is up and the economy is growing again. The election is over and it is my hope that the newly elected President will lead the way in this effort. It is vitally important to our national security.

I will elaborate on the seriousness of this situation both from a fiscal policy standpoint and a legislative procedures standpoint in this report on 1984. I am hopeful that the history of the current Government's failure to produce a plan for achieving a balanced budget will be instructive and provide direction for the future.

APPROPRIATIONS BILLS AND BUDGET PROCEDURES

I am proud to serve as the ranking Democratic member of the Appropriations Committee and honored to have the privilege of joining the outstanding Senators who serve on this committee under the leadership of Chairman MARK HATFIELD, the distinguished Senator from Oregon. Chairman HATFIELD and I have served together for many years on this committee, and I hold him in the highest regard as a public servant, a Senator and a great patriot.

The committee's work was frustrated by a stalemate over this year's budget. It was not until the last days of the Congress on October 1 that the fiscal year 1985 budget resolution was adopted. Months of debate over the positions taken by the White House on the level of Defense spending and the size of the deficit delayed this resolution from May 15, the schedule required by law, to October 1. For a period there were many who thought that the Congress would not be able to pass a budget resolution and would violate the legal requirement set forth in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Fortunately, Senator CHILES, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, using a procedure made possible by the Congressional Budget Act, objected to proceeding any further on appropriations bills until a budget resolution was adopted. Through his act the Congress was compelled to carry out its responsibilities. Although I regretted the delay and the consequent failures to act on the regular appropriated bills, I was happy that the Congress was able to preserve its budget discipline.

Because of these delays, by October 1, the start of fiscal year 1985, Congress had passed only four of its 13 regular appropriations bills: Commerce, State, Justice; judiciary; energy and water development; housing and urban development; and legislative branch. The House passed 10 of its regular appropriations measures: the Senate, 8.

In the final days before adjournment, the Congress passed a $467 billion continuing resolution that will run the Government until September 30, 1985, the end of the fiscal year.

The bill contains funds for the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Interior, Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, Transportation, Treasury, Postal Service and funds for foreign and military construction.

The bill also contains as an amendment a major revision of the criminal code which the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator THURMOND, said was the most significant crime bill since the 1968 Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act.

Altogether the appropriations bills passed by the Congress this year were $17.2 billion less than requested by the President. This continues the good record of the committee on holding the line on spending, but it is increasingly clear that there is an urgent need for the President and the Congress to pull together in an effort to bring spending and taxes more in line.

I was not happy that the appropriations measures were lumped together in this fashion. It lacks order and discipline. The experience of the past 4 years has moved me to think that the committee system and the legislative procedures, especially in the area of the budget, need to be revised to preclude last minute consideration of the main body of Government financing along with signficant changes in substantive law, such as the crime bill.

THE 1985 BUDGET

Following a pattern established in his first budget, President Reagan's original budget for fiscal year 1985 forwarded to Congress in February 1984 proposed spending restraint in most areas of Government except Defense. The budget totals also showed large deficits for fiscal year 1985—$180 billion—and following years. More recent estimates—August 1984—have lowered the expected 1985 deficit to $167 billion—Office of Management and Budget—or $178 billion—Congressional Budget Office.

In the initial budget, the President included $27.2 billion of spending and tax proposals that would have reduced the deficit projected under current law from $207.6 billion in 1985 to the President's budgeted deficit of $180.4 billion.

The President's budget request emphasized that the gap between spending and receipts had become too large. The President warned in February that growth would not cause these large annual Federal Government deficits to go away.

The President's fiscal year 1985 budget stated:

> Budget projections on a current services basis—that is, assuming no further policy actions to curb spending growth or increase receipts—indicate that deficits will remain near the $200 billion level even after the economy has returned to lower levels of the unemployment rate, below 6% in 1989. At that time economic recovery will have completed its contribution to deficit reduction. Attempts to achieve still lower levels of unemployment by monetary stimulus would be likely to lead to a reacceleration of inflation and an end to sustainable economic recovery, so projected deficits at this level of unemployment are not 'cyclical' or temporary. They are permanent or structural and will persist unless determined policy actions are taken to eliminate them.

The financial and economic community agreed with the administration's view that if no actions were taken to reduce these huge projected deficits that they would pose serious economic problems. It was generally agreed that if the deficits were financed by money creation, they would cause inflation to move to higher levels and bring about the inefficiencies, misdirection of resources, and the instability that led to the stagnant growth and recession of the previous decade.

Additionally, it was agreed that credit demands of the Federal Government would crowd out private investment and inhibit growth by hurting the homebuyers, farmers, and businesses which depend on credit by generating excessively high interest rates. Also, excessive Federal borrowing would add to the Nation's trade deficit and causes problems for U.S. exporters and for domestic industries that must compete with imports.

Both the House and the Senate responded to the President's budget with calls for greater deficit reduction. After a period of hearings on the budget, Senate Republican leaders and the President agreed in March to a larger deficit reduction plan than envisioned in the original budget. This so-called Rose Garden budget proposed revenue increases of $50 billion and spending reductions of $100 billion over 3 years. But, even though the President proposed substantially more deficit reductions in the Rose Garden plan in March than in his initial February budget, the still enormous size of the deficits and the lack of a plan to balance the budget provoked a higher controversial budget debate.

In the spring, the budget debate focused on the urgency of bringing the budget under control. Several attempts were made to bring discipline to the process. During the debate I offered along with my colleague from South Carolina, Senator HOLLINGS, former chairman of the Senate Budget

Committee, an amendment to the first budget resolution which would have virtually balanced the budget by 1989. This plan called for an across-the-board sharing of the burden of balancing the budget. This concept of shared sacrifice and early deficit reduction—nearly $40 billion in 1985—made it a do-able and realistic alternative for dealing with this deficit.

This amendment failed by a narrow margin but I believe the logic and fairness of an across-the-board approach is gaining in popularity.

Regrettable, a plan for balancing the budget was not achieved this year. After months of debate and negotiations between the White House and congressional leaders, Congress achieved a compromise budget resolution that called for less of a reduction in the deficit than I felt was necessary. The budget resolution provides insufficient relief from the staggering deficits that threaten the Nation's economic future. Election year politics seemed to stand in the way of reaching a solution.

But, in recognition of my belief that it will take bipartisanship to break the pattern established by a breakdown in leadership and discipline, I offered a proposal to establish a Bipartisan Commission on the Deficit whose objectives would be to submit to the President not later than January 10, 1985, a budget plan for fiscal years 1985 through 1990 that would result in a balanced Federal budget not later than fiscal year 1990.

It is my belief that a consensus exists in the Nation and in the Congress for balancing the budget as soon as possible. It will not be easy, but it must be done. It is a fundamental truth that no national government can continue to live off of credit year after year, without eventually destroying its economy. The serious damage which can result from the growing deficit and the growing burden of interest payments which must be paid on money borrowed by the government is widely recognized. It is up to the elected leadership to act. Clearly, we must work together as a nation to tackle this problem. It is too serious for partisan politics. It will require leadership and careful and thoughtful consideration of the economic situation. Most of all, it will require discipline and a willingness to share in the effort required to put the Nation's fiscal affairs in order.

HISTORY OF 1984 ACTIONS ON THE DEFICIT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985–87

[In billions of dollars]

	1985	1986	1987
President's February budget	180	177	181
"Rose garden" plan in March	181	185	204
Stennis-Hollings plan	158	129	104
Compromise 1st budget resolution	181	193	207

GROWTH IN THE NATIONAL DEBT

Large annual deficits, especially in recent years, have caused the Federal debt to grow very rapidly. For example, under current law, the debt is projected to increase from $1.5 trillion in 1984 to $3.1 trillion in 1989—more than doubling in 5 years. The rapidity of growth in the debt in recent years is alarming. By way of illustration, since I have been a Member of the Senate from 1947 through 1981, which includes the administrations of Presidents Truman through Carter, $477 billion was added to the Nation's debt. In the past four annual budgets, $655 billion was added to the Nation's debt. As of the last day of the 98th Congress, the Nation's borrowing authority was raised to $1.8 trillion from the current limit of nearly $1.6 trillion.

UPDATED CBO BASELINE BUDGET PROJECTIONS OF DEBT SUBJECT TO STATUTORY LIMIT AUGUST 1984

[By fiscal year; in billions of dollars]

	1983 actual	1983 base	Projections				
			1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
Revenues	601	673	751	811	881	965	1,042
Outlays	796	845	929	1,006	1,097	1,203	1,305
Unified budget deficit	195	172	178	195	216	238	263
Debt subjected to statutory limit	1,378	1,572	1,818	2,095	2,402	2,754	3,140

GROWING BURDEN OF PAYING INTEREST ON THE NATIONAL DEBT

We are living beyond our means by borrowing against the future. The Government is borrowing the Nation's savings and the savings of foreign investors at the highest level in the Nation's history. This policy is robbing future generations of the ability to grow.

It is a policy which will sap the strength of the economy—the Nation's strength in productivity will be weakened. It is a policy of bankruptcy. It is a policy of high risk with grave economic and social consequences.

We're in a deep hole of Federal debt. The severity of our position is obvious on the face of it. For example, the tax increase and spending cut which the President signed into law in July of this year will not mean lower Federal budget deficits in the coming years because the savings achieved in this legislation will be eaten up by rising interest costs. The Deficit Reduction Act of 1984, which was finally agreed to after months of difficult bargaining, is the so-called down payment on moving the budget back toward balance. It will boost Federal taxes $10.6 billion in 1985, and $16.9 billion in 1986 while cutting spending about $4 billion each year.

But this year the Government will borrow about $175 billion—more than $1 out of every $5 that it spends, and its net interest bill will reach about $110 billion. If interest rates climb, the $110 billion forecast for each year could easily jump by $25 billion in 1985 and $35 billion in 1986.

The rise in interest payments, which must be paid, will be about as big as the increase in defense spending in 1985. The increase in interest cost alone will be as big as the total combined costs of Federal welfare payments to the elderly, and to families with dependent children, and all housing assistance programs.

The debt and interest payments on the debt are rising faster than the economy. Each year the Government has to borrow still more to pay the interest due on the money borrowed to pay interest the previous year. This is the budget equivalent of compound interest.

According to the latest projections of the Congressional Budget Office, the net interest budget category will more than double in 5 years, increasing from $111 billion in 1984 to $214 billion in 1989, an increase of 93 percent.

Congressional Budget Office, projections for net interest payments, August 1984

Net interest:	
1983 actual	90
1984	111
1985	134
1986	150
1987	169
1988	194
1989	214

This is a highly unstable situation. Higher interest rates, combined with the costs of refinancing a huge national debt have created a condition where interest payments on the debt is the fastest growing category of Government spending. The deficit is being driven by the deficit.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATION BILLS

I have served on the Armed Services Committee since 1951, including 12 years as chairman. Although I relinquished the chairmanship in 1981, my interest and participation in the committee's activities have in no way diminished. I have an excellent relationship with the current chairman, Senator TOWER, and the ranking minority member, Senator NUNN.

I have served on the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee since 1955 and am the ranking minority member of both this subcommittee and the committee as a whole. As a result of my assignment on these two committees, I play a unique role in the Senate as I am the only Senator who serves on both committees. I participate in the development of the basic defense plans and programs, as well as assure the appropriation of sufficient funds to execute these programs.

DEFENSE BUDGET AND DEFENSE SPENDING

This year, the President proposed substantial increases in spending for national defense as part of a $1.9 trillion 5-year program. Initially, the

President requested congressional approval of $313.8 billion for national defense in 1985. Later, as part of the so-called Rose Garden Agreement, the President lowered his request to $298.4 billion. Ultimately, the Congress approved $292.5 billion for 1985, a reduction of $21.3 billion from the original request, but an increase of $27.2 billion over the funding provided by Congress in 1984.

These increases continue to be necessary to fully meet our national security requirements, but we must continue to find ways to get more real military muscle out of the defense dollar.

In the past, we have been troubled by massive increases in the costs of major weapons systems. However, the problem seems to have abated and the costs of most major weapons systems have been restrained this year. We do have considerable evidence of major problems in the purchase of spare parts for military equipment—reports about grossly excessive prices for items such as bolts and wrenches trouble me.

I have always been for a frugal, make-do, practical approach to military programs. Now, more than ever, there must be frugality. We must continue to search out and slice away at waste, extravagance, and fraud so that our military forces are lean, trim, and ready to perform its fighting mission.

Frugality is essential for another reason—the public support of the military and the military budget will quickly evaporate if our military purchasing managers do not show real improvement in how they buy spare parts. Without a clear demonstration of frugality in our defense spending, there will be a great and justifiable pressure to restrain the defense budget.

STRATEGIC ARMS PROGRAMS

A major focal point of the debate over this year's defense budget was the decision to continue production of the MX missile. I have been a supporter of the MX missile deployment. It has been an important demonstration of our military resolve to the Soviets and it may thus contribute to efforts to control the growth of nuclear arms.

The Congress has chosen to defer the final decision on 1985 funds for production of additional MX missiles until next spring. At that time, we will be able to review our military needs as well as progress achieved on arms control. I firmly believe that it is vital for the United States to continue efforts to limit all nuclear arms. Recent statements by Soviet leaders create some hope that fruitful arms control talks might begin within the next year. Hopefully, these talks might lead to an equitable and verifiable treaty controlling and reducing the level of strategic nuclear weapons.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE

The growing importance and the growing performance of our National Guard and Reserve Forces is one of the very bright things in the present picture with reference to our military preparedness and our Armed Forces. I have been among the men and women who constitute these National Guard and Reserve units, and I find that many have had seasoned military training in the regular service. They are leaders in their communities, supporters of the schools, the churches, the civic organizations, and all the activities that make up the American way of life. They have some affinity with military life and military training because they stay with it year after year and show a fine performance.

These are not merely words. The record shows that many of these units outperform the regulars in corresponding types of military units. That is not just in easy maneuvers but also with respect to the complicated assignments.

The Guard and Reserve have not received their full share of the large increases in the Defense budget. They have not had too fine recognition from the regular services, and that is not any criticism of the regular services. They, naturally, put most of the money into their needs. But Congress is now allotting more money each year for modern equipment.

As I have stated over and over again, our Guard and Reserve Forces deserve field units with equipment that still has the factory paint on it, rather than something that is worn out and almost ready to be thrown away. Instead, the weakest link in assuring that our Guard and Reserves are fully combat ready has been the obsolescence, compatability, and shortages of equipment. I have advocated for a number of years that a long-term plan and additional funds are required to assure that essential equipment is provided to our Guard and Reserve Forces. This is the only way that our total force requirements can be met in these claims of constrained fiscal resources.

In fiscal year 1982, I proposed a $400 million long-term plan to assure that essential equipment was provided to the Army National Guard. This amendment included a requirement for an annual report by the Secretary of Defense on the equipment needs of the Guard and Reserve, which has been a good start in insuring that the equipment needs of the Guard and Reserve receive adequate consideration. This amendment also included $50 million as a down-payment for equipment needs as identified by the Guard leaders.

In fiscal year 1983, the scope of this plan was expanded from $400 million to $2.6 billion to include all the Reserve components. Congress appropriated $125 million that year to begin equipping the higher priority units of the Guard and Reserve.

In fiscal year 1984, $125 million was approved by Congress for the equipment needs of the Guard and Reserve—$100 million for the Army National Guard and $25 million for the Air National Guard. In addition, I offered an amendment, which was adopted, increasing the end strength of the Army National Guard by 3,000 above the administration request.

This year, fiscal year 1985, the defense bill includes $380 million to upgrade equipment for National Guard and Reserve Forces, a continuation of the "Stennis Plan".

With the money the Guard and Reserve have received, they are able to begin supplying new equipment to the good people in the goods units in the field. The equipment they have purchased includes Air Guard long-haul communications equipment, radios, trucks, and air defense equipment—brand new, top-of-the-line equipment for these deserving and dedicated soldiers.

NAVY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM

The fiscal year 1985 Navy Shipbuilding Program contains several projects of interest to me. First, the bill continues the CG-47 AEGIS guided missile cruiser program. There is over $2.9 billion for procurement of three more CG-47's in this year's defense bill. The Navy plans to build 27 of these cruisers to be the backbone of the surface combatant fleet and its air defense capability. Thus far, 15 of these CG-47 cruisers are under contract and Ingalls Shipbuilding of Pascagoula is to construct 13. Ingalls built the first ship of this class, the U.S.S. *Ticonderoga*, which was commissioned in January 1983.

The bill also provides approximately $1 billion for procurement of the lead ship of the DDG-51 Arleigh Burke class guided missile destroyer. This new destroyer is being built to replace existing guided missile destroyers which are to be retired beginning in the late 1980's. The contract for this lead ship is to be awarded in 1985 and Ingalls Shipbuilding anticipates being the lead shipyard in this competition.

Another ship being funded in this year's Navy budget is the new class of amphibious assault ships, the LHD-1. The first LHD-1 was fully funded in last year's budget, with the contract being awarded to Ingalls. This year, $39.2 million was included for advance procurement of the second ship and again, Ingalls is expected to be the top bidder on this ship. The LHD-1 is similar to another class ship which Ingalls helped design and construct.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION IN MISSISSIPPI

This year, the Senate and House Appropriations Committees agreed to a total figure for military construction

of $8.4 billion. Of this amount, over $69 million was approved for more than 25 projects at military installations throughout the State of Mississippi. Major projects include $7.8 million at A.C. Thompson Field in Jackson for a ramp expansion and fuel system modification to accommodate delivery of eight C-141 aircraft for the strategic airlift mission of the Air National Guard and $8.1 million for a major rehabilitation/winterization project at Camp Shelby in Hattiesburg.

Also included are 10 projects, totalling over $21 million, for the Naval Construction Battalion Center in Gulfport. The Navy plans to increase its number of active duty naval mobile construction battalions—or Seabee battalions—above the eight it presently has. This year's budget includes money for 9th active duty Seabee battalion, which is to be homeported in Gulfport. This will bring the total number of Seabee battalions homeported there to five. Some of these military construction projects funded are in direct support of this plan. As many of you know, the Seabees have provided essential facilities to support all branches of our military services in combat operations, while in peacetime, Seabee battalions are deployed around the world training and developing their construction skills while building facilities at U.S. bases overseas.

The military installations in Mississippi for which money was appropriated for fiscal year 1985 are as follows. Those projects marked with an asterisk denote ones which I was instrumental in adding to the bill:

Fiscal year 1985 military construction—Mississippi

Navy:	
Naval Oceanographic Office, Bay St. Louis:	
Data processing center addition	$1,570,000
Naval Oceanographic Command, Bay St. Louis: Administrative office	375,000
Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport:	
Seabee military training building	1,860,000
Gymnasium	1,740,000
Elevated portable water storage tank	810,000
Seabee regimental headquarters	2,590,000
Seabee battalion headquarters	2,800,000
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,650,000
War reserves warehouse	4,460,000
Enlisted dining facility addition	1,580,000
Medical clinic addition	325,000
Pay and personnel support office	1,030,000
Meridian Naval Air Station:	
Aircraft operations building addition	[1] 1,150,000
New service roads to runway ends	[1] 750,000
Arm/dearm pads	[1] 1,300,000
Air Force:	
Keesler Air Force Base:	
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	9,500,000
Multipurpose aircraft maintenance shop	3,100,000
Air condition composite medical facility kitchen	435,000
Energy conservation investment program—insulate buildings/alter mechanical	520,000
Alter electrical distribution system, phase III, part II	[1] 3,000,000
Columbus Air Force Base: Aircraft maintenance dock	[1] 5,000,000
Army National Guard:	
Camp Shelby:	
Land acquisition—phase III	941,000
Major rehabilitation	[1] 8,113,000
Air National Guard:	
Jackson (A.C. Thompson Field):	
Combined squadron operations/dining hall	2,400,000
Ramp expansion/fuel system modification	[1] 7,800,000
Gulfport: Munitions maintenance and storage facility	900,000
Total	68,699,000

[1] Denotes add-on.

THE ECONOMY AND SUSTAINING ECONOMIC PROGRESS

The close of this legislative year will end a second full year of growth in the national economy. These 2 years of growth were a welcome relief from the terrible suffering that occurred during the previous 2 years. Unemployment has improved from the disastrously high levels reached when the recession hit bottom in December 1982 with 11.9 million people unemployed. Currently, 8.5 million are out of work, a rate of about 7.5 percent. This is still too high and makes achieving sustained growth in the economy even more urgent.

I believe sustained growth can and must be achieved. Conditions in the economy make this a real possibility. The progress made in wage and price inflation is the basis for optimism. Prices of goods and services have slowed to a 4- to 5-percent rate from the very high level of 13.5 percent that was reached after the oil price shock of 1979 that doubled oil prices almost overnight and sent the prices soaring. While interruption of oil could occur because of some unexpected event, it is my belief that the U.S. economy has become more energy conscious and we now have, in place, programs in energy conservation and in developing energy alternatives to oil which could lessen the impact of an unexpected curtailment of oil. There seems to be sufficient supplies of oil to keep downward pressure on prices and makes the possibility of an arbitrary price hike by oil exporting nations unlikely.

The current price inflation environment was gained by paying a high price in unemployment. It did not come easily and should not be lost because of poor economic policies. In this regard, it is generally agreed by the financial and economic community that the main obstacles to sustained economic growth are unprecedented Federal budget and trade deficits. These twin deficits pose a clear danger to U.S. growth and stability. I have consulted with many financial and economic experts during the turmoil of the past decade, including the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, whose advice I value very highly, and I am advised that unless we close these gaps we risk losing all that has been gained, and we would jeopardize our future as a dominant economic nation. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve sounded the warning this year when he warned that we could become the world's largest debtor nation in the next year or two. Mr. Volcker's warning was so clearly made that it bears repeating in this report. He said in a statement to the Congress this year:

> What we have not done this past year is face up to other hazards to our prosperity and to our stability, hazards that are new to our actual experience but which have been long identified. I am referring, of course, to our twin deficits: the structural deficit in our Federal budget and the deficit in our external accounts, both at unprecedented levels and getting worse. Both of these deficits carry implications for the prospects of reducing our still historically high levels of interest rates.
>
> So far, the strains have been masked by other factors of strength and by the rapidity of growth from the depths of recession. But with the passage of time and with full recovery, the predictable effects have become more obvious. They pose a clear and present danger to the sustainability of growth and the stability of markets, domestic and international. We still have time to act—but in my judgment, not much time.

The failure to act on these problems is underscored by high interest rates. It is my deep belief that high Federal budget deficits, coupled with the failure to propose a plan for achieving a balanced budget are important factors in the persistence of historically high levels of interest rates. The needed investment in the economy to meet the needs of our future, for jobs, to keep our goods and services competitive with growing international competition, will continue to be retarded. Therefore, while there is still time, I believe economic policies must focus on investing wisely, putting more into those investments which will improve the economy by improving productivity and strengthening our future generations.

I intend to continue to give special emphasis to those areas of Government investments which contribute to these objectives, with special attention to those areas that affect Mississippi.

The recession hit Mississippi hard, and the recovery has been slow in coming. Many of our industries in textiles, needleworking, shoemaking, and agriculture have been especially slow in coming. International competition has made recovery in these and other industries in the State especially hard.

The trade value of the dollar has made U.S. goods more expensive to overseas buyers and made foreign goods cheaper in this country. The high value of the dollar, which is related in large measure to high interest rates, is having a serious depressing effect on the Mississippi economy.

There are bright spots. New industries are being developed and new opportunities are being created. It is clear that Mississippi and other States in the Southeast must redouble their efforts to diversify their economies and make full use of their natural resources. As I have said for many years, in our region we have advantages. We have hard working people, a good climate, plenty of water, and excellent transportation access to the United States and to international trade.

In the following status reports on education, agriculture, forestry, water resources, industrial development bonds, the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, parks and recreation, and the new Mississippi Institute of Technology, the opportunities and challenges for Mississippi's economic development are discussed further.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS

On June 27, 1984, the Congress enacted legislation to restrict the growth and uses of private-purpose, tax-exempt bonds, often called industrial development bonds, or IDB's. This bill, signed into law on July 18, 1984, as the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984, Public Law 98-369, provides for a volume cap of $150 per capita or $200 million in each State's annual issuance of IDB's; terminates the authority of the State and local governments to issue bonds after 1987; and requires that not more than $40 million in IDB financing be outstanding for each beneficiary of the small issue bonds. The bill also prohibits the use of IDB's to finance businesses that were of questionable public purpose, such as gambling establishments, liquor stores, and massage parlors.

I agree that there were abuses by some in the use of these bonds, and I fully support those changes in the law to prohibit using these bonds for spurious and questionable projects. However, I believe these bonds have served Mississippi well and I opposed the volume ceiling imposed on the use of these financing instruments. Our State records show that the Federal Treasury received a net gain from the State of Mississippi by the use of these bonds. Mississippi's Research and Development Center in Jackson estimates that by use of these bonds 31,000 primary jobs were created from 1976 through 1983.

During consideration of this bill in the Senate, I successfully offered an amendment that would have removed the volume caps and extended the expiration date of the authority to use these bonds. However, this amendment was not fully agreed to in conference. The expiration date was extended but the restrictive volume caps remained. It is my belief that the value of these bonds as an economic development tool became more apparent to the administration and the Congress and we will successfully repeal the volume restrictions on these bonds.

WATER RESOURCES

It has been 8 years since Congress enacted any major water resources development legislation, and the need for such legislation has grown more pressing each year. There are many serious flooding problems in Mississippi that need correction, and project plans have been developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to correct these problems, but regrettably the Congress and the administration have not been able to agree on authorizing legislation.

The failure of the administration to agree to legislation stems mainly from the Congress being unwilling to accept the administration's proposals for greater sharing of the cost of construction than current policy requires. There was also strong disagreement between the administration and the Congress over increasing user's fees above those already imposed on barge operators to cover the costs of modernizing the waterways and over new revenues to dredge ports and harbors.

Omnibus water bills were reported by both the House and the Senate. These bills contained flood damage prevention projects for the Pearl River Basin and the Sowashee Creek. They also contained projects to improve the harbors at Gulfport, Vicksburg, and Greenville.

In the last days of the Congress, the House bill was attached to a stopgap spending measure, but unfortunately support was not strong enough to sustain these authorizations.

These projects are extremely important to Mississippi and will be given top priority when a new Congress reconvenes. Fortunately, we have been able to start work on the Sowashee Creek and Pearl River flood problems by appropriation of emergency funds. However, to solve these problems, and to start on harbor development, permanent comprehensive water resources projects should be authorized by congressional legislation.

TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE—AN OPPORTUNITY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The 234-mile long Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is scheduled for opening to through barge traffic early next year. The opening will connect the Gulf of Mexico to 16,000 miles of inland waterways and provide a new route from the Gulf to the interior of the United States. Shipping traffic from points on the Ohio and Tennessee Rivers to Mobile, AL, is scheduled to commence on February 1, 1985, and the official dedication ceremony is planned for June 1, 1985, with major ceremonies at Columbus, MS. It will be a great day and a great year for this project, which has been under construction by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers since 1972.

The industrial and recreational development potential along this waterway is very great. Development won't come overnight, but with the continued interest of the citizens in the communities all along the waterway, a real positive gain can be realized from its opening.

I will concentrate on helping Mississippi realize the industrial and recreational benefits along the waterway.

AGRICULTURE

Since early 1980, American farmers have been waiting for "next year." Since that time, high interest rates, high production costs, low prices for products, declining land values, and strained foreign markets have placed great economic stress on the entire agriculture industry.

In 1981, Congress passed a new farm bill that was to turn things around and make it possible for farmers to once again make a profit from farming, but it did not work. In 1983, the Payment-in-Kind Program was put into effect, not necessarily to insure a profit, but to make sure that good farmers were able to keep farming; but it did not work. Many good farmers have already lost or are on the verge of losing their lifelong livelihood.

Through the Appropriations Committee this year, I have joined with several of my colleagues in an attempt to provide the means for enabling at least some farmers to hold on until we can pass another farm bill in 1985 that will put us back on the right course.

On September 13, I joined with 14 other Democratic farm-State Senators in a letter to the President asking him to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to use his existing authority to provide credit assistance to our Nation's hard-pressed farmers. Under that authority the Farmers Home Administration could lower the interest rates for farm loans made through its major loan programs, provide loan guarantees to commercial and cooperative lenders, restructure existing debt, carry out a policy of forbearance, and work with local farm credit and management ex-

perts to resolve individual credit problems.

On September 18, the President accommodated our request and announced a new policy on agriculture credit similar to that requested by my colleagues and me. A few weeks later Congress passed and the President signed a bill which provided additional funds for fiscal year 1985 to carry out this farm credit policy.

Congress has already begun the earliest negotiations on a new farm bill, which should be passed before we adjourn next year's session. As the new year develops, so will these negotiations, which will involve not only Congress and the administration, but also farm and citizen groups from all across the country. It is my intention that Mississippi's interests will be especially well heard and considered.

FORESTRY

Mississippi has always been a leader in the forest products industry due to this great natural resource that is so abundant within our borders. This year that leadership was especially evident as Congress approved an appropriation allotting $1 million to the School of Forestry at Mississippi State University for a new program of research in wood utilization. It is anticipated that additional grants will be added to this to allow the school to focus on improved technology necessary to develop new products and new markets, both foreign and domestic.

This program is designed to help with a problem in the forest products industry which has already caused a great economic hardship on the part of that industry in the Pacific Northwest, and which signs show, may be just around the corner for the southern pine region of the Southeast. Currently, U.S. lumber and plywood mills produce more wood products than the total domestic demand requires. Nevertheless, we are a net importer of wood products. Our biggest competitor, Canada, now holds an estimated 40 to 50 percent of the U.S. domestic market.

We must become more competitive in the domestic and foreign markets and the research conducted at Mississippi State should help in this area.

Throughout my service in the Senate, I have enjoyed my role as a strong advocate of forestry programs. I am happy that I have been able to have a part in the development of new research programs through the years aimed at increasing our capabilities in the forest industry. Several of those programs, such as the McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Program, still continue; and, this year we provided a modest increase in their funding.

We were also able to increase funding for State and private forestry initiatives as well as the important Forestry Incentives Program, which I was fortunate to have had a part in starting years ago. Through this program, seedlings are made available to private tree farmers along with assistance in how to plant and nurture them. I am proud that the State of Mississippi has a sister program to this Federal program, which is providing extra assistance in building this great economic resource.

PARKS AND RECREATION

With an additional appropriation of $22.5 million for new construction in fiscal year 1985, Mississippi's premier park, the Natchez Trace Parkway, took another step toward completion.

Forty-seven years ago the National Park Service began construction on the Natchez Trace Parkway. Since that time, over $227 million has been appropriated for continued construction on this important national roadway. This money has provided for construction of 402 miles of the 449-mile parkway. Of that amount, all but 33 miles have been completed to date. I expect that Congress will appropriate the money for the remaining 47 miles within the next few years.

In addition to appropriating money for the Natchez Trace Parkway and general appropriations for other Mississippi parks, Congress passed important legislation this year establishing wilderness areas in two of our national forests. With the passage of the Mississippi wilderness bill, two areas in south Mississippi, totaling 5,440 acres, will receive wilderness designation. This means that these parts of our Nation's forests will remain in the condition in which mankind found them, both as a comparison to where we have developed, and as a refuge for those who want to temporarity get away from civilization.

Both of these areas are in the DeSoto National Forest. The largest—4,500 acres—is located in Perry County and includes 5 miles of Black Creek, which is being studied by the Forest Service for possible designation under the National Wild and Scenic River System, and Beaverdam Creek.

The other area is located in the Greene County and consists of 940 acres of creeks, sloughs, bluffs, and lakes with a great variety of bottomland and hardwood and pine timber.

EDUCATION

For the past 2 years there has been a great deal of emphasis on education in Mississippi and nationwide. At home, of course, the Education Reform Act was passed which put Mississippi in the national limelight for efforts to improve her education capabilities.

Nationally, much of the emphasis have been on the need to improve education in the field of high technology. I was in the Senate in 1957 when the Soviets launched the Sputnik, which set off a cry about our shortfall in math and science education. We responded with the National Defense Education Act which provided support in these important areas. Soon, America was clearly back in the forefront worldwide as the country with the most expertise in math and science.

For the past few years, a number of studies have set off another cry about our shortfall in education. While the studies point out the need for improvement in almost every aspect of our education system, the greatest need seems to be again in math, science, engineering, and other high technology areas.

Early last year I saw this great need and introduced legislation which would establish a partnership program between Federal Government, State and local governments, private business, and educational institutions. This would bring everyone into the business of insuring that our future is secured by proper education for our children now. Federal funds would be matched by contributions from these other sources to provide teacher training, curriculum improvements, and other innovative teaching programs, and for the purchase of much needed equipment for teaching in high technology fields.

I was joined by several other Senators and Congressmen who also introduced legislation calling for improvements in math and science education. This summer the Congress passed a comprehensive math and science education bill which incorporated my legislation, along with other programs to be operated by the Department of Education and the National Science Foundation.

In addition to our work on math and science legislation this year, we were successful in passing legislation to reauthorize several Federal education programs. One of the more notable is the Vocational Education Program. This Federal program is used to the maximum in Mississippi and I am proud that our State is recognized as one of the national leaders in this field.

MISSISSIPPI INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

Mississippi universities have developed expertise in several highly technological fields of research and study. I have been fortunate to have seen this expertise develop over the years to the point where our State is ready to capitalize, economically, from its benefits.

Last year I was successful in adding $250,000 to a pending appropriations bill for studying the potential of an institute of technology development to be established within the State of Mississippi. At the same time this study was underway, State government officials, university officials, and leaders of the Mississippi business community were joining hands to put together a

coalition for the eventual implementation of such an institute.

This past spring, the study was completed and recommended that an institute be developed, drawing from the research capabilities of the major universities in the State. The Mississippi Institute of Technology Development was established and an excellent board of directors was chosen, representing State government, private business, and the university community. This summer another appropriation was approved in the amount of $7 million for this particular institute. This will be matched by $4 million from the State of Mississippi, and at least $1 million from private business.

The primary purpose of the institute is to take the research conducted at several institutions of higher learning and develop it to the point that it can be used by industry in Mississippi. This will help our State by attracting new high technology industry and by assisting in the further development of the industry that is already here. It is anticipated that this initial $12 million will trigger about $60 million in spending by the institute.

CONTROL OF ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFIC

For several years I have had a growing concern over the transporting of illegal drugs into the United States. These drugs are coming into our country by both ship and plane, and much of the supply is being introduced in our own State.

At one time, the main point of entry for this illicit drug traffic was Florida because of its closeness to the points of origin of illegal drugs. Through the Coast Guard, we stepped up efforts to interdict the boats that were bringing the drugs into Florida. As a result of successes in Florida, the drug traffickers have moved into other States such as Mississippi, and are now coming in much more through planes. It is estimated that there are 6,000 to 7,000 illegal drug-carrying flights into the United States each year.

In an effort to decrease this growing amount of traffic, Congress appropriated additional funds this year to the Coast Guard and the Customs Service. Also, in a special appropriation, we provided $25 million for the purchase of eight high-performance aircrafts which will be used to track and intercept drug traffickers. These planes, which will be maintained in Jackson, are already being used in large numbers by the military, so we know how effective they can be.

ANTICRIME LEGISLATION

During this session, the Senate considered and passed major changes in the Criminal Code. This legislation which passed the Senate in February was called the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984, and was finally adopted as an amendment to the continuing resolution for 1985.

Passage of this anticrime legislation marked the culmination of an 11-year effort to make changes to the Federal Criminal Code. The new crime law will overhaul the disparity in punishment for defendants who commit similar crimes, and will allow pretrial detention of defendants considered to be dangerous.

The new law also expands the requirement that convicted defendants forfeit the profits of their drug or organized crime enterprise to the Government to cover any assets derived illegally and reforms the insanity defense procedures. Under this law the burden is placed on the defendant to establish the lack of guilt due to insanity.

The bill also provides assistance to State and local law enforcement in the area of juvenile assistance and missing children by establishing a crime victim's assistance fund in the Treasury composed of forfeited appearance bonds, criminal fines, and funds collected from convicted defendants. The money in this fund will be distributed to the States for use in victim compensation and assistance. Currently, Mississippi has no statewide compensation program for victims of crime. Due to this legislation and the funding it will provide, plans are underway to have such a program approved through the State legislature. I feel that this direct victim compensation program, along with services provided to victims by local private and public organizations, will most certainly help in the efforts to meet the needs of many in our State who have been victimized by crime.

The crime package also deals with many new areas of crime by improving laws dealing with international money laundering, trademark counterfeiting, antiterrorism, computer fraud, and increased penalties for credit card fraud. This new law also strengthens Federal laws against labor racketeering.

Of special interest to me was the provision of this law which strengthens drug enforcement. I am hopeful that this will help bring to an end the terrible waste in our country from the use of drugs. The growing use of drugs is a special concern to me and will be a priority with me until this terrible waste of our people is stamped out.

WYOMING WILDERNESS BILL

● Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the full Wyoming congressional delegation, consisting of my friends Congressman DICK CHENEY, Senator MALCOLM WALLOP and myself would wish to take an opportunity to clarify the snowmobiling issue that was thoroughly discussed and deliberated during the recent consideration of the Wyoming wilderness bill.

We have all long recognized the importance of recreational snowmobile use to the residents of the State of Wyoming and the surrounding States. This delightful and enjoyable sport is considered to be a vital and important activity that is expressly and clearly allowed under the multiple-use management activities in the national forests as well as in wilderness study areas. Knowing of the great interest in Wyoming for snowmobile activity, the members of the Wyoming congressional delegation were adamant during the deliberation and drafting of the final bill that snowmobiling would indeed continue to be a well recognized and valuable recreational activity in the wilderness study areas that were established by the passage of the measure. In particular, the High Lakes Wilderness Study Area in northwest Wyoming was very specifically and purposely designated as a "study area" in order to encourage and allow the continuation of the use of snowmobiles in that area.

It has never been the understanding of the Wyoming congressional delegation that the very specific language used in the bill regarding snowmobile use is to be construed, defined or interpreted in any way which would establish an unreasonable cap or limit on the numbers of snowmobiles or extent of snowmobile use in the High Lakes area. This language, found in section 301(c)(4) of the recently passed measure states, "within the Palisades, High Lakes, and Shoal Creek Wilderness Study Areas, snowmobiling shall continue to be allowed in the same manner and degree as was occurring previous to the date of enactment of the act." This language is intended to provide that the mere designation or description of "wilderness study area" will not be used by the appropriate Federal management agencies to decrease or limit future snowmobile use.

It is not the intention of the sponsors of the bill that this language will be used, in any way, to influence pending or future administrative or judicial decisions regarding the approval, construction, opening of or maintenance of any snow machine routes or trails that are presently used or may be used in the future for access to or from the High Lakes Study Area.

The delegation feels very strongly that the Forest Service is well qualified and very capable of adequately managing the newly established wilderness study areas in a manner that is quite compatible with their "study status" as well as providing for full and appropriate snow machine usage.●

TRIBUTE TO JENNINGS RANDOLPH

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I just said to the distinguished Democratic leader that I wanted to extoll the virtue of West Virginia and, of course,

that is to extoll the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, my seatmate, JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

It is an honor and a rare privilege to serve in the Senate. Only 100 men and women can do so at any one time.

For me, one of the greatest privileges of Senate membership has been to be the seatmate during the past Congress of the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia. He is a man I knew long before I came here. I used to sit in the galleries as a law student at Georgetown and listen to him debate on the floor.

I used to listen to him give history lessons which, in 4 or 5 minutes, equaled a semester in college. He spoke of the history of our country, the history of the political life of our country, and the history of this great body in which we all serve.

He would do it not only with a warmth and a humanity but also with an enormous depth of understanding, and I think that part of my own love of the U.S. Senate and part of my own desire to serve here came out of hearing those speeches.

Mr. President, I must say when I sit here in this seat, as I will in the next Congress, that there will be times when there will be a little milling about in the well of the Senate as votes are coming and I will find myself getting up to start to go down and join that maelstrom of confusion. I will get part way out of my seat and I will feel the presence of JENNINGS RANDOLPH beside me saying, "Now, PATRICK, you are going to be put out of order if you do that. Don't be out of order even if the rest of the Senate is out of order. Vote from your seat."

JENNINGS, I must say I cannot tell you honestly that I will never join that herd of confusion down there. I know I will and you must forgive me for that. Realize that I have only been here 10 years, and I still do not know everything I am supposed to know. I will pledge you this, my friend, more often than not when I start to go I will hesitate and say, is this trip really necessary? And I will try to vote from my seat.

Every time I do that, it will be a sign of tribute to JENNINGS RANDOLPH and a sign of tribute to the man who has upheld the highest standards of the Senate, who has shown courage and dignity and truthfulness, but also a gentle and kind spirit toward all his colleagues, Republican and Democratic, throughout those years.

I know the love my senior colleague from Vermont, BOB STAFFORD, expresses toward Senator RANDOLPH. It has been this bipartisan nature and his own sense of history and his own sense of statesmanship that has enabled JENNINGS to serve his State so well—the State of West Virginia.

So, in closing, Mr. President, I must say that it has been a unique honor and privilege for me not only to serve with JENNINGS RANDOLPH, but to be seated next to him.●

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR PAUL TSONGAS

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, with the decision of Senator PAUL TSONGAS of Massachusetts to retire at the end of the 98th Congress, this body has lost one of its ablest and most accomplished Members.

Although only 37 years of age when elected to the Senate in 1978, PAUL TSONGAS had already distinguished himself as a public servant. He had served in the House of Representatives for two terms, representing the Fifth Congressional District in Massachusetts. Earlier he had served as a Peace Corps volunteer in Ethiopia and as a training instructor in the Caribbean. Born, raised and educated in the Massachusetts city of Lowell, he had returned there after college, law school, and the Peace Corps to serve as a city councillor and a commissioner of Middlesex County.

From his service at home in Lowell and abroad in the Peace Corps he brought to Congress principle, commitment, ability and experience. PAUL TSONGAS played an important role in assuring the revival of Lowell, which had declined precipitously from its onetime eminence and prosperity as a textile center. He was instrumental in the establishment in Lowell of our first national urban park, an initiative of great importance to the Lowell community which has become a model for many other parts of the Nation. His work as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, where I was privileged to be his colleague, was always inspired by his sense of the world beyond our borders, by his experience of having lived in the world where poverty, hunger, ignorance, illness and violence are too often the rule rather than the exception in daily life.

In his 6 years as a Member of the U.S. Senate, PAUL TSONGAS served on the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Small Business, on the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and subsequently on the Committee on Foreign Relations. To each assignment he brought special distinction, whether the issue was renewable energy resources, or housing, or the violation of human rights, or the unreasonable obstacles to entrepreneurship. To all his assignments he brought his formidable intelligence, his quick humor and his commitment to service.

PAUL TSONGAS' retirement is a loss to the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to the people of the Nation and to us, his colleagues. In reaching the decision to leave the Senate, he has placed first and foremost his love and responsibility for his family, his wife, Niki, and his young daughters, Ashley, Katina, and Molly. A person of deep commitment—to his family, to his church and community, to the principles of hard work, of mutual respect and concern—he has honored those commitments in his decision. Our tributes to Senator TSONGAS pale in comparison to the eloquent tribute which he, throughout his career as a public servant, has paid to the cherished values that make our Nation great.

TRIBUTE TO MSGR. CHARLES OWEN RICE

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to the golden milestone of an extraordinary man. June 19, 1984, marked the 50th anniversary of Msgr. Charles Owen Rice's ordination to the Priesthood of Jesus Christ. In a half century since, he has lived a life of devotion to his fellow man and to the teachings of his church. Foremost, a dedicated priest, Monsignor Rice has faithfully ministered to the spiritual needs of his parishioners. But his deeds extend far beyond the parishes he has served. He has been a relentless advocate for prison reform, a fearless crusader for civil rights, a leader of the labor movement, and a spokesman for world peace and brotherhood. He has helped feed the poor, house the homeless, and stand up for the rights of the disenfranchised—a rare combination, indeed, of compassion and strength.

I have been privileged to know Monsignor Rice, and I know many of my colleagues in the Senate share my sentiments. I ask that the text of a brochure from the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, marking the 50th anniversary of Monsignor Rice's ordination, be printed in the RECORD, so that all my colleagues may know more about this fine man.

The brochure follows:

MSGR. CHARLES OWEN RICE

Charles Owen Rice was born Sat. Nov. 21, 1908 in New York City. He was the second son born to Anna (nee: O'Donnell) and Michael J. Rice. His brother Patrick W. Rice had been born 2 years earlier.

Anna Rice died in 1913. Shortly thereafter the boys were taken to Ireland where they were raised by family members and continued their early education.

Patrick and Charles returned to the United States in 1920 when their father remarried. They graduated from St. Mary of the Mount High School in Mt. Washington. Patrick in 1923 and Charles in 1926. It was in high school that Charles developed his life-long passion for Anglo-Irish poetry and the use of written and spoken English.

He and his brother both attended Duquesne University. Charles wrote many controversial articles for the college paper the Duquesne Duke. When he became editor of the paper in 1929, his challenging editorials attacked such sacred cows as football players, the practices of certain coaches, and

various members of the faculty. His fellow students elected Charles President of the College Council and the Student Senate. He was graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1930.

After his senior year in college, Charles applied to Bishop Hugh C. Boyle of the Diocese of Pittsburgh to study for the priesthood. He joined his brother Patrick in the study of theology, scripture and canon law at St. Vincent's Seminary, Latrobe, Pa. Charles read omnivorously and continued to sharpen his writing skills. During his seminary years three of his articles were published nationally in Commonweal, and several others in Sign Magazine.

Bishop Boyle ordained Charles and 13 of his classmates to the Priesthood of Jesus Christ in St. Vincent's Archabbey Basilica, June 19, 1934. He celebrated his first Solemn Mass of Thanksgiving at St. Justin Parish, Mt. Washington. Fr. Patrick had been ordained 3 years earlier.

The newly ordained Fr. Charles Rice spent early months of his priesthood attending to the spiritual needs of the people of Immaculate Conception Parish, Bloomfield. He was then transferred to St. Agnes Parish, Oakland, where he served for 5 years.

For a year, Fr. Rice taught at Mt. Mercy College, but was relieved of these teaching duties when he joined Msgr. Carl Hensler in blazing the foundations of the Catholic Radical Alliance. Within a decade Rice was to return to the academic setting and for many years he taught at Duquesne University. When Duquesne celebrated its 100th Anniversary, Rice was the only Diocesan priest to be singled out for honors among 100 outstanding alumni.

From his earliest days in the priesthood, Fr. Rice cultivated his skills in communications. He began his radio career at Radio Station KDKA, May 15, 1936. Later he moved to Radio Station WWSW where for 44 years (1936-83) he had a regular weekly broadcast. He also served as host for a Sunday talk show on Radio Station WJAS from 1969 through 1971.

During his long radio career and in writing a column which appeared regularly in the Pittsburgh Catholic (1936-46/1959 to present) Fr. Rice openly discussed controversial topics. He was pro-labor, anti-Communist, pro-Black, anti-Vietnam War. In 1930 he met the leaders of the Irish Republican Army while visiting in Ireland. He staunchly supported their cause. Local judges quickly learned that the outspoken Rice would do battle with them over the treatment of Blacks and other minorities. In a classic case of crusader against the institution, Rice even took on J. Edgar Hoover, the founder and director of the F.B.I., over the issues of the Vietnam War and the Black Panthers. Not even churchmen were exempt from his incisive and sometimes biting commentary.

Rice had a life-long interest in prison reform. For many years he served on the Governor's Justice Commission. Governor Shapp appointed him to a Commission on Capital Punishment. He is an active member of the Allegheny County Prison Board and continues to help convicts, and visits prisons.

During the Great Depression, Fr. Rice befriended, supported and became a disciple of the well-known pacifist, Dorothy Day. Like Dorothy Day, he too sought to serve the poor in the name of Jesus Christ. In 1937 when millions were unemployed and family life was disintegrating, Rice opened St. Joseph House of Hospitality in Pittsburgh to provide food, clothing and temporary shelter for hungry and homeless men. He was resident director of the House for more than 10 years. Bed bugs and rats were a constant problem.

During the turbulent years of the Great Depression and World War II, Fr. Rice addressed thousands of groups and rallies in the cause of labor and conducted many labor schools. Despite much criticism of his direct tactics Fr. Rice always remained strongly pro-labor. He was confidant and advisor to many labor leaders including Philip Murray, the President of the United Steel Workers. To this day he may be seen at strikes and demonstrations.

An excellent administrator, Fr. Rice was appointed Area Rent Director of the Office of Price Administration during World War II; his office had the best record in the nation.

Despite his involvement in communications, labor, feeding the poor and serving the cause of social justice, he faithfully carried out his duties as a parish priest—proclaiming the Gospel, celebrating the Sacraments and caring for the spiritual needs of the people wherever he was assigned.

Fr. Rice was appointed administrator of St. Brigid's Parish, Hill District in 1950. Bishop Dearden assigned him as Pastor of St. Joseph Parish, Natrona, where he served from 1952 to 1958. The same Bishop asked him to accept the pastorate of Immaculate Conception Parish, Washington, PA, where he served from 1958 to 1966. In 1959 Bishop John Wright appointed him a member of the Diocesan Board of Consultors. In March, 1964, he was named a Domestic Prelate and installed as a Monsignor.

At his own request he was made Pastor of Holy Rosary Church, Homewood. During 10 years (1966-76) of racial strife and social unrest he was a force to be reckoned with in that community. A tireless advocate, he spoke out then—as now—for the rights of minorities to decent housing, employment and education. While in Homewood, the Monsignor sought election to the Pittsburgh City Council. He did well in the Black and Jewish wards, but the Catholic wards did not support him.

Msgr. Patrick Rice died in 1971, but Msgr. Charles Rice continues to keep close contact with his family here in Pittsburgh, Mrs. Eleanor Halloran and her children; with cousins in New York and in Counties Clare and Dublin, Ireland. He visits frequently with his family in Ireland where his cousin Rev. Patrick J. Rice is pastor at Sandymount, Dublin.

In 1976 Bishop Vicent Leonard appointed him pastor of St. Anne Parish, Castle Shannon. He continues involvement in the controversial matters. He reads widely, plays some golf, writes occasional pieces for national publications and exercises daily: running, light weights, trampoline. True to his vocation, Msgr. Charles Owen Rice continues to serve St. Anne Parish and minister to the spiritual needs of her people as he celebrates the 50th Anniversary of his ordination to the Priesthood of Jesus Christ.●

FOREST SERVICE'S OLDEST LIVING RETIREE

● Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, there is a special event coming up in Montana in November. The occasion of a 100th birthday will be celebrated at region 1 headquarters in Missoula.

I would like to take this opportunity to honor Mr. Clyde Fickes. Mr. Fickes is, to the best of our knowledge, the USDA Forest Service's oldest living retiree. Mr. Fickes celebrates his 100th birthday on November 2. He was born in Nelson, Nuckola County, NE, in 1884 and grew up in the 1890's in Bedford County, PA, and in the city of Pittsburgh.

In the summer of 1900 he moved to his uncle's farm in Kalispell, MT, and then attended school at Ohio Northern University from 1901-03. In 1904 he returned to Kalispell where he trapped and worked on ranches and for the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. Fickes was appointed as a forest guard on July 6, 1907, at $720 a year. He was required to furnish his own saddle, pack horse, and food. This appointment was on the Lewis and Clark National Forest, which covered everything in western Montana north of the Clark Fork River. On July 20, Mr. Fickes took the district ranger test, passed, and was assigned the Sun River Ranger District at the time Teddy Roosevelt was President of the United States and Gifford Pinchot was the Chief of the newly formed U.S. Forest Service.

In 1908, Mr. Fickes was promoted to assistant district ranger at $1,000 a year. That same year, a major organization change occurred in the Forest Service: Six regions and numerous new national forests were established. In 1909 Mr. Fickes tried to get a transfer back to the Flathead country so he could be close to his sweetheart. He couldn't, so he resigned. Later that year he was reappointed as deputy district ranger on the Flathead National Forest and assigned to the Bear Dance Ranger District.

In 1910 he was given a $100 promotion to $1,100 per year. Again restlessness overtook him and in April of 1910 he resigned to return to Pittsburgh, where he spent a year with his father in the construction business.

In late 1911 he returned to Kalispell where he worked as an operator in the Bigfork powerhouse till 1916. During this time he completed a course in civil engineering and married Ruth McCrea. During all of these years Mr. Fickes was a member of the National Guard. In 1916 his unit was mobilized and he saw duty on the Mexican border with the cavalry and in a machine gun unit.

In 1917 he was reapponited to the Forest Service as district ranger of the Upper Gallatin Ranger District. He was exempted from further military service because it was determined that he could render greater benefits to the Nation in the Forest Service than in the military. In 1919 Mr. Fickes was promoted to deputy forest supervisor of the Nezperce National Forest in Grangeville, ID, at $1,400 a year. His

principal assignment was the grazing program. In 1924 Mr. Fickes was transferred to the Madison Forest in Sheridan, MT, and in 1927 to the Pend Oreille National Forest in Sandpoint, ID. It was here he designed the prefab lookout house that become a standard fixture on mountain peaks throughout region 1.

In 1928 Mr. Fickes was moved to the operations staff in the regional office in Missoula. As a result of the extreme fire season of 1929, he conceived the idea of the region's remount depot, a central place where necessary pack and saddle stock could be located and dispatched to fires on short notice. The plan was approved and under Mr. Fickes' direction it became operational in 1930. He served as overseer of the depot until 1936.

In addition, he was responsible for Boy Scout camps at Seeley Lake and Red Lodge and the Forest Service radio station on Whitaker Hill.

In 1936 Mr. Fickes was transferred to the division of engineering. One of his key contributions there was authorizing a log construction handbook, which was later adopted and reprinted by the State of Alaska. In early 1942 he was ordered to Salinas, CA, to organize construction at the guayule rubber project, a national war effort to produce synthetic rubber.

In 1942, Mr. Fickes returned to Montana and in 1944, now making $4,200 a year, he resigned to become deputy director of the War Assets Board in Seattle. The Board's function was to dispose of surplus war property from the Pacific theater. After about a year he was reassigned to Los Angeles, where he retired from the War Assets Board in 1947.

In 1972 the Forest Service published Mr. Fickes' "Recollections," which he wrote at the request of Gifford Pinchot.

Mr. Fickes had approximately 35 years of Federal service—service during which he built bridges, trails, lookouts, and ranger stations, and installed some of the Agency's first communications equipment—service during which the very foundation of the organization was shaped.

Our Nation owes a debt of gratitude to Clyde Fickes and we thank him deeply for his contributions.

Mr. Fickes still lives in Missoula County and he is active today as he has been since his retirement. He was instrumental in building a city library as well as a new Catholic church in Missoula. He is an active member of the Elks Club and dances three times a week. He is an American citizen of which we can all be proud.●

FLORIDA'S FINEST SERVANT

● Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a man by the name of James Thomas Vocelle. When I mention his name, it immediately recounts to me fond memories of his outstanding life and career of public office. I am not the only one that appreciates his outstanding service. The Indian River County Bar Association is sponsoring a luncheon on November 29, this year in recognition of the 60 years Mr. Vocelle has practiced law in Florida. Jim is having quite a life you see; his father and uncle defended the confederacy during the period of Northern Aggression—Civil War. Jim himself was a war veteran; he fought for the U.S. Army during WWI. He served with distinction and today is an active member of the American Legion.

His professional career is noteworthy to say the least. He is a member of the Florida, Georgia, and New Mexico bar dating back to 1916 when he was admitted to the Georgia bar. He has counseled many clients over the years, and is known for his reputation for being fair and just and for helping thousands of people who could not afford counsel. Today, Jim is actively engaged in his private practice in his hometown of Vero Beach.

Jim's public service began in 1918 when he was appointed as county attorney of Camden County, GA. Two years later he was elected to the State house, and in 1922 elected to the Georgia Senate. In 1925, Jim's faithful, productive, and honest service to the State of Florida began. Jim was the first county attorney of Indian River. Subsequently, in 1941 Gov. Spessard L. Holland appointed Jim as a commissioner of Florida First Parole Commission. During his tenure on the Commission, Mr. Vocelle was elected president of the Southern State Parole and Probation Association. While there, he successfully emphasized and then introduced to the South some of the modern reforms of penology which stressed offender rehabitation and human dignity. Governor Caldwell later appointed Jim State beverage director. In 1953 Gov. Dan McCarty appointed Mr. Vocelle chairman of the Florida Industrial Commission, the forerunner of today's Florida Department of Labor and Employment Security. He was the first State official to grasp the plight of migrant farm workers, and implemented programs in regard to the needs and rights. For those who do not know Jim Vocelle personally, it is obvious that he has always been a staunch champion of human rights, without regard to race, sex, creed, or origin, and is committed to the dignity and equality of all people.

Mr. President, it is with great pride that I shared with you the splendid life and many achievements and accomplishments of my good friend Jim Vocelle.●

COMMUNICATION WORKERS OF AMERICA—PAY EQUITY STUDY

● Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, on October 3, during the Senate's consideration of House Joint Resolution 648, the continuing resolution, I sought to offer an amendment to require a study of the Federal Government's wage classification system to determine whether workers in positions filled predominately by female employees are paid less than workers in positions in which male workers predominate, although the job qualifications, working conditions, and requirements are comparable. Although the pay equity study amendment, which had passed the House in June by an overwhelming bipartisan vote, was not adopted, an agreement was reached between myself and the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], who Chairs the Subcommittee on Civil Service, Post Office and General Services of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, as well as the Chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service [Mr. FORD] and the Chair of the House Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits [Ms. OAKAR], on a series of events to take place over the next 8 months to bring about this type of review of the Federal Wage Classification System. That agreement is set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 10, 1984, at 31143.

In the meantime, many similar efforts are taking place in both the public and private sectors. In this regard, I recently received a copy of a very informative special report on wage discrimination issued by the Communications Workers of America. This report, entitled "Closing the Wage Gap" was prepared by a special CWA task force on pay equity. It provides a comprehensive overview of the pay equity problem as well as possible strategies for rectifying wage discrimination. The report outlines some of the successes achieved by this union in bargaining for pay increases to help close the wage gap as well as its activities in legislative and judicial areas.

Mr. President, I ask that the CWA report be printed in the RECORD.

The report follows:

CLOSING THE WAGE GAP: BACKGROUND ON WAGE DISCRIMINATION GUIDE TO EQUITY IN THE WORKPLACE

INTRODUCTION

There is a big problem in America's workplace: women earn less than men. This problem is pervasive, affecting every industry and occupation; it is persistent, dividing the sexes in spite of major economic, demographic and political changes; and it is unfair, imposing second class citizenship on half of this country's population.

The Communications Workers of America has worked to close the wage gap since the founding of the Union in 1947. That year at the first CWA Convention, delegates adopted a resolution directing the union to abol-

ish employer practices of paying women less than the established wage rate for men performing the same job and to prevent employers from using separate wage lists for "male" and "female" jobs.

Since that day, CWA has fought for pay equity at the bargaining table, lobbied Congress and state legislatures to pass laws that would prohibit employment practices which result in the wage gap, and gone to court to remedy discriminatory wage practices.

One strategy for closing the wage gap is Pay Equity—a concept which requires paying wages based solely on job content—the skills, effort, training, responsibilities and working conditions that comprise a person's work. Researchers have indicated that Pay Equity has the potential to close half of the wage gap by revaluing the work done by women and compensating it at the proper level. Comparable Worth[1] has been called the "cutting edge" labor issue of the eighties. Every worker is bound to be affected by debate over the issue, whether directly or indirectly.

This report is for the members of the Communications Workers of America. It explains the wage gap and the causes of the gap. It lays out different strategies for closing the gap. Finally, it affirms this union's support for Pay Equity as an essential means for eliminating sex discrimination[2] from the nation's workplaces.

I. THE GENDER BASED WAGE GAP AND JOB SEGREGATION

It is a widely known fact: women in America earn less than men. A large part of the gap can be attributed to the different jobs of men and women.

The wage gap: Women earn less than men

In 1946 women who worked full time, year round were paid about 66 cents for every dollar earned by their male co-workers. Today the gap is wider. Women now earn approximately 62 cents for every dollar in wages paid to men. In 1982 the median annual income for women working full time, year round was $13,014.

TABLE 1.—WOMEN'S EARNINGS AS PERCENT OF MEN'S MEDIAN EARNINGS

Year	Women	Men	Percentage
1946	$1,710	$2,588	66.1
1956	2,827	4,466	63.1
1966	3,973	6,848	58.0
1976	8,099	13,455	60.2
1981	12,001	20,260	59.2
1982	13,014	21,077	61.9

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, 1982 and 1984.

This gender gap in wages exists for every racial and ethnic group as well. White women earn 60 percent of the income of white men. Hispanic women earn 80 percent of the income of Hispanic men. Black women earn 76 percent of the income of black men. Minority men earn significantly less than the white men, so minority females find their wages depressed twice—because they are minorities and because they are women.

[1] Pay Equity is also known as Comparable Worth since the process involves comparing the content of different jobs to determine their relative worth. In this report the terms are used interchangeably.

[2] Most studies to date have focused on sex bias in employment practices, yet minorities are also trapped on the lower end of the pay scale. CWA's pay equity efforts recognize the parallels between the plights of women and minorities in the job market, and are directed toward eradicating race as well as sex discrimination.

TABLE 2.—WAGE GAP AFFECTS EVERY RACE AND ETHNIC GROUP

	Amount
White men	$21,178
Black men	14,984
Hispanic men	14,981
White women	12,665
Black women	11,438
Hispanic women	11,917

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1981.

The wage gap crosses every sector of the nation's economy. In state and local governments women receive, on the average, 72 cents to the male dollar; in the federal government that ratio is 63 cents to the dollar; and in the private sector women earn only 56 cents for every dollar earned by men.

The wage gap divides men and women in every occupation at every level of the job hierarchy. Waitresses are paid 72 percent of waiters' earnings. Female office managers are paid 66 percent of the wages paid to their male counterparts. Women attorneys earn 71 percent of the earnings of male lawyers.

The wage gap has widened over time in spite of the expansion of white collar industries and their growing demand for female labor. The gap has enlarged even though more women are working than ever before, even though their labor force experience is increasing, and even though fewer women quit their jobs to raise families.

TABLE 3.—WOMEN EARN LESS THAN MEN FOR THE SAME WORK

	Women's earnings as percent of men's
Occupation:	
Bookkeeper	69.4
Clerical workers	68.3
Computer programmer	73.6
Cook	73.4
Freight handler	78.0
Lawyer	71.0
Office manager	65.5
Social worker	79.9

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, 1981.

Job segregation and the undervaluation of women's jobs

Traditionally, women have been concentrated into a narrow range of jobs. Fully 80 percent of all women workers can be found in just 25 of 427 possible occupational titles. Men, on the other hand, are spread among many job categories, and fewer than 20 percent of all male employees are found in the ten largest male-dominated occupations. This job segregation—the division of labor into women's work and men's work—has enabled employers to discriminate against women by undervaluing their jobs.

Employers argue that they set wages according to "the going rate" and that the rate is determined by supply and demand or the market. But in fact, the market itself is permeated with discrimination, and supply and demand does not work for traditionally female jobs. The example of nursing is often used to demonstrate the fraility of the market argument. For years there has been a shortage of qualified nurses, and yet it is still considered one of the most underpaid professions. Indeed, of the top ten predominantly female job titles, only one pays more than $14,000 a year. In contrast, only one of the top ten male-dominated occupations pays less than $14,000.

TABLE 4.—WOMEN'S JOBS PAY LESS THAN MEN'S JOBS

	Percent	Median earnings
Female-dominated occupations:		
Secretaries	99.2	$12,636
Receptionists	97.5	10,764
Typists	96.6	11,804
Dressmakers (except factory)	96.4	9,204
Lodging quarters cleaners	96.2	7,384
Registered nurses	95.6	18,980
Sewers and stitchers	95.5	8,632
Keypunch operators	94.5	12,480
Bank tellers	92.0	10,348
Telephone operators	91.9	13,988
Male-dominated occupations:		
Railroad switch operators	100.0	22,828
Firefighters	99.5	20,438
Plumbers and pipefitters	99.2	21,944
Auto mechanics	99.1	15,964
Carpet installers	98.8	15,392
Surveyors	98.5	17,472
Truck drivers	97.9	17,160
Garbage collectors	97.3	12,116
Engineers	94.3	30,472
Meatcutters and butchers (except manufacturing)	93.4	17,732
Forklift and tow motor operatives	92.0	15,652

Note: The telephone operator is a good example of how women can improve their economic status by joining a union. In 1982 only 47 percent of the Nation's telephone operators were employed in the telephone communications industry where CWA members are represented. The rest are employed by other businesses, such as hotels, office and apartment buildings and other service-oriented concerns. The average wage for telephone operators under the CWA-Bell System contract in 1982 was about $373 a week, about $5,400 (or 38 percent) more annually than telephone operators nationwide.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1982.

Several studies have revealed patterns of discriminatory practices which lead to the undervaluing of traditional women's jobs. For example:

Job descriptions for positions held mainly by men are generally more detailed than those for female-dominated jobs—making the women's jobs appear less difficult.

The physical and psychological stress caused by "women's jobs" often is not considered as important as the heavy physical work done by men.

Female-dominated titles are often not paid in proportion to the education, skills or expertise required to do the job.

Specialized skills such as shorthand and typing needed for secretarial work are often ignored by job evaluation systems.

Jobs in which workers have significant contact with the public are paid lower than jobs involving equipment, goods or money.

Researchers have found that only a small part of the difference between men's and women's wages is due to the differences in work experience, education and skill requirements. The rest of the gap cannot clearly be explained by job or worker characteristics, except for one: sex.

II. CLOSING THE WAGE GAP: A COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY

There are two reasons for the differences in women's and men's wages. First, men and women perform different jobs, and the work done by women is underpaid. Second, women are paid less than men doing the same type of work. A comprehensive strategy for closing the wage gap is required to address the different circumstances of workers affected by discrimination.

Pay equity and job evaluation

Because men and women traditionally work in different jobs we need a strategy which compares "women's work" with "men's work." Pay Equity requires paying wages based solely on the skill, effort, training, responsibilities and working conditions of a job. The goal of Pay Equity is to raise the wages of jobs which have been underpaid because they are staffed primarily by women and minorities.

Even though one job may not be identical to another, the skills used in those jobs may have the same level of demand on the worker and the same value to the employer. Specialists in job evaluation have developed objective processes to rate features of jobs and to assign a value to each job. These specialists can also train workers to evaluate their own jobs.

There is no single plan that can rate all jobs in every workplace, but when labor and management work together to develop and implement a plan, factors can be agreed upon which respond to the values of the workers and the employers, men and women, minorities and non-minorities.

Pay Equity evaluation plans generally include all of the job titles used by an employer and measure them against a single set of factors. The factors may be different from employer to employer but usually they encompass skill, effort, responsibility, and working conditions. In order to eliminate the bias that has tended to undervalue traditional women's jobs, evaluation plans should include factors such as mental demand and manual dexterity which are major features of female-dominated jobs, as well as factors to assess the physical prowess which is associated with male-dominated jobs.

This strategy is also called Comparable Worth since it involves comparing different jobs to determine their relative value.

Nontraditional jobs and new career paths

Women workers are clustered into a narrow range of jobs which, in addition to being characterized by low wages, generally have short career ladders. Even though the jobs may be highly skilled—for example, teaching, nursing and secretarial work—there are no avenues for advancement as seniority and expertise increase. Furthermore, employers rarely structure their female or minority dominated jobs to lead to other jobs which could provide the ladder to career growth and higher wages, and they do not generally provide training programs to workers in these short-ladder jobs to provide them with the skills needed to move into established advancement opportunities.

Pay Equity will remove barriers to comparable pay by setting wages for female and minority dominated jobs at their full, unbiased worth. But to bridge the wage gap, women and minorities must move out of dead-end jobs and out of occupations that limit their career mobility.

The key to this movement is training, and education. Women and minorities must have access to training and career development programs in order to equip themselves for nontraditional jobs. For example, women in administrative support jobs are frequently overlooked for promotions and instead find themselves training their new supervisors. With proper management training these women could easily be advanced to higher level positions.

Equal pay for equal work

A 1981 study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics compared the weekly earnings of full-time men and women in 100 occupations and found that in each job category, women made less money than men. Some of the differences in these national figures may be due to the fact that men and women tend to work in different industries, differences in seniority, or other non-biased factors. But some of the differences may be due to discrimination.

For example, employers may use two different titles for the same job. Men are assigned to the higher paying job, and women are hired for the lower level title. One company hired women as plant clerks and men as line designers. The positions involved identical work, yet the plant clerk title was paid $100 a week less.

Not every instance of unequal pay for equal work is due to intentional discrimination, but some management practices may have discriminatory effects. For example, some employers base the salaries for new hires on the earnings of their previous job. While such a practice is unbiased on the surface, it has the effect of perpetuating any discrimination inherent in the pay schemes of other employers. In one case an insurance company paid its sales agents a base salary plus commissions. The base salary was calculated from the prior salary of the new hires. As a result, the average salary of the female sales agents was $175 a week less than the male sales agents.

If employers refuse to correct such inequitable practices either unilaterally or through negotiations with the union, legal action can be taken. Remedies can be sought through the grievance procedure of the union's contract using the non-discrimination clause or in the courts under the Equal Pay Act and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

III. ACHIEVING PAY EQUITY

The three-tiered strategy for eliminating the wage gap can be carried out in three fields of action: at the bargaining table, in the legislatures and in the courts.

Union-management negotiations

In many instances, through collective bargaining, unions and management have negotiated remedies which bring the pay of undervalued jobs up to their proper rank over a period of time. For example, in New Jersey CWA won an extra 10 percent increase for clerical workers employed by the State in order to close the wage gap between those workers and others in the unit.

CWA has also bargained for pay upgrades for telephone operators, service representatives and several clerical classifications through negotiations with AT&T and the Bell Operating Companies. As a result women in those units earn 81 percent of men's pay—a ratio far superior to the private sector where women receive 56 percent of men's wages and better than the nationwide figure of 62 percent.

CWA is continuing to use other tactics in Bell System bargaining to improve the relative pay position of women. The union negotiated to restructure the clerical classifications so that unnecessary job titles were eliminated and clerical workers would realize more substantial wage increases upon promotion. In addition, CWA has been successful in negotiating career development training programs to prepare workers for promotions to higher level jobs as well as programs designed to enhance the skills of workers whose jobs are being displaced or restructured by technology.

Finally, CWA has developed a job evaluation plan in cooperation with the former Bell System and AT&T. It ranks jobs by using 17 different factors including expression, safety skills, physical demands and mental demands. Since the divestiture of the Bell System, CWA has been negotiating with the new independent operating companies to establish joint labor management committees which will put the plan into practice.

Strategies such as these can be used in other contract negotiations where they are appropriate and if they can effectively address a wage bias problem at the particular worksite.

Legislative initiatives

In the legislatures, laws can be enacted to compel employers to eliminate wage discrimination through pay equity methods. Some states have already adopted the principle of equal pay for work of comparable value in their statutes in some manner. California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Iowa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, and Oregon are among the states that support pay equity. Others states have had or now have pay equity legislation under consideration. They include Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, Ohio and Pennsylvania.

The California law was passed in 1981 and established a policy of setting salaries for female dominated state jobs on the basis of comparable worth. This year a bill was introduced in the State Senate which would establish a special fund for pay equity wage increases. CWA is supporting that measure which would benefit the State Psychiatric Technicians in CWA Local 11555, but the bill faces strong opposition from the administration. The Republican Governor has taken the position that the subject of pay equity is the appropriate subject of collective bargaining, but that any comparable worth increases would have to be accommodated without adding to the total funds he has deemed available for employee pay. Backers of the Senate bill feel the Governor's stand would undermine support for pay equity since gains in the name of comparable worth would be made through lower increases for other employees.

In Ohio, Governor Richard Celeste established the Pay Equity Advisory Committee to review the state's job evaluation plan. A CWA member from the Ohio Council of Public Workers was appointed to the committee. In June 1984 an initial study of state jobs was released. It showed that jobs of equivalent worth had equal pay. Nevertheless, the study also found that over 75 percent of all State employees are in sex segregated jobs; that the median pay of male dominated jobs is almost 20 percent higher than the median wage for female dominated jobs; and that in classifications with more than ten employees the highest wage for male jobs is 78 percent more than the highest wage for female jobs. The Advisory Committee will now oversee a more in-depth study to determine whether the factors used in the State's evaluation plan are biased, resulting in the concentration of female dominated jobs at the lower end of the pay scale. In the meantime CWA District 4 is continuing to push for legislation to correct any inequities found through the committee's work.

In New Jersey, CWA has been influential in the introduction of legislation that would require the state to examine its pay setting process and to remedy any discriminatory practices. One bill passed both houses of legislature, but was conditionally vetoed by the Governor. The conditions included denying union participation on the committee guiding the job evaluation process, the removal of a provision that would prohibit the reduction of wages to achieve pay equity, and the elimination of time limits for achieving equal pay for work of comparable value. With strong urging and assistance from CWA District 1 representatives, a second bill was drafted, adopted by both houses, and now awaits the Governor's action (as of this writing).

Most of the state laws now in effect, as well as most of those now under consideration, require pay equity in state government employment—they do not address the issue for the private sector or other governmental units. In Hawaii, however, three resolutions were adopted requesting all employers, public and private, to adopt the conduct of equal pay for work of comparable value. Minnesota recently passed legislation requiring all local units of government to establish a process leading to pay equity. And finally, two pay equity bills pending in the Pennsylvania legislature would amend the state's Human Relations Act to provide clarification of language concerning equal pay and allocate $870,000 for the enforcement of pay equity.

CWA actively supports the passage of pay equity measures at every level of government. The Union has testified before major legislative committees and lobbied lawmakers to secure enactment of pay equity bills. Such legislation is an essential strategy for achieving comparable worth since it will set the precedent for the private sector and pave the way for pay equity efforts in collective bargaining. In addition, CWA is pressuring political candidates to adopt pay equity in their campaign platforms.

Legal remedies

In the courts strategies for closing the wage gap can be pursued under the Equal Pay Act and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

The Equal Pay Act requires equal wages for jobs which are substantially alike. Jobs such as janitor and maid, for example, could be compared, and an equal pay case could be established if there were wage discrepancies between those jobs. The Act allows four exceptions to the basic rule of equal pay for equal work. If the differential is based on (1) a seniority system, (2) a merit system, (3) a piece rate or wage incentive system, or (4) "any other factor other than sex," then the wage discrepancy is not discriminatory.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin in all employment practices including hiring, firing, promotion, compensation and other terms and conditions of employment. It also recognizes the four exceptions available under the Equal Pay Act.

Pay Equity provides a means of comparing dissimilar jobs under Title VII. If it can be determined that two jobs require equal, though different, skill, effort, training and responsibility, but that one job is paid less solely because it is staffed mostly by women while the other, higher paying job is staffed primarily by men, then legal remedies can be sought under Title VII.●

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HOWARD BAKER

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, with the retirement of Senator HOWARD BAKER at the conclusion of the 98th Congress, after 18 years of service to the people of Tennessee and the Nation, the Senate of the United States loses a most accomplished member and leader. One is struck by the versatility of Senator BAKER: Since his election to the 90th Congress in 1966, he has served on an impressive range of committees—Government Operations, Public Works, Commerce, the Joint Committees on the Library and on Printing, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; the Select Committee on Small Business and the Select Committee on Intelligence; and two select committees whose effects long outlived their relatively short duration, the Select Committee to Study Government Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, and the 1973 Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities, better known as the Senate Watergate Committee. In the 98th Congress, Senator BAKER served on the Foreign Relations Committee, where it was my privilege to be his colleague, and the Environment and Public Works Committee and the Rules and Administration Committee, and ex officio and the Select Committee on Intelligence as well.

Apart from his extraordinary versatility, HOWARD BAKER has brought to his service in the Senate great intelligence and integrity, a strong sense of the national interest and a profound respect for and understanding of the Constitution; these qualities have served him well as the leader of his party in the Senate, and since 1981 as Senate majority leader. Senator BAKER's keen appreciation of the relationship, in our system, of the legislative to the executive and judicial branches of government; of the unique role of the Senate in the legislative branch; and of the traditions and procedures of the Senate has added luster to his leadership and won him the admiration and affection of his colleagues in both parties. We have benefited from his skill as a parliamentarian, his patience, tact, and good humor, his dedication to the Nation. Not long ago HOWARD BAKER was described in a national news article as "one of the most able Senate leaders of the century." It is a judgment widely shared by those on both sides of the aisle who have served with him. When the 99th Congress convenes, his presence will be sorely missed.●

PRESIDENTIAL AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS TEACHING

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, a century ago, American education placed great emphasis—nearly exclusive emphasis one might say—on the written word. For some time now, and certainly well into the 21st century, rapid technological innovations require increasing attention to mathematics and the sciences.

For this reason, I am proud to recognize two of New York's math and science teachers, Mark E. Saul and Chirakkah Variyam Krishnan, as recipients of the second annual Presidential Awards for Excellence in Science and Mathematics Teaching, presented by the National Science Foundation. Mr. Saul teaches geometry and computer science at the Bronx High School of Science; Mr. Kirshnan teaches chemistry at East Islip High School. Both men have successfully conveyed their enthusiasm for math and science learning to their students. Both also have applied their considerable knowledge and talents for a wide range of activities outside the classroom. The teaching profession is honored by their commitment to excellence in math and science education. Mr. Saul and Mr. Krishnan richly deserve recognition of their distinguished careers.

I ask that an article from the New York Daily News of October 25, 1984, detailing Mr. Saul's and Mr. Krishnan's distinguished accomplishments, be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

TWO JOIN ELITE—TEACHERS PICKED BEST IN STATE TO COLLECT PRESIDENTIAL AWARDS

(By Judith Randal)

WASHINGTON.—Mark E. Saul, 36, of the Bronx High School of Science and Chirakkal Variyam Krishnan, 47, of Long Island's East Islip High School are the New York state winners of this year's Presidential Awards for Excellence in Science and Mathematics Teaching, the National Science Foundation announced yesterday.

They joined the other winners—two from each of the other states and two each from the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico—for a three-day stay here during which they will meet with George Keyworth, the White House science adviser, and be guests of honor at a National Academy of Sciences reception. Their schools will each receive a $5,000 grant.

"Teaching is more than just interpreting a textbook. It's a highly charged emotional experience for both the students and the teacher," Saul said yesterday when asked why he thought he had been selected for a presidential award. "I teach geometry and computer science, but what I am really interested in is getting kids motivated to be interested in a problem of a kind they've never seen before."

Saul is president of the New York City Interscholastic Mathematics League, which gives him a chance to convey his enthusiasm for math and science to youngsters and their teachers at more than 600 other elementary, junior and senior high schools.

Besides that, Saul created ABC-TV's computer graphics for the 1984 Olympics, coaches the New York City mathematics team and serves as an admissions panelist for the High School of the Performing Arts.

He and his wife, Carol, an early childhood development specialist, have three children—Susanna, 7; Michael, 4, and 10-month old Peter. They live on Amsterdam Ave. in Manhattan.

Krishnan's field is chemistry and his particular interest is teaching laboratory methods of scientific research. He also keeps his professional hand in research projects at the Brookhaven National Laboratory and the State University of New York in Stony Brook, where he often is accompanied by one or more of his students.

A native of India, Krishnan lives in Coram, L.I., with his wife, Nalini, and their son, Sayon, 8, and daughter, Mini, 16.●

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, THE SENATE'S TRUEST GENTLEMAN

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from West Virginia who embodies all that we mean when we say the word, "gentleman."

For indeed, JENNINGS is the truest gentleman in the Senate. I choose to believe that this is the natural result of a man who's grown with, has been witness to, and taken part in much of, the significant political and governmental history of 20th century America.

"A free man. An American. A democrat. In that order," the late Lyndon Johnson once said in describing himself. So, too, would JENNINGS RANDOLPH describe himself.

But the unquenchable, vibrant spirit of this man—so often the conscience of our party and this body—grew to political maturity at about the same time his principal political mentor, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, issued his political call to arms. In his crusade to restore America to its own people. I am sure that JENNINGS listened intently on that hot Chicago night of July 2, 1932, when FDR challenged JENNINGS to choose a vision of America.

"There are two ways of viewing the Government's duty in matters affecting economic and social life. The first sees to it that a favored few are helped and hopes that some of their prosperity will leak through, sift through, to labor, to the farmer, to the small business man," said Roosevelt. But it is not and never will be the theory of the Democratic Party.

My gratitude goes out to JENNINGS RANDOLPH, for always remembering and reflecting the soul of our party. He did not forget it then, back in 1932. He did not forget it in the spring of 1933 when he joined the U.S. House of Representatives. He did not forget it back in 1958, when you joined the U.S. Senate.

And now he leaves us, the last to carry with him to the Congress of the United States the reality of the vision that was shaped the night the New Deal was born.

No, not now, not ever did he allow anyone or any force to dim the vision of that night.

When I praise JENNINGS RANDOLPH for having helped to shape so much of the progressive legislative legacy of the past half-century, I must make special mention for all that he has done for the people we both represent. JENNINGS RANDOLPH was there and worked for the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Economic Development Administration, and the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The propulsion of the people of the Tennessee Valley to economic parity with the rest of America owes much to this man. We thank JENNINGS RANDOLPH, for all that he has done to build, to improve, to create work, and to foster economic development for the people of Tennessee.

The salient characteristic that came through in all that he has done, in his more than half century of service to the people of West Virginia and the Nation, is the way he has always been a gentleman.

Yes, the gentleman from West Virginia would never let us forget about decorum, decency, and order. Never. Not even during debate over those things that most passionately involved him.

How fitting it is that in the legacy he leave us, that which will likely mean the most to the people of America reflects this characteristic. There will finally be a National Peace Academy because of JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

For once and for all, there will be an institution that teaches, researches, and promulgates the need for qualities which resolve conflicts and prevent them. An institution that will genuinely promote peace and good will among humanity. These are the qualities of a gentleman. Indeed, they are the qualities of the truest gentleman in our midst, the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH. He can leave the Senate, knowing that his mark having become the standard, all of us will always have something for which we can strive.●

SENATOR JOHN TOWER

● Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, when I first met Senator JOHN TOWER at the University of Alaska in Fairbanks, my hosts said, "We want you to meet JOHN, the TOWER of Texas." That introduction has proved to be correct time and again.

As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator TOWER has been a tower of strength here in the Senate. Many times he has stood alone on this floor and successfully challenged the Senate to fulfill its constitutional duty to provide for the common defense.

As chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I have worked closely with JOHN TOWER over the past 4 years, and I know his record. JOHN is second to none in his commitment to the protection of our Nation and the rest of the free world. Without his leadership, the current modernization of our Armed Forces would not have been initiated. When the records of the past two decades are reviewed by historians, they will document the dramatic difference JOHN has made in the ability of the United States to defend itself.

The Senate will greatly miss JOHN TOWER's insights into the needs and capabilities of our defense forces, but I know he will continue to be an outspoken advocate for a strong national defense. Catherine and I wish JOHN and his wife Lilla the best in their future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN TOWER

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the end of this session marks the departure of JOHN TOWER from the Senate, and I want to take this occasion to note his many accomplishments as a Member of this body since 1961 and as a leading force on the Senate Armed Services Committee from the day he joined the committee in 1965.

JOHN TOWER and I have had our differences over the years, but I have come to know him as a tireless and forceful advocate for America's national defense. His knowledge of the myriad, complex defense issues facing the country in unsurpassed. His training at the London School of Economics and as a college professor gave him a unique background of insight, experience and debating skills to tackle the difficult problems of American security in our changing modern world.

In my own service in the Senate over the past two decades, I was impressed every year by his mastery of the issues and his skill in presenting them on the Senate floor. And since I joined the Armed Services Committee 2 years ago, I have been equally impressed by his skillful leadership in handling the challenging business of our committee.

Though we have disagreed on many things, one vital area of fundamental agreement stands out; JOHN TOWER's unyielding commitment to the security of America, to the strength of our Armed Forces, and to the well-being of the dedicated men and women who serve in those forces. They are the true backbone of our national security and for 24 productive years, they have had a magnificent champion in Senator JOHN TOWER.●

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

● Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, other Senators have enumerated Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH's many legislative achievements. I want to make certain the RECORD reflects the personal affection members of the Senate have for Senator RANDOLPH. Throughout his years in this body, he has gone out of his way to be a good friend to all of his colleagues.

Few know of Senator RANDOLPH's efforts as a recruiting officer for the Senate prayer meetings. And even fewer know of the many times he comforted and consoled other Members of the Senate when they were faced with trouble and despair. JENNINGS' actions, however, live on in the hearts of those whom he helped.

Many of my memories of JENNINGS focus on the time we have spent together in the Senate gym. There, we have discussed life and death, victory and defeat, politics and and religion, and the role of the Senate in the life of the Nation. Through his comments

31-059 O-87-23 (Pt. 23)

and observations, JENNINGS has passed on to a new generation of Senators his vision of our country's destiny.

Thoughout his decades of public service in Washington, JENNINGS has retained a youthful enthusiasm for change and innovation. He and I were and are members of opposing political parties, but we have embraced similar proposals to improve air transportation in our country.

JENNINGS, we all are sorry to see the Randolph era in the Senate come to an end, but we look forward to seeing you here on the floor and in the gym in the years ahead. You must continue to pass on to new Senators the wisdom you have acquired during your many years of service to the people of West Virginia.●

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR TOWER

● Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is an honor for me to pay tribute and to give personal thanks to Senator JOHN TOWER of Texas upon his retirement from the Senate.

During my first term in office, it has been a distinct pleasure for me to work along side of my friend, JOHN TOWER. I was especially glad to be able to work with JOHN TOWER on the Senate Armed Services Committee, first as a member of the minority, and then with JOHN as the committee chairman.

Working with someone is made easier when you share common positions and goals. JOHN and I believed that a strong, effective, and efficient defense posture was essential to protect our national security. JOHN TOWER worked long and hard to provide for a strong defense. The long hours spent in committee deliberations, floor debate, and conferences with the House never swayed JOHN from his beliefs. This type of devotion to duty and purpose has a big effect on the recent reversing of the readiness trends of the U.S. military forces.

Senator TOWER will be missed in the Senate in the future. Someone will have some big shoes to fill to keep the President's defense plan for improving military readiness, while modernizing our forces moving in the Senate and the Congress.

The tough, intelligent, and effective manner Senator TOWER handled the defense issues gained not only my respect, and the respect of fellow Senators, but respect here in the United States and overseas. I hope this unique talent will be used in some service to our country in the immediate future.

My service with JOHN TOWER has been beneficial to me personally also. I feel JOHN was an excellent teacher, and I was provided outstanding guidance. This guidance will assist me in the future when facing the problems of defense and national security.

I wish Senator TOWER the very best in his future endeavors, and hope that we will work together again soon.●

SENATOR PAUL TSONGAS

● Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I wish my friend Senator PAUL TSONGAS well as he leaves the Senate. In my home, we know PAUL best as the daddy of Molly, who was born the same summer as our daughter Lily. In the Senate, I know PAUL best as an articulate opponent of my position on the management of Federal lands in Alaska. PAUL will long be remembered in my home State for his fairness and honesty in dealing with this controversial issue.

In 1979, PAUL came to my home to discuss the Alaska lands bill. He was frank and concise. Rather than trying to stonewall us, he suggested reasonable compromises. In the course of the lands bill debate, which consumed most of my time for the next 2 years, I had many discussions off the floor with PAUL and our late friend and colleague, Senator Scoop Jackson. Scoop said many times that PAUL would always keep his word, and he was right.

PAUL, Catherine, Lily, and I wish you, Niki, Molly, Katina, and Ashley the very best in the years ahead. And we hope that you will visit us in Alaska to see the land that you came to know so well during your service in the Senate.●

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR PAUL TSONGAS

● Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, all of us who have served with Senator PAUL TSONGAS can agree that he is one of the most able Senators in this body. In the span of a single term he has had a substantial impact on the deliberations of the most important questions of our day.

He has fearlessly stood for his convictions and ably debated the issues. He has thus contributed a great deal to the policy processes of this body and challenged and stimulated the thinking of all of his colleagues.

As Senator TSONGAS returns to private life, I join his many friends in congratulating him for his outstanding tenure in the U.S. Senate. We appreciate his service to the self-governmental system and wish a wonderful and promising future for him and all best wishes.●

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

● Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I wish to add my tribute to those of my colleagues to Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH on the occasion of his retirement from the U.S. Senate. Senator RANDOLPH has been an inspiration to all of us during his long commitment to serve the people of West Virginia and the Nation. I am certain that the people of West Virginia have elected to keep JENNINGS RANDOLPH in the U.S. Senate for over a quarter of a century because they know that he is a man of the people who has studiously maintained their link to the highest representative body in the land.

Senator RANDOLPH's faith in this country and its people have been reflected in his dedicated service in this body and he has never ceased to do everything in his power to improve the Senate as an instrument of the people in forging their own destiny. I count it a privilege to have served with Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH and I congratulate him on a long and distinguished career of public service.●

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHN TOWER

● Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I am sure that all of the people who have served in the U.S. Senate down through the two centuries of its existence have wanted to help our country and to have a major impact on its direction and policies. One who has succeeded in that purpose is JOHN TOWER.

Senator TOWER has established himself as one of our country's chief proponents of the concept of "freedom through strength" and one of the pivotal leaders in rebuilding our defense capability. JOHN TOWER has never wavered from a conviction that America is the bastion of freedom in a world populated by regimes that do not share our commitment to liberty. His conviction has been translated into both renewed military power and a rebirth in our confidence to defend ourselves and the values we cherish in this beloved country.

As Senator TOWER prepares to return to other activities, however, all of us realize that his impact has extended across the spectrum of American thought. He has been one of the formative leaders in the long-term effort to rein in the expanding powers of the Federal Government and to rebuild a society with less tax and regulatory burden on the individual. That movement has now gained great breadth and depth, and its importance is being realized by a growing majority of our population. We owe a debt to JOHN TOWER for his commitment and tenacity to a change in direction for our country that will bring renewed opportunity for generations to come.

I congratulate Senator TOWER on a distinguished career and urge that he continue to exert his considerable leadership powers in other endeavors to the lasting benefit of our Nation.●

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HOWARD BAKER

● Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, Gene Millikin, one of Colorado's most distinguished Senators, once said:

The qualities that make a man respected in the U.S. Senate are the same qualities that make him respected up and down the main street of his own home town.

HOWARD BAKER, as much as any Senator I have ever known, has demonstrated the truth of that statement throughout his distinguished career in the U.S. Senate. The qualities of integrity, leadership, vision, dedication to principle, sensitivity, respect for others, fairness, humility, and good humor are attributes that we admire, and we find them in abundance in the person of HOWARD BAKER.

To say that we will miss HOWARD BAKER is totally inadequate to express the consequence of his retirement from this body. His presence will be sorely missed because he is a man with great leadership talents who loves the Senate and knows how it works. As all of us who serve here know, this great deliberative body is a complex institution that relies heavily on leaders who know the Senate's history, its rules, its precedents and its subtleties who can lead it to perform its historic role in our system of checks and balances. This is not the kind of knowledge that comes quickly and easily, so the extensive understanding and deep appreciation of the Senate that HOWARD BAKER carries with him will not be readily replaced.

More fundamental, however, is HOWARD BAKER's deep an abiding faith in this country and his vision for its future that will be most deeply missed in the U.S. Senate. It is this quality, more than any other, that we seek in selecting individuals for the key leadership positions in our self-governmental system and HOWARD BAKER's vision and faith have established him as one of the great majority leaders of the U.S. Senate.

I want to join my colleagues in wishing HOWARD BAKER the best in his future endeavors. We know that his service to this great country will continue and that we will all be better off because of his devotion to our self-governmental system. HOWARD BAKER has strengthened the quality of our democracy and has enriched the proud tradition of the U.S. Senate.●

TRIBUTE TO PAUL TSONGAS

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to one of the Senate's finer members, who will not be returning. PAUL TSONGAS decided to retire from the Senate after just one term, to return to Massachusetts with his wife and children. His decision, a personal one, has enhanced the respect I am sure we all have for PAUL.

Although our paths crossed here for only 2 years, I had an opportunity to come know and highly regard the junior Senator from Massachusetts. He has applied a deep understanding and interest in foreign affairs, particularly the affairs of the Third World, in pursuit of a more effective, humane and just foreign policy for our Nation. His insight about the complex situation in Central America has been instructive to me and the entire Senate.

PAUL has also distinguished himself in seeking to chart a new path for securing continued economic growth and prosperity in Massachusetts and the United States. Massachusetts, like my own State of New Jersey, has enjoyed the growth of new industries and new employment, based in the new technologies, while coping with the gradual decline of older industries and the communities that depend on them. PAUL's service to the renewal of Lowell, MA, is a lasting contribution to his constituents. His understanding of what is needed to nurture our technology-based industries and to promote tomorrow's invention, has been an asset in the Senate. His new ideas, and fresh approach, will be missed.

Mr. President, I am consoled by the thought that while PAUL TSONGAS is retiring from the Senate, he will not retire from the debate about the important issues facing us all. His commitment and his values, will, I trust, still serve the cause of peace and justice. His insights and wisdom will, I hope, still contribute to the thinking in this great body.●

TRIBUTE TO HOWARD BAKER

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, when the Senate returns for the 99th Congress, there will be a new majority leader. Whoever that may be, he will have to fill big shoes. HOWARD BAKER has earned the admiration of Members of both sides of the aisle for his fairness, his equanimity, and his commitment to his word.

Unlike many of my colleagues, I have served only with HOWARD BAKER as majority leader. While I yearn for the day when my own party resumes the leadership of the Senate, HOWARD BAKER has evinced a respect for this body, its history, and its tradition that has been a lesson to new Members. The Senate can be a fractious body of 100 individuals with diverse views. Without the kind of leadership that HOWARD BAKER has provided, this would have been a much less productive place. Without his efforts to accommodate the needs of so many Members, without his deep sense of comity, this would have been a much less pleasant place.

I am pleased to count HOWARD BAKER among the friends I have made in this body. I wish HOWARD the best. His service to the Senate will be long remembered.●

RECESS UNTIL 1:30 P.M.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess until 1:30 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:12 p.m., recessed until 1:30 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. DANFORTH].

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have indicated through staff and the minority leader that I intend now to suggest the absence of a quorum, which will be a live quorum. If a quorum is not present, I anticipate a motion to instruct the Sergeant at Arms, on which there will be a rollcall vote.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

[Quorum No. 19 Leg.]

Baker	Dodd	Gorton
Burdick	Domenici	Hecht
Byrd	Evans	Stafford
Danforth	Ford	
DeConcini	Glenn	

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

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be instructed to request the presence of absent Senators, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee. They yeas and nays were ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ARMSTRONG], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Florida [Mrs. HAWKINS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. JEPSEN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. MATTINGLY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MCCLURE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS],

and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP] are necessarily absent.

Mr. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. CHILES], the Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. EAGLETON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUDDLESTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 291 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Abdnor	Ford	Nickles
Baker	Garn	Packwood
Baucus	Glenn	Pell
Bentsen	Gorton	Pressler
Biden	Hatch	Randolph
Boschwitz	Hecht	Riegle
Burdick	Heinz	Roth
Byrd	Humphrey	Rudman
Chafee	Inouye	Sasser
Cochran	Johnston	Simpson
Cohen	Kassebaum	Specter
Danforth	Kasten	Stafford
DeConcini	Laxalt	Stevens
Denton	Leahy	Thurmond
Dodd	Lugar	Tower
Dole	Mathias	Trible
Domenici	Matsunaga	Tsongas
Durenberger	Melcher	Warner
East	Mitchell	Wilson
Evans	Moynihan	Zorinsky
Exon	Murkowski	

NAYS—4

Nunn	Quayle
Proxmire	Weicker

NOT VOTING—34

Andrews	Grassley	Long
Armstrong	Hart	Mattingly
Bingaman	Hatfield	McClure
Boren	Hawkins	Metzenbaum
Bradley	Heflin	Percy
Bumpers	Helms	Pryor
Chiles	Hollings	Sarbanes
Cranston	Huddleston	Stennis
D'Amato	Jepsen	Symms
Dixon	Kennedy	Wallop
Eagleton	Lautenberg	
Goldwater	Levin	

So the motion was agreed to.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT INCREASE

The Senate resumed consideration of House Joint Resolution 654.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is House Joint Resolution 654.

The question is on agreeing to the joint resolution.

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

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ARMSTRONG], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Florida [Mrs. HAWKINS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. JEPSEN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. MATTINGLY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MCCLURE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. MATTINGLY] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY].

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS].

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], the Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. EAGLETON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUDDLESTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN].

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

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

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 292 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Abdnor	Garn	Rudman
Baker	Gorton	Simpson
Boschwitz	Hatch	Specter
Chafee	Hecht	Stafford
Cochran	Heinz	Stevens
Cohen	Laxalt	Thurmond
Danforth	Lugar	Tower
Denton	Mathias	Trible
Dole	Murkowski	Warner
Domenici	Packwood	Weicker
Durenberger	Pressler	Wilson
East	Quayle	
Evans	Roth	

NAYS—30

Baucus	Glenn	Moynihan
Bentsen	Humphrey	Nickles
Biden	Inouye	Nunn
Burdick	Johnston	Pell
Byrd	Kassebaum	Proxmire
Chiles	Kasten	Randolph
DeConcini	Leahy	Riegle
Dodd	Matsunaga	Sasser
Exon	Melcher	Tsongas
Ford	Mitchell	Zorinsky

NOT VOTING—33

Andrews	Grassley	Levin
Armstrong	Hart	Long
Bingaman	Hatfield	Mattingly
Boren	Hawkins	McClure
Bradley	Heflin	Metzenbaum
Bumpers	Helms	Percy
Cranston	Hollings	Pryor
D'Amato	Huddleston	Sarbanes
Dixon	Jepsen	Stennis
Eagleton	Kennedy	Symms
Goldwater	Lautenberg	Wallop

So the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 654) was passed.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, this vote is not subject to reconsideration. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote having been reversed, it is subject to reconsideration.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business until not past the hour of 2:30 p.m., under the same terms and conditions. May I say to my colleagues that there will be no more votes today. There will be no more votes this session. And there will be no more votes in my career. [Applause, and Senators rising.]

The MAJORITY LEADER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, for a brief moment I thought that was for me. But I realize it was for sine die adjournment. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. BAKER. Yes; I yield.

THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the majority leader's word is his bond. I have always found that, if he said this would happen or that will not happen, I could with confidence, walk off the floor and know that he would keep his word. He has said that this is the last vote today, that this is the last vote of the session, and that this is the last vote of his career. I know he means that. But I hope that some day he will come back to the Senate Chamber and join those of us who will then be in the majority. [Laughter.]

May I say one other thing? I was a little bit taken aback when Senator BAKER made a proposition to me this morning saying, "I will give you your room back if you will vote with us." [Laughter.]

BIDDING A FOND FAREWELL TO SENATOR HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have a few resolutions that will not take long. I will send them to the desk. I have four of them. I ask the clerk to report.

The resolution (S. Res. 481) was read as follows:

Whereas, the end of the 98th Congress represents the completion of his four years of service as Majority Leader of the United States Senate; and

Whereas, as Majority Leader, Howard H. Baker, Jr., has unfailingly performed his duties with humor, patience, and diligence in allowing the Senate to express its will on the important issues of the day; and

Whereas, in the long tradition of leaders of the Senate, the service to the Senate and the Nation by Howard H. Baker, Jr., will stand as a benchmark for future leaders; and

Whereas, the trust and respect which Senators feel toward Howard H. Baker, Jr., is a testament to his humanity, his empathy for his fellow Senators, and his good will which he displays toward all those around him; Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate bids a fond farewell to Howard H. Baker, Jr., knowing that to have served with him will be a continuing source of pride for the Senate as a whole, and the Senate wishes to thank Howard H. Baker, Jr., the distinguished Majority Leader, for his outstanding service to the Republic.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this resolution extols the virtues of the majority leader, and the great work he has done here. I move its passage.

The resolution (S. Res. 481) was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

COMMENDATION OF THE EXTRAORDINARILY COOPERATIVE CONDUCT OF THE DISTINGUISHED MINORITY LEADER

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I send a resolution concerning the minority leader to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 482) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate extends its thanks to the distinguished Minority Leader, the Senator from West Virginia, the Honorable Robert Carlyle Byrd. The extremely cooperative and able manner in which the minority leader has approached his duties as protector of the rights of the minority has been duly noted and the Senate commends the minority leader for his understanding, his devotion to the rules of the Senate, and for his outstanding leadership.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this resolution commends the minority leader for the great work he has done for the Senate, and I ask that it be passed at this time.

The resolution (S. Res. 482) was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

COMMENDATION OF WILLIAM F. HILDENBRAND

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I now send to the desk a resolution concerning Mr. William F. Hildenbrand, who is retiring as Secretary of the Senate, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 483) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to as follows:

Whereas, upon the completion of the 98th Congress, William F. Hildenbrand will have fulfilled four years of service as the Secretary of the United States Senate; and

Whereas, as an elected officer of the Senate, both as Secretary for the Minority and Secretary of the Senate, the said William F. Hildenbrand has performed the duties and discharged the responsibilities of his offices with unfailing dedication and a high degree of efficiency; and

Whereas, the said William F. Hildenbrand has upheld the high standards and traditions of the Office of Secretary of the Senate with abiding devotion; and

Whereas, he has gained the trust, confidence, and respect of his associates and the Members of the United States Senate; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes the notable contributions of William F. Hildenbrand to the Senate and to his Country and expresses to him its appreciation and gratitude for his long, faithful, and outstanding service.

COMMENDATION OF THE EXEMPLARY SERVICE OF THE PARTY SECRETARIES AND STAFFS, OTHER VARIOUS OFFICERS OF THE SENATE, AND THEIR STAFFS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk for myself, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. BYRD, commending the Secretary to the Majority, the Secretary to the Minority, their assistants, and other attachés in the Senate. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 484) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the exemplary and faithful service of the Secretary for the Majority, the Honorable Howard O. Greene, Jr.; Assistant Secretary for the Majority, John C. Tuck; Republican floor assistants Elizabeth B. Baldwin and Lynne Grant; the Secretary for the Minority, the Honorable Patrick J. Griffin; Assistant Secretary for the Minority, Patrick Hynes; Democratic floor assistants Abby Saffold, Charles Kinney, and Martin Paone; the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Honorable Robert B. Dove, and his assistants, Alan S. Frumin and Gail M. Cowper; the other various officers of the Senate and their respective staff members; and attachés, pages, and cloakroom staffs is deserving of the commendation and appreciation of the Senate. The able manner in which each of them has attended to their duties is a source of pride to the Senate as a whole, and the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to each of them.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move, en bloc, to reconsider the votes by which the Senate resolutions were agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, that is all of the resolutions.

I wish to thank the Senate for its consideration, and wish all the Senators a nice recess, and see those who will come back in January.

Again, I want to express my appreciation to the great majority leader, the great work he has done, and thank the able minority leader for the fine job he has done.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HOWARD BAKER

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, so many of us leave office by way of the box, either the ballot box or a coffin. When there are exceptions to this rule, usually we regret their departure.

In this regard, Mr. President, I would be remiss if I did not pay a final au revoir to the majority leader. In my association with the majority leader, I have always found him compassionate, fair, considerate, and always showing good sense. I particularly liked, admired, and benefited from his quality of compassion, a quality which I hope his successors may emulate. We will miss him a great deal.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. He has been a good friend, a distinguished colleague, and a fellow member on the Foreign Relations Committee. I am especially grateful for his remarks, coming as they do at this time.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there is one other matter that addresses itself to the Senate, not to the House of Representatives.

I understand this matter has been cleared on both sides, Mr. President. I refer to Calendar No. 39 on the Executive Calendar, the Convention Relating to the Distribution of Programme-Carrying Signals Transmitted by Satellite.

If the minority leader does not object, I would like to proceed to that item.

Mr. BYRD. No objection, Mr. President.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE DISTRIBUTION OF PROGRAMME-CARRYING SIGNALS TRANSMITTED BY SATELLITE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of considering the Convention Relating to the Distribution of Programme-Carrying Signals Transmitted by Satellite.

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

Without objection, the convention will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention Relating to the Distribution of Programme-Carrying Signals Transmitted by Satellite, which was signed by the United States at the close of the Diplomatic Conference in Brussels on May 21, 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Treaty Document No. 98-31, the Convention Relating to the Distribution of Programme-Carrying Signals Transmitted by Satellite. (Putting the question.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

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

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now return to legislative session.

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

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HOWARD BAKER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, over these last days I have listened to the outpouring of genuine tribute to and regard for HOWARD BAKER. How extraordinarily well deserved it all is. Now we are hours away from the time when he will end his service as a Member and the majority leader of this body.

Recently I had the honor and privilege to join with some distinguished company—the President and other delightful people—in "roasting" HOWARD BAKER. There was present that night a great reservoir of good humor and good will—and deepest respect—and rich and rare affection for the retiring majority leader of the U.S. Senate.

Now, the serious impact of it all comes upon us. He can never be replaced. He is unique and extraordinary in every possible description one could confer. We shall miss him dearly. He leaves a void that will be tough to fill. If I personally could describe his tenure it would be in three words—patience, patience, and patience.

Mr. President, I have served as a majority leader and majority whip of a legislative body and I can only state that of all the leadership posts I have held or seen performed by others, I have never seen a more graceful, sincere, patient, caring, or appropriate carrying out of legislative duties. HOWARD BAKER is a class act. He is the glue and the grease that has kept us moving forward in a cohesive way.

It has been a rare treat and privilege for me to be able to share some of my time in the Senate with that remarkable individual. We have worked together, campaigned together, anguished together, legislated together, and put ourselves on the line together. And now he is leaving the U.S. Senate.

He cannot be replaced—or equaled—or compared. He is as unique as a rare gem in every sense—in every facet. His judgment, balance, extraordinary kindness, patience, his savvy, and his marvelous inner gyroscope that shows him the sense of right will carry him on to new challenges and new interests.

He is a man who has come to command my deepest admiration and respect.

My wife, Ann, and I have cherished our friendship with HOWARD and Joy. And here is an extraordinary and delightful woman. Joy has been at his side through his professional and political career and she, too, serves with grace and distinction. My father, Milward L. Simpson, served in this body with Joy's father, Everett Dirksen. They were great personal friends and Lou Ella and my mother enjoyed a lovely friendship.

It has been my rare privilege to sit at the chairman's meetings on Tuesday mornings at 11:45 and share in the achievements, the frustrations, and the deliberations that shape the legislative agenda in this place. Meeting the needs of the other 99 Members of the body has not just been an idle attempt—but a genuine and real effort on HOWARD's part. I really wonder sometimes if we all are aware of how very fortunate we have been to have his steady and guiding hand. We will feel it distinctly when he is absent from us.

So it is with a personal sense of sadness that I see HOWARD BAKER depart the U.S. Senate. Yet, I know that HOWARD will eagerly embrace new challenges and new opportunities—and because of him we shall all be the better for his honest and truly caring efforts in leading us in this body.

So, let me add my voice to the large and appreciative chorus—and express my deepest thanks for HOWARD's selfless and patient service to me, to this body, and to the Nation. We wish him all of the essence of the best in his future endeavors—whatever they may be.

God bless HOWARD and Joy BAKER. The world is better for them both.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, what a great honor and privilege to join with my colleagues in a tribute to one of the most remarkable men that I have known in the U.S. Senate—or outside of it. And that is our dear friend, JENNINGS RANDOLPH. It matters not who follows him here—Democrat or Republican—the vacancy will not be possible to fill. Other fine Senators

will come to this place to carve out their own niches and their own special places—both in the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee and in the Senate Chamber—but no one will ever replace JENNINGS RANDOLPH. His is a singular presence.

What has he done here? Only everything.

It has been my consistent joy and pleasure to come to know him ever better as we have served together. I serve with him on two committees—Veterans' Affairs and Environment and Public Works. There is not one person who has been more kind to me when I came to this curious arena than JENNINGS RANDOLPH. And he was always most gracious in introducing me to other Members of the Senate and he had a special remembrance and affection for my father, Milward L. Simpson, who served with JENNINGS in the early 1960's here in the U.S. Senate.

I had been here but a few weeks when one day JENNINGS said to me in his most genuine way, "ALAN, how would you like to go to Pittsburgh with me to appear before the Amen Corner Group? I allowed as to how I really didn't know the Amen Corner from hell's half acre but since he recommended it, I said I would go—besides that, I think both of us picked up about $250 apiece! Big bucks for me then. So off we went in a chartered plane and that was one of the most delightful days and evenings I have spent in many a time. He shared with me so much about himself—his early days in coaching and as an athletic director and his traveling the country over in the dead of winter with his football team and being in Wyoming and North Dakota and Montana. He told me of his days in West Virginia and his beloved Salem College, his school, his family, and of Mary and his two fine sons. We covered it all and shared some great stories—some a bit wilder than others and most all of them quite gentle and kindly uttered.

His has been a steady voice and one always heard on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Always reminding all of us to keep foremost a compassionate view of the individual veteran—to make certain that our hearts as well as our heads are used in our analytical powers.

He has given me remarkable counsel and advice as we deal with our Nation's veterans and especially the most seriously disabled veterans. Such advice is always in order from him. In JENNINGS it has always been offered with the warmth, wisdom, and dignity of the elder statesman and received by this chairman with the respect and appreciation accorded only to those who I most highly admire.

Of course, he is an original member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and has much more perspective to offer to us all and is ever more valuable to those of us who are junior Members as we seek to do our jobs properly.

Not once in my time as chairman have I known JENNINGS to act from base partisan motivation. Promoting needed legislation for disabled veterans has been one of his highest priorities. For it was he that sponsored the Randolph-Shepherd Act—along with innumerable other pieces of legislation addressing the needs of handicapped, the less fortunate, blind persons, and veterans.

He was the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on the Handicapped from 1972 to 1981—as we all well remember. Of course he works tirelessly as the ranking minority member on the full Committee on Environment and Public Works.

On the Veterans' Affairs Committee he has always urged attention to compensation rates for the most severely handicapped blinded veterans. In the compensation bill of 1982 and yet again in this year's bill the provisions which address the severely blinded veterans are really the result of JENNINGS' introduction, persistence and his skilled advocacy. He worked diligently with all of us to make certain that all members of the committee joined with him in the support of these measures—and while there were many adjustments made along the way—we always did so.

So here am I, a man with 6 years of duty behind me in the U.S. Senate paying tribute to a man who has given nearly 53 years of his lifetime to the Congress of the United States—and I say humbly and honestly to him that if he has had the same impact on his fellows as he has had on this junior Senator from Wyoming in just 6 years, then indeed his mark in this body will never be erased.

He is a man of wit, wisdom, intelligence, surging energy, moving compassion, righteous urging, earthy humor, gentleness, gentlemanlyness—a proud, patriotic, and remarkably genteel and effective colleague. I salute you, my good friend, you have been like a second father to me.

I will miss you greatly, God bless you, JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR PAUL TSONGAS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in these last hours we pay tribute to several of our colleagues who have voluntarily chosen not to pursue another Senate term. They are those who believe fully in the adage "yes, there is life after the Senate."

I want to share some thoughts and feelings with you with regard to PAUL TSONGAS. PAUL and I came to this body in the class of 1978. There are a rich and remarkable array of human beings in that class—11 Republicans and 9 Democrats—we came to enjoy each other's company greatly since indeed we comprised a new course of energy in the Senate since one-fifth of the body was brand spanking new.

All of us here remember our "classmates" who come in with us—except for our extraordinarily capable and delightful colleague from Washington who constituted the sole member of the class of 1983.

I early observed PAUL TSONGAS and what I saw was a serious and thoughtful man with a real sense of purpose and a sense of personal worth that was very obvious. I perceived him as being sharp, curious, bright-eyed, and thoroughly involved. I watched with interest as he published a book which sent a few rigors through members of the establishment. The revelations of that book have been absorbed into his party's activities and he described in that book some themes that put him well ahead of his time as a politician.

Then I heard him one morning at the Senate prayer breakfast group describe his life in the Senate and his observations about life, family, and love of fellowman. It was most moving. He is an authentic man. I watched him sink his teeth into the Alaska lands bill and when he came away from the lengthy debate he had spread before us a remarkable piece of legislation which made an honest attempt to strike a balance between the environmentalists and the developers in that extraordinary area of America. He did that with patience, good humor, and rare legislative skill.

We both do share a chuckle about a particular Cabinet Officer appointment during this administration where PAUL sought my advice and counsel. I remember his thoughtful questioning of me and his reluctance to support the person in the task and I remember the thoughtful line of inquiry and intensity of the interrogation as to an appointment that troubled him greatly. I also remember that I shared with him my own honest views of the potential appointee. After weighing the difficult issue so carefully—as is his stock and trade—PAUL finally determined to confirm the appointment. In PAUL's mind, my endorsement didn't quite match up to the performance of the Cabinet nominee and PAUL would always josh me on that one and as we would pass in the aisle or during rollcall vote, he would say "thanks, AL. You sure led me off a cliff on that one." It was a gutsy vote for him and he took some heavy flack on that one and handled it all with his usual great grace.

I shall miss him. I have also come to know his sensitive and beautiful wife, Nicki. Coming to know them, it is much easier to see the real reason for the decision on retirement. For he

would not want to abbreviate his ability to love and nurture those three sparkling children and to share in the rare privilege of parentage with Nicki. That investment will be the best one they will ever make—of either time, talent, or treasure. PAUL leaves an extraordinary record of achievement and prowess in this Senate, and he will leave a lovely legacy with his children. Fortunate are the children in America who receive such an unselfish gift from parents. PAUL and Nicki know exactly what they are doing in this decision—and the children will find out the full richness of it in their later years.

So, it has been a privilege to come to know PAUL. A great guy. To you I wish good health, good healing, and God bless.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHN TOWER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, what can I say about JOHN TOWER? He is a human dynamo. He keeps more spheres up in the air than a medieval juggler.

He is tough and fair and when you are in a scrap with him you should bring a light lunch—for it could last a while.

He works hard. He says what he feels and feels what he says. He means what he says and says what he means. He is enthusiastic, and yes, aggressive in the most positive sense of the word. He is not exactly a "wanda wallflower"!

He is tenacious—a real bulldog on the things that he deeply believes in. When he gives his personal commitment he gives his all. He is a real scrapper and when he is going to do something and tells you he is going to do it—count on it.

He was one of the real troopers in the U.S. Senate during the time when our party was in the minority and sometimes he was a minority within the minority. He and my father served together here in the then minority party. Without his determination, parliamentary savvy and competitiveness in those years there would have been some odd bits of legislation spread on the books that would have popped our eyes.

As a member of the majority party he assumed a new and increasing responsibility and he has handled it magnificently.

It is my personal privilege to sit each Tuesday morning at 11:45 with the standing committee chairmen of the U.S. Senate. Each of us report on the areas of jurisdiction and authority. JOHN has done an absolutely magnificent job with the Committee on Armed Services. He has been fair, precise, held the hearings required, presented his case and presented the other side—all the while keeping in mind the sense of the President's program of economic recovery and the real need for real money defense ticket items. He has done that with real legislative skill. That is not just my view. That is the view of many in Washington.

It has been a rare privilege to serve with him, to catch his enthusiasm, to know his marvelous sense of humor as he pursues the things near and dear to his heart, to watch his zeal and enthusiasm in which he pursues the things that he believes in.

JOHN and Lilla have been very kind to Ann and to me during our time in Washington. They have given quite freely of their time and their good counsel and their friendship to me when I was a freshman 6 years ago. I wish them Godspeed.

THE SECOND SESSION OF THE 98th CONGRESS: CONTRIBUTIONS OF SENATE DEMOCRATS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as the 2d session of the 98th Congress draws to a close, I would like to take a moment to review the contributions which Senate Democrats have made to the national debate on the critical issues facing our country and our world.

As the session began, the economy was in its second year of struggle to recover from the steepest economic downturn since the Great Depression of the 1930's. Although unemployment was declining, millions remained jobless. Today, 8.5 million people are still out of work, nearly half a million more than when President Reagan was elected. America's basic industries, long the envy of the world and the living symbol of our industrial might, were reeling from the combined effects of recession and the pressures of ever tougher international competition, rapid and destabilizing technological change, and the breakdown of a stable world currency system.

The administration's fiscal policies had burdened the country with the largest deficits in our Nation's history, and with a mounting pile of debt that has placed a mortgage on our children's future. The deficits had pushed real interest rates to record levels and keeps them there today. High interest rates have helped to create a dollar that is grossly overvalued, opening U.S. markets to a floodtide of cheap foreign imports and crippling the ability of American goods to compete in international markets. The trade deficit with our trading partners has broken one record after another. It is now expected to virtually double in 1984, which translates into a loss of 3 million American jobs.

When this session convened, our Nation's debt stood at $1.433 trillion. Today, as we prepare to adjourn, the debt stands at $1.573 trillion, an increase of $140 billion in just over 9 months. If the Government continues to increase its debt at this rate, by the end of this decade we will have a debt over $3 trillion, more than three times what the debt was in 1980. This year, the administration will spend 37 cents of every dollar collected in individual income taxes just to pay the net interest cost on the debt.

Senate Democrats have done their part to face these issues head on, by proposing a host of concrete policy alternatives designed to reduce the deficit, to lead our Nation back to economic preeminence in the world and to assure that in the future, America will remain second to none. In February of 1983, I asked Senator EDWARD KENNEDY to chair a task force of Senate Democrats to look beyond the short-run business cycle to focus on the country's long-range economic problems. The task force met regularly over a period of 9 months before presenting its report to the full conference of Democratic Senators. The Democratic Conference unanimously endorsed the proposals it contained. A steering group of Democractic Senators under the leadership of Senators CARL LEVIN, TOM EAGLETON, and TED KENNEDY oversaw the drafting of legislation embodying the Conference proposal, which was introduced as the Economic Cooperation and Competitiveness Act of 1984, on June 27, 1984. The legislation outlines a comprehensive approach to tackling the job of modernizing America's industries and restoring our competitive edge in the world. Key provisions include a tripartite Council on Economic Cooperation and Competitiveness composed of business, labor, and government representatives; an aggressive trade policy to open new markets and assure fair treatment from our trading partners; adjustment assistance for individuals and communities to help them respond to rapidly changing economic circumstances; and increased emphasis on education, training, and research and development.

Senate Democrats have also offered their own prescriptions for bringing the Federal deficits under control. In February of 1984, President Reagan submitted a budget request to the Congress which contained a deficit next year of $197 billion, reaching $248 billion by 1989. It was a budget that was met with immediate and nearly unanimous bipartisan rejection. Faced with this crisis of confidence in its fiscal policy, the administration resorted to a series of closed meetings designed to fashion a more acceptable alternative. However, the administration insisted that the effort be limited to a downpayment on the deficit, ruling out Democratic proposals to double the amount of deficit reduction that the administration has set as its

target. While Democrats initially were invited to participate in these meetings, White House representatives quickly made clear that the administration was not prepared to meet them halfway. In the end, closed door meetings from which Democrats were excluded produced a new budget proposal which was unveiled with much fanfare and dubbed the "Rose Garden" deficit plan.

That plan, however, would have actually resulted not in lower deficits, but in higher deficits each year. Rather than lend support to such a proposal, Senate Democrats, under the leadership of Senator CHILES, produced a budget plan of their own, which would have cut the deficit by $200 billion and which, unlike the administration plan, would have produced declining, rather than increasing, deficits in future years. Further, the Chiles proposal reflected a different set of priorities than the plan supported by the majority, containing fewer cuts in vital programs such as medicare and a more restrained and affordable rate of increase in the Pentagon budget. The proposal failed on a near party line vote.

In addition to the Chiles proposal, Senate Democrats worked together to modify the budget resolution and Deficit Reduction Act to protect Medicare beneficiaries from deep cuts that would have increased their out-of-pocket medical expenses and to assure that Congress would have sufficient flexibility within overall spending limits to shift funds between the Pentagon budget and domestic programs.

While much of the year was devoted to the intense debate over the administration's fiscal policy and spending priorities, Senate Democrats were also active on a host of other important fronts. Senate Democrats fought to open a seat on the Federal Reserve Board to a governor with experience in small business or agriculture. They worked to extend the Superfund Program to clean up the hundreds of toxic waste sites which pose the greatest threat to the health and safety of our citizens.

And Senate Democrats were at the forefront of efforts to overturn the Supreme Court's decision in the Grove City case, which limited the scope and effectiveness of the Title IX Program, the landmark legislation which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in educational institutions, and which has made such a signal contribution to the impressive victories of young American women athletes at the recent Olympic games. The Court decision in Grove City threatens to cripple not only title IX, but also three other vital statutes which forbid discrimination in American life: The Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, which forbids discrimination against handicapped Americans. Legislation to reverse Grove City and return the law to its status quo ante was killed on a party-line vote in the final days of this session, despite months of good-faith effort to reach a compromise with the opponents of this critically important legislation.

The major, comprehensive anticrime measure which passed the Senate on October 4, 1984, contains almost all the elements of the Democratic crime package which Senate Democrats first offered during the 97th Congress. It provides for stiffer criminal sentences, pretrial detention of dangerous criminal defendants, and a whole host of other tough anticrime measures. Our initiative on crime has had a long and arduous path. The first time our crime proposals were enacted by the Congress, the bill which contained them was vetoed by the President, primarily because he did not want to create the Cabinet-level drug czar which we thought was necessary to run a truly effective and coordinated effort to attack the massive problem of illegal narcotics traffic. Our proposals were again contained in the legislation which recently passed the Senate, and if and when the President signs the continuing resolution for fiscal year 1985, our proposals will finally become law.

The minority has supported a vigorous national security program and a strong, appropriate, defense spending level. At the same time, they have made major efforts to attack waste and abuse of the taxpayer's dollar, and focused on promoting those weapons systems which enhance the use of America's technological edge and America's traditional policy of deterrence. These attempts have had considerable success even in the face of stubborn opposition by the administration. Lastly, Senate Democrats have been concerned about the readiness of our conventional forces, particularly in the European theatre. In this case, the administration has thwarted efforts to increase the level of burden sharing in the Alliance and have frustrated attempts to reorient the administration's priorities away from overspending on redundant strategic nuclear systems.

In the conduct of American foreign policy, Democrats have insisted on a coherent and consistent approach worthy of the Nation that leads the free world. Democrats offered legislation to clarify America's role in Lebanon and define objectives in Central America. But the administration opposed these initiatives, and we were left with tragedy in Lebanon and a dangerous uncertainty in Central America.

Mr. President, in my view, this Congress has failed to address many of the pressing issues before the Nation. When compared to its immediate predecessors, it stacks up poorly.

A statistical analysis of this session and last with the 95th and 96th Congresses bears out the truth of this charge.

From 1981 to 1984, the Senate passed 45 percent fewer major bills than in the previous 4 years. In fact, in no other Presidential election year in the last 20 years did the Senate pass so few bills. Twenty-five percent fewer laws were enacted during the last 4 years than the preceding 4. At the same time, the percentage of public laws enacted which were of a nonsubstantive or administrative nature increased from only 17 percent in 1977 to a whopping 64 percent in 1984.

While the President often blames Congress for the record deficits and a myriad of other problems, he has veoted very few bills compared to other Presidents. Only President Kennedy, who served 3 years and with a Democratic House and Senate, vetoed fewer bills. One has to go back to President Harding for a President who used his veto authority even less.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire statistical analysis which I have only highlighted be inserted into the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BYRD. I further ask unanimous consent that my entire statement and insertions be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Let me turn now to a more detailed discussion of Democratic initiatives during the last year.

INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY

On June 27, 1984, a number of Democrats introduced the Economic Cooperation and Competitiveness Act of 1984. As I indicated earlier, the legislation was the product of a Senate Democratic conference task force that had spent months in crafting a series of proposals that will help foster long-term growth and allow America to move into the future with a highly diversified, internationally competitive industrial base. The legislation was preceded by a Senate Democratic conference publication—"Job for the Future"—that detailed the competitive challenge facing America and developed a comprehensive policy to meet it.

The American economy is now closely tied to a world economy that has become more volatile and more competitive over the last 10 years. American involvement with world markets is not just a question of imported oil or other raw materials. In most years, one in three acres is planted for overseas markets and one in six industrial jobs depends on exports. There was a

time when American technology and productivity kept most of the world at bay. No longer. The bulk of American manufacturers face stiff foreign competition for domestic as well as international markets.

The Reagan administration has done nothing to meet the growing challenge of foreign competition—in fact it has made things worse. Huge budget deficits and high real interest rates have combined to create a dollar that is no longer competitive. At the same time, high real interest rates have slowed recovery overseas and exacerbated the problems of the debt-burdened developing countries. The results can be read in the trade statistics. The Reagan administration has broken one trade deficit record after another. Last year it was a record $69 billion. Recent forecasts suggest the trade deficit will roughly double in 1984—reaching $130 billion by year end. If that deficit were eliminated by American goods, produced by American workers in American factories, the country would be richer by 3 million jobs.

Industry specific figures are even more shocking. Imports have made major inroads in one American market after another—shoes, textiles, consumer electronics, autos, steel—even semiconductors. Despite some recent gains, employment in the steel industry is 200,000 below its 1978 level; employment in the auto industry is 25 percent below the 1978 figure.

The President's refusal to accept the recommendation of the International Trade Commission concerning relief and adjustment for the steel industry is a recent example of continuing administration indifference and uncertainty. Without an attempt to deal with the trade crisis in a systematic way, the administration seems content to see U.S. industry lose its world-class status. More important, it seems content to stand on the sidelines while American jobs become our number one export.

The administration has done nothing to lay the basis for a longrun competitiveness policy. They have slashed the education and research budgets—jeopardizing America's ability to excel in the industries of the future. Adjustment programs for workers and communities have either been eliminated of severely cut back. The administration has essentially abandoned programs designed to get labor, management, and government pulling together to make a more competitive America.

The Economic Cooperation and Competitiveness Act will sharply reverse that course. The act proposes a Council on Economic Cooperation and Competitiveness to produce informed, coordinated, coherent policy choices and to encourage business/labor/Government cooperation. To lay a base for long-term competitiveness, the act proposes a number of investments in the future—in education and research. The act contains a number of proposals to aid the process of adjustment to rapidly changing technology and heightened foreign competition—training programs for small businesses, a modified unemployment insurance system to open up opportunities for training, and adjustment assistance to firms and communities. The act spells out an aggressive trade policy that will help open new markets overseas and, at the same, responds effectively to the unfair trade practices of our partners. Under the act, there would be a study of capital markets, support for State development finance agencies, and the consideration of a National Development Bank.

The Economic Cooperation and Competitiveness Act is a road map for an American future of long-term growth and broad based opportunity. It will help America to meet and beat the foreign competition, create a climate for investments in our future, and ease the painful adjustments to rapid economic change. It will be high on the Democratic agenda for the 99th Congress.

MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

In no issue area were Democrats more deeply involved during the past year than in attempting to protect the elderly from deep and damaging cuts in the Medicare Program. In his 1985 budget, the President proposed billions of dollars of Medicare cuts that would have made considerably more difficulty the plight of the elderly who now cannot afford their medical bills even with Medicare's help. The legislation on which this issue confronted the Senate was the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984. The Finance Committee included in that bill a number of the President's proposals—increasing health care costs for elderly and disabled beneficiaries by an estimated $9.9 billion over the next 5 years.

Senate Democrats led the effort to reduce these increased costs. On three separate votes Democratic efforts were defeated by the majority. In the first amendment, Senators KENNEDY and CRANSTON sought to eliminate both proposed increases in premiums paid to gain Medicare coverage of doctors' bills and proposed increases in the deductibles that Medicare beneficiaries must pay each year before Medicare will pay remaining bills. The same Senators sought to eliminate a delay in initial eligibility until the month following the month in which a person's 65th birthday falls—which would affect only sick and injured persons. When these two amendments were defeated, Senator BAUCUS proposed an amendment to eliminate the deductible increase and hold the premium increase to 1 year. This, too, was defeated.

Democrats also sought early in the year to minimize the continuing tragedy of the long-term unemployed by establishing a 2-year program of health insurance for the unemployed. The amendment, cosponsored by Senator RIEGLE, was defeated.

In August, Democrats sought again to help the victims of the recession, when Senator DIXON and others sought to add an additional $60 million to an appropriations bill for use in funding emergency food and shelters for the homeless and destitute. This time, Democrats prevailed and the additional help was made available.

One of the efforts during the past year of which I am proudest is the critical leadership and participation of Senate Democrats in efforts to reform the Social Security Disability Insurance Program. The administration used congressional directives to review the operations of this program as an excuse to indiscriminately purge the rolls of tens of thousands of disabled beneficiaries. Senator LEVIN, along with Senators SASSER, PRYOR, MOYNIHAN, and other Democrats, worked ceaselessly and diligently for over 2 years with several Senators from the other side of the aisle, including Senator COHEN, and Members of the House, to accomplish the reforms so desperately needed in this program. Just last month those efforts were successful—and we now can expect the program to be operated more humanely and carefully—for the benefit of the disabled as well as for the benefit of all taxpayers.

ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY

Senate Democrats can be proud of the record they have established in the 98th Congress in the areas of environmental protection and energy policy. This record includes support for a responsible approach to the development of the Nation's vast oil and gas resources and support for a balanced approach to the development of alternative energy supply technologies.

The extent of the threat to public health from exposure to improperly disposed of toxic wastes is only now becoming clear. The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that there may be as many as 22,000 sites located across the Nation where toxic wastes have been dumped. Of these, as many as 2,200 may be placed on the national priority list for sites which are of sufficient concern that they are considered a priority for clean up under the Superfund Program. Senate Democrats have been at the forefront of efforts to clean up toxic waste dumps.

Senate Democrats also supported an effort to correct abuses of Federal onshore leasing procedures. Democrats support efforts to improve the approach to leasing onshore lands for oil

and natural gas development. Senate Democrats voted to consider an amendment to the fiscal year 1985 continuing resolution which would have required the Secretary of the Interior to use competitive bidding for the leasing of such lands, rather than rely on a lottery system which is being abused at the expense of the Federal Government.

Democrats support a balanced approach to the development of alternative energy supply technologies. Democrats have resisted administration efforts to drastically reduce, and more narrowly focus, the budget for the Department of Energy's energy research and development programs. Senate Democrats voted to support consideration of an amendment to the fiscal year 1985 energy and water appropriations bill which increased funding for solar-thermal research, and to bring the Department of Energy's solar energy program up to a par with its recommended fiscal year 1984 funding levels.

Finally, I am proud that the Senate adopted my clean coal technology bill as an amendment to the continuing resolution. It provides $750 million for clean coal technology demonstration activities.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD APPOINTMENTS

Credit is the lifeline of most American businesses. That is particularly true of farmers and small business people. Local banks are the first source of credit for most farmers and small business people. Yet, local credit conditions are heavily influenced by the national monetary policy established by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Because credit is so vital to farming and small business, it is important that when policy is set, the special needs of farming and small business be taken into account. Too often, that is not the case. To make sure that the voices of the farmer and small business person are heard, Senator PRYOR proposed a sense of the Senate resolution expressing the view that the next appointee to the Federal Reserve Board be someone with either a farming or a small business background. Despite stiff opposition, Senate Democrats succeeded in attaching the Pryor amendment to the Export Administration Act.

Despite the clearest possible expression of senatorial sentiment, the President nominated Dr. Martha Seger, an academic with banking and regulatory experience, to the next seat on the Federal Reserve Board. What she clearly did not have was any special familiarity with either agriculture or small business. Again, the Senate Democrats took the lead in stressing the importance of making sure that the needs of farmers and small business people were taken into account when monetary policy was being made. Senators BAUCUS and PRYOR proposed an amendment to the second supplemental appropriations bill expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should withdraw the recess nomination of Dr. Martha Seger and, instead, nominate a person with a small business or agricultural background. Despite overwhelming Democratic support, the Baucus-Pryor amendment was defeated.

RECESS APPOINTMENTS

The recess appointment of Dr. Martha Seger to the Federal Reserve Board also raised the question of the President's use of the recess appointment power. Dr. Seger's nomination had been sent to the Senate Banking Committee in early June. Four days of hearings were held before her nomination was approved by the committee on a 10 to 8, straight party line vote. The Democratic members of the committee had raised serious questions about Dr. Seger's qualifications and the hearings had not put those questions to rest. There was every indication that her nomination would be subject to considerable debate on the Senate floor.

At that point, the Senate adjourned for the July 4 recess and the Democratic Convention. The next Monday, the President avoided the problem of lengthy Senate advice and uncertain consent by giving Dr. Seger a recess appointment to the Federal Reserve. Under the current interpretation of the recess appointment power, Dr. Seger will be able to serve until the end of the first session of the next Congress.

In my own view and the view of most Democrats, the President violated at least the spirit, if not the letter, of the recess appointment power. As a result, 41 Democrats joined me in introducing a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that no recess appointment should be made unless there had been a formal termination of a session of the Senate or there was a recess in excess of 30 days.

NUTRITION

The House has passed and sent to the Senate several important pieces of nutrition legislation, including reauthorization of the child nutrition programs, authorization of the Women, Infants, and Children Program, and legislation responding to the recommendations of the President's own Task Force on Hunger in the Child Nutrition and Food Stamp Programs. Two of these House bills have been placed on the calendar. Democratic Senators have introduced several pieces of legislation similar to these House bills, but none has been reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee.

Finally, under the leadership of the ranking Democrat on that committee, Senator DEE HUDDLESTON, a modest child nutrition authorization bill, concerning the WIC Program and four other nutrition programs, was reported and placed on the Senate Calendar. To date, however, the matter has unfortunately not been placed before the Senate for consideration.

EDUCATION

The most critical issue facing American education today is one of excellence. American education is simply not as good as it must be for the future of our country. Our once unchallenged preeminence in industry, science, technology, and commerce is being overtaken by our competitors throughout the world. This crisis in our public schools threatens American prosperity and security.

The Democrats in the Senate have attempted to respond to this challenge. The economic cooperation and competitiveness bill, developed by the Senate Democratic conference, included a number of specific proposals designed to upgrade the proficiency of our schools in teaching our children the math, science, computer, and foreign language skills they will need if America is to compete successfully in a rapidly changing world economic order. It also includes provisions designed to recognize and reward excellence, and to spur students to greater achievement. I am especially pleased that legislation to create a Federal Merit Scholarship Program, which I introduced on August 8, was passed by both the House and the Senate.

DEFENSE

Democrats in the Senate have attempted to bring major management reform to the Department of Defense through a series of initiatives. Those initiatives include the creation of an independent inspector General in DOD, the development of warranty requirements for new weapons systems, the establishment of a bureau of independent weapons testing and evaluation, and the creation of an effective office of Competition Advocate General in each of the services designed to increase competition in procurement contracting. In each case the administration and the Republicans in the Senate attempted to kill or water down the proposal. Fortunately, in all four situations, Democrats prevailed, and to the extent that the shameful level of waste has been revealed and reforms have begun, it has largely been to the credit of Senate Democrats.

Democrats attempted to influence our NATO allies to increase their level of defense spending to the 3-percent annual real growth level that they had promised, in order to spread the burden of the common defense. But the majority party in the Senate fought this attempt, and watered down this proposal by Senator NUNN. On June 20, 1984, the proposal was defeated, leaving the American taxpay-

ers to fill the gap left by the shortfall of allied spending levels.

Democrats support a strong strategic defense, including the MX missile in a survivable basing mode. The President, supported by the Republican majority in the Senate, supported an indefensible and nonsurvivable basing mode which weakens our strategic defense. The overwhelming majority of Democrats supported a Chiles amendment on June 14, 1984, to refocus our strategic missile efforts toward the more survivable Midgetman missile, but were defeated by the Republican majority.

Given the shocking level of waste in Pentagon programs, Senate Democrats supported a Dixon amendment on June 14, 1984, to recommit the defense authorization bill to committee to reduce the real growth level from 7 to 5 percent, which was judged to be a responsible level of real growth—at least double the efforts of our NATO allies. The Republican majority in the Senate defeated the proposal, signalling to the Pentagon that they were not prepared to make the Pentagon live within a responsible budget level and to exert greater efforts to remove waste from Pentagon programs.

The majority of Democrats support the reinstitution of the GI bill of education benefits, one of the most successful programs ever created in the Nation. A clear majority of Republican Senators defeated this proposal on June 12, 1984. Instead, the country must be satisfied with a limited test program of 2 years in duration.

Democrats support the most advanced technologies in our defense programs as the cutting edge of deterrence against the Soviet Union. The Pentagon has attempted to reduce the level of funding for the Stealth bomber program in order to shore up support for an expanded B-1 bomber, clearly a second-rate strategic system. My efforts to protect the Stealth bomber against such reductions were successful over a 2-year period. Democrats want an effective defense, based on the best in American technology, not a cosmetic program designed more for public relations than for deterrence and defense.

FOREIGN POLICY

There probably has not been an administration in modern-day history which has had such a dismal record in the area of foreign policy.

The only achievement to which this administration can point is the successful invasion of the tiny island of Grenada, populated by 110,000 inhabitants and defended by a less than imposing Cuban force and rag-tag elements of the Grenadian security forces. I supported the invasion of Grenada, but this was certainly no big task for a superpower. However, in assessing the more relevant and important foreign policy concerns which have traditionally preoccupied the energies of our policymakers, the picture is very bleak.

Because the administration's foreign policy has been at times overreactive, overly militaristic, uncoordinated, and oftentimes incomprehensible, the Senate minority party has attempted to compel the administration to explain its policies to the American people in a coherent fashion.

Lebanon stands out as a particular case in point. In August 1982, U.S. marines were sent to Lebanon as part of a multinational force to facilitate the withdrawal of the PLO from Beirut, a mission which most in the Congress believed was attainable and a mission with which most in the Congress agreed, due to its limited scope.

However, following the massacre of Palestinian refugees in the Shatila and Sabra refugee camps on the outskirts of Beirut, the marines returned to Beirut on September 25, 1982, as part of a multinational peacekeeping force. The American people were led to believe that this would be a temporary presence in order to allow time for the Lebanese Government to exercise control over the greater Beirut area.

In September 1983, the administration requested legislation authorizing the continued participation of the U.S. Marines in the multinational peacekeeping force for another 18 months—an open-ended authorization for a President who still had not defined the role and mission of our forces in Lebanon.

Subsequently, the Democrats offered an alternative to the authorization which would have required the President to report to the Congress, under the War Powers Resolution, the circumstances necessitating the introduction of U.S. troops into Lebanon; the constitutional and legislative authority for their introduction; and the estimated scope and duration of the hostilities or their involvement. In addition, the Democrats would have required the President to describe the specific goals of U.S. policy in Lebanon, the specific roles and missions of the U.S. forces in Lebanon, and the specific criteria that were being applied to determine when they had accomplished their roles and missions. If the reports were not forthcoming, then the President would have had to withdraw the marines within 60 days.

Needless to say, the Democratic alternative was defeated 55-45 on September 29, 1983, by a straight party line vote, thereby denying the American people the information that Senate Democrats were attempting to obtain from the President.

Less than a month later, on October 23, 1983, 241 American servicemen were killed in a terrorist bombing attack on the U.S. military headquarters at the Beirut Airport. On March 30, 1984, the President announced the U.S. role in the multinational force was being terminated. Warring intercommunal factions in Lebanon, along with Syria, had forced the withdrawal of the U.S. Marines.

In the closing days of this session, the Senate voted 57-42 against an amendment offered by Senator DANIEL INOUYE to prohibit any further aid going to the Contras fighting the Nicaraguan Government. Once again, most Democrats supported the amendment. The reasons were obvious. The administration's original justification for arming and training the Contras operating from Honduran soil against Nicaragua was to interdict the alleged arms flow going from Nicaragua to the guerrillas in El Salvador. The original plan called for the training of 1,500 Nicaraguan exiles.

However, the Contra army grew to 15,000 guerrillas and the administration's rationale for supporting this army began shifting like sand. From the original, narrowly-defined purpose of arms interdiction, the objective became one of harassing the Sandinistas in the hopes of convincing them to end their support for the Salvadoran insurgency.

Now, the administration argues that continued funding for the Contras is vital to keep pressure on Nicaragua to open up its internal political processes.

Therefore, most Democrats are raising the question as to what the administration's real goals are in Nicaragua. And since the answers have not been forthcoming and the rationale continues to shift, the only option left open to most of us on the Democratic side of the aisle is to cut the funding for this operation.

Efforts on the part of Democrats to bring foreign aid spending in line with the administration's cutback in domestic programs, have also failed. Last week, the Senate, largely on a party line vote, defeated 54-46 an amendment offered by Senator DAVID PRYOR, to cut $211.5 million from the $917 million in military assistance program moneys requested by the administration. The $917 million figure represented a 600-percent increase in the MAP Program from fiscal year 1981.

Twice the minority has attempted to go on record supporting the administration's concern for international terrorism and twice we have failed. On April 4, 1984, Senator DODD's amendment to prohibit the use of any funds, directly or indirectly, for planning, directing, executing, or supporting acts of terrorism against Nicaragua, was tabled 47-43, largely along party lines. A similar amendment was defeated 53-45 recently, once again largely along party lines.

Democrats also attempted to have the Senate go on record in opposition to U.S. Government support for any

individual or group in Central America which is known by our Government to have as one of its intentions the violent overthrow of any Central American government with which we have full diplomatic relations. Once again, this amendment to the supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1984 was tabled by a vote of 51-44, largely along party lines.

Largely because of the Lebanon experience, Senate Democrats have been concerned that the War Powers Resolution needs strengthening. Since U.S. involvement in Central America has been escalating, Senator LEAHY offered an amendment on April 4, 1984, which would have amended the War Powers Resolution as it affected El Salvador. The amendment would have prohibited the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces into or over El Salvador for combat purposes unless the President first obtained a declaration of war or a specific authorization for the use of U.S. combat forces in El Salvador. The amendment was tabled 59-36, largely along party lines.

Senate Democrats remain deeply concerned that our institutional responsibilities and prerogatives under the Constitution continues to be eroded by this administration. In an effort to begin reversing this trend, Senators SASSER, INOUYE, and BINGAMAN offered an amendment to the fiscal year 1984 supplemental appropriations placing a limitation on the use of military facilities in Honduras. Some eight airfields have been ordered constructed in Honduras, all without specific congressional authorization. These airfields are being paid for with tax dollars taken from the Department of Defense's operations and maintenance account, out of which we are supposed to pay for such readiness items as spare parts, ammunition and fuel.

Also, the Sasser-Inouye-Bingaman amendment would have limited the use of the so-called temporary facilities in Honduras, financed by the Pentagon, only to training exercises. In addition, the amendment would have prohibited any Pentagon funds from being used to convert a temporary facility into a permanent base unless specifically authorized by the Congress. This was a modest attempt to bring some integrity into the congressional exercise over the power of the purse. But once again, Democratic efforts were thwarted on a party line vote of 50-44.

Mr. President, the Democrats were selective in trying to raise the national debate on matters of vital concern to us all. We were not attempting to haggle over parochial concerns. We were demanding the institutional checks and balances so laboriously constructed by our Founding Fathers to assure that a national consensus would prevail in matters of war and peace.

We Democrats believe that we have a compact with the people of this Nation, and that compact is the Constitution. We Democrats are not prepared to rend the fabric of this compact by turning over to one man, even though he be a President, the sole responsibility for making war. The people of the United States, through their votes, invest in us a trust. Democrats believe that this trust manifests itself in the instrumentalities of governance and we believe that the principal instrument of governance is law—law which is promulgated for the common good. We have attempted to manifest this concern and commitment through the only mechanism we have available to us—the legislative process.

Mr. President, in these remarks I have attempted to outline the contributions which Senate Democrats have made to the national debate during the second session of the 98th Congress. No evaluation of this Congress, however, would be complete without looking as well at the first session of the 98th Congress. I ask unanimous consent that an edited and excerpted chapter from the Democratic Policy Committee publication "Democratic Alternatives: A Look at the Record, Part III," published in March 1984, be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 98TH CONGRESS

When the new Congress convened in January to listen to the President's State of the Union address, they heard President Reagan declare that "America is on the mend". Senate Democrats saw the picture differently. On January 27, in a speech on the Senate floor, the Senate Democratic Leader, Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia, presented his own view:

". . . the state of our nation's economy is deeply troubled. We are in the grips of the deepest and most severe recession since World War II. Twelve million of our citizens are jobless.

"Our nation desperately needs a change of course. We must act decisively to meet the human emergencies caused by this recession. We must put into place the fiscal and monetary policies which can turn the corner on this recession. And we must embark on a major cooperative effort by government, business, and labor to meet the longer term challenges posed by the profound structural changes sweeping our economy.

". . . the human side of the question is the one that, for me, is overriding.

"Every morning and night for the past several weeks, the nation's television viewers have been exposed to the true state of the Union. . . .

". . . There, we have seen the tents in Texas housing families who, two years ago, were members of the middle class in other cities in our country. There, we see the reports of the increases in suicides, in battered spouses, and in battered children. There, we see the interviews with the men and women bravely holding on—with their fingernails—to their dignity.

As Senators, we hear more of this. We meet the real State of the Union in our mail pile, on the street back home, and in visits with deeply concerned constituents . . .

. . . the nation may well be "on the mend," as the President said last night. But an Administration that still has not developed an understanding of what is fair and what is not, is not—I am sorry to say—likely to help it along the way very quickly.

Senator Byrd went on to promise that for their part, Senate Democrats would offer alternative solutions to the pressing problems confronting the nation. He said:

We will propose means of meeting the emergency human needs created by this recession and for turning around our troubled economy. We will offer proposals to help us meet the long-term economic challenges of international competition, regional economic imbalances, and the ever-accelerating pace of structural change in the American economy. We undertake this task in a constructive spirit. We welcome the opportunity to work with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and with the President to put in place the policies and programs which are so sorely needed to restore this nation's economic health.

This document records that we met the challenges laid down a year ago by Senator Byrd. In rollcall vote after rollcall vote, we offered measures designed to help put Americans back to work, to provide health insurance for the jobless and their families to extend unemployment benefits to help those temporarily unable to meet their mortgage payments, and to stop deep and unfair budget cuts in Medicare. In nearly every case, these proposals were voted down on party line votes.

There were, to be sure, a few instances of bipartisan compromise. A limited jobs bill was passed in the early days of the 98th Congress, although only after Democratic calls for a more adequate measure were rejected out of hand by the White House. A bipartisan Social Security package passed both Houses and was signed into law, successfully ending the two year struggle by Democrats to stop the Administration all-out assault on Social Security. Bipartisan cooperation also provided the margin of support needed to pass 10 of the 13 regular appropriations bills into law.

But these rays of bipartisanship were few and far between.

TAX FAIRNESS AND THE BUDGET

Bipartisan efforts to contol the hemorrhaging federal deficits—the legacy of the Majority's reckless policies of seemingly unlimited defense spending increases, enormous tax cuts for the rich, and the recession itself—proved fruitless in the face of the President's intransigent opposition to any modification of his program. As the deficit projections broke record after record, the President continued to insist that he would block any attempt to increase defense spending at a more moderate pace, or to limit the amount of the tax cut going to those in upper income brackets. Rather than modify the huge tax breaks going to the wealthy under his program, the President proposed a standby income tax surcharge and an excise tax on oil, a tax which would have meant higher home heating bills for millions of hard-pressed citizens.

In the final weeks before the third installment of the tax cut was scheduled to take effect (on July 1, 1983), Democrats under-

took a last ditch effort to restore a measure of fairness to the President's tax program, and to help staunch the flow of red ink from the Treasury by proposing to put a cap on the amount of the tax cut for higher income taxpayers. Under the bill, which passed the House on a party line vote, every taxpayer would still get a tax cut. Ninety percent would receive their scheduled tax cut in full. Only ten percent would have their tax cut capped—and even these taxpayers would still get approximately a $700 tax cut. The bill would have saved $38 billion over five years; eighty-nine percent of the revenue would have come from those earning over $50,000 a year. Despite the obvious fairness of the tax cap proposal—and the equally obvious need to stem the $200 billion deficit—the Democratic bill was overwhelmingly defeated.

THE BUDGET

In May, the Senate succeeded—just barely—in passing a compromise, bipartisan budget over the President's vehement objections. The budget passed only after six tries, however, and only after moderate Republican Senators defied the President, leader of their party, to vote for the compromise measure.

When the President's efforts to torpedo the budget itself failed, he turned his attention to preventing the legislation needed to implement the budget plan from being enacted. Repeated efforts to involve the President in devising a compromise budget plan were rebuffed by a President seemingly oblivious to the enormous deficits his policies had created. In frustration, the Senate voted down the debt ceiling bill—thereby threatening to cut off the government's borrowing authority—in an effort to send a message to the President that his continuing refusal to compromise was unacceptable. But the President remained steadfast in his intrasigent position. In the end, he was successful in stopping the Senate in its tracks. As the Congress adjourned *sine die*, the stalemate over the budget remained unbroken. The President remained on the sidelines throughout, unwilling to accept responsibility for the deficits—which even his own Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers admitted stemmed from the Administrations's policies—and equally unwilling to join in responsible, bipartisan efforts to bring the deficits under control.

WORKING FOR A BETTER ECONOMIC FUTURE

Democrats also kept their promise to address the nations's long-term structural economic problems. As the 98th Congress convened, the recovery from the country's worst recession in 50 years was still in its infancy, born only after the Federal Reserve turned away from the Administration's longstanding policy of tight money and high interest rates. It was an effort led by Senate Democrats to enact the Balanced Monetary Policy Act of 1982, requiring the Federal Reserve to bring interest rates back into their traditional relationship with inflation, which was largely responsible for the change. In February of 1983, Democratic Leader Robert C. Byrd established a task force, chaired by Senator Edward Kennedy and charged with recommending a program to increase the competitiveness of the American economy. The group met regularly for nine months and presented a far-reaching program of policy initiatives, entitled "Jobs for the Future," which was unanimously endorsed by the Senate Democratic Conference.

These proposals represent our alternative to the aimless drift of the President's policies, which promise to mortgage our economic future to an ever-increasing mountain of national debt. In just four short years, the Administration projects it will add $846 billion to the federal debt—more than the entire debt accumulated under all previous post-war administrations. By the end of President Reagan's first four years in office, it is estimated that the per capita debt—the debt for each man, woman and child in this nation—will reach $7,733. By 1987, the President's policies will cost $60 billion each year in increased interest payments alone.

After paying this enormous price, we might expect an improvement in our long term prospects. But no such improvement is in sight. Instead, our deficit with our trading partners continues to worsen, reaching $69 billion last year and projected to reach $100 billion this year. Deficits of $200 billion stretch, in OMB Director David Stockman's words, "as far as the eye can see." Slashed education and research budgets jeopardize our ability to excel in the industries of the future. Basic industries are being destroyed by our dramatically overvalued dollar and the absence of a coherent trade policy.

Programs designed to ease the adjustment and adaptation by our firms and communities to a rapidly changing economic world have been abandoned.

The program endorsed by the Democratic Caucus contains 22 specfic recommendations in six vital areas:

1. A Council on Economic Competitiveness and Cooperation to foster business/labor/government cooperation.

2. Programs to accelerate the development and commercialization of new products and processes, and to provide strong support for basic research.

3. Finacing programs to improve investment in plant and equipment.

4. Trade programs to support the marketing of domestically produced and internationally traded goods and services.

5. Adjustment programs to facilitate the adaptation of workers, communities and industries to changing markets and technologies.

6. Education and other human resources programs to increase the creativity and productivity of U.S. workers.

During this year, the Minority will work to enact these recommendations into law. In some areas we have already begun. In March of 1983, the House passed legislation to increase support for math and science education. The bill was never brought to the floor in the Senate. That same month, during the Senate debate over the budget, Democrats sought to restore funding for vital education programs which had been deeply cut during the past two years. Four times, their efforts were turned down until finally, on the fifth rollcall vote in two days, a compromise amendment was passed.

But when it came time to enact appropriations to give life to the budget plan, Democrats were unsuccessful in two separate votes in their attempts to increase funding for these programs. This despite the fact that 1983 was a year in which the crisis of confidence in our nation's public schools reached new heights, after several commissions and blue-ribbon panels issued alarming findings about the state of America's educational system. As President Reagan's own National Commission on Excellence in Education, put it bluntly:

"The educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a people."

PROTECTING AMERICA'S NATURAL HERITAGE

While much of the year was consumed by the debate over the budget and foreign policy, congressional Democrats also found themselves engaged in a running battle to protect America's precious natural heritage from the policies of EPA and James Watt's Interior Department. In late 1982, a concerned House launched an investigation into allegations that EPA had manipulated the "Superfund" toxic waste clean-up program to protect big business and advance the political interests of Republican candidates for office. The House hearings unearthed a scandal which ultimately led to the resignation of Anne Gorsuch Burford and 16 other EPA officials, and to the conviction of one of those officials, Rita Lavelle, on charges of perjury. The hearings were widely televised, and the spectacle which they spotlighted deeply shook the confidence of the American people that EPA would place the public's long-term health and safety above the pleas of special interests and big business.

Meanwhile, at the Interior Department, Secretary James Watt's stewardship of the nation's vast publicly-owned natural resources and lands proved equally controversial. The GAO charged Watt with selling coal leases at fire-sale rates. Because of his failure to respond to the congressional concern over his coal-leasing policies, the Minority in the Senate tried unsuccessfully to force a temporary suspension of further coal sales. Although the amendment failed in the face of Majority opposition, the suspension was adopted in the House and ultimately became law. Watt was forced to appoint a Commission to review the Department's policies on coal leasing. In announcing the Commission's appointment, Watt remarked that its membership was comprised of "a black, a woman, two Jews and a cripple." That remark was the last in a series of comments from James Watt that had outraged the American public and demonstrated a singular lack of fitness for public office. On September 23, 1983, Democratic Leader Robert C. Byrd introduced a resolution calling upon the President to ask for Mr. Watt's resignation. Rather than face losing a vote of confidence in the Senate, James Watt left office.

When the President nominated his close personal advisor William P. Clark, to become the new Secretary of the Interior, Senate Democrats offered an amendment to place the Senate on record that Watt's policies should be revised by the new Secretary to ensure that they conformed to congressional mandates and could regain the public's confidence. The amendment was rejected.

DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY

The United States since World War II traditionally has successfully captured the high ground on arms control, particularly as it relates to the nuclear arsenals of the superpowers. Throughout this period, Democrats have been instrumental in forging a bipartisan support for nuclear arms control agreements with the Soviet Union.

Beginning with President Dwight Eisenhower, whose Administration negotiated the Antarctic Treaty with the Soviet Union to create a nuclear-free and demilitarized zone in Antarctica, the policy of the United States has been fairly consistent.

The Eisenhower Administration also initiated discussions with the Soviet Union to control nuclear testing. The Kennedy Administration followed through on these ini-

tial discussions and the Limited Test Ban Treaty was ratified in 1963.

Under the Johnson Administration, the Outer Space Treaty banning weapons of mass destruction was ratified in 1968, and the Treaty creating a nuclear-free zone in Latin America was negotiated.

The Nixon Administration continued the tradition of three previous presidents with the Seabed Arms Control Treaty which was ratified in 1972, the ABM Treaty and the SALT I interim agreement in 1972, and the Agreement on Measures to Reduce the Risk of Outbreak of Nuclear War between the United States and the Soviet Union in 1971.

The Administration of Gerald Ford negotiated the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty and the Vladivostok Accords, the latter of which established a new framework which set the stage for SALT II negotiations.

The Carter Administration negotiated the SALT II Treaty, ratification of which was withheld in the aftermath of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

Throughout the post-World War II period, Democrats have been committed to policies directed at reducing the threat of nuclear war between the two superpowers limiting the nuclear arsenals of both sides, restricting the threat posed by nuclear testing, and discouraging the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries.

With the advent of the present Administration, the primary issue of concern has been whether or not those currently controlling our government are committed to achieving realistic and verifiable nuclear arms control agreements with the Soviet Union. Public speculation that then-Secretary of State Alexander Haig was considering a nuclear "demonstration shot" over Europe in order to influence potential aggressive Soviet behavior, and recent published reports stating the President admitted to a group of Congressmen his belated discovery that most Soviet intercontinental missiles were land-based, have only served to call this commitment into question.

The Administration's commitment to arms control was called into question further with the nomination this year of Kenneth Adelman to be Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Although the nomination was approved on April 14 by a vote of 57-42, some 83 percent of the Senate Democrats opposed Adelman after the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations failed to report the nomination favorably by a vote of 8 to 9. Senate Democrats expressed legitimate concern that Mr. Adelman lacked the stature, qualifications, and commitment to arms control necessary to be the Director of ACDA. During his confirmation hearings, Adelman demonstrated an unacceptable understanding of vital arms control issues. Democrats believed that in order to restore the credibility of the Reagan Administration's commitment to arms control, the ACDA nominee must be of greater experience and stature than Adelman. Some 92 percent of the Senate Republicans disagreed and voted to confirm the nominee.

Senate Democrats have forged a general consensus during the first three years of current Administration on board national defense policy goals. These goals include, first, a pursuit of essential modernization of weapons systems, combined with a balance between hardware procurement and readiness. Second, that in light of the soaring deficits and the waste and mismanagement in the Pentagon a more prudent annual real growth rate in defense expenditures would be 4-5 percent, rather than the 7-10 percent sought by the Administration.

The programs proposed by the Reagan Administration unfortunately have lacked balance and prioritization. Every conceivable weapons system or gleam in Secretary Weinberger's eye became eligible for the taxpayers' dollars. By requesting funding for some many expensive hardware systems, particularly in the strategic area, the out-year spending requirements can very well "bleed dry" other critical defense needs such as readiness. Included on Weinberger's supermarket shopping list are two new strategic bombers, three new strategic missiles, theater nuclear cruise missiles, and an expressed desire to begin looking at a new variety of space-based strategic systems. Yet, as these new systems move from the research and development phase into the procurement stage, cost over-runs and mismanagement may threaten U.S. military preparedness even further.

The problem of waste in the Pentagon has become a national scandal. Overpricing of spare parts, and the apparent inability or unwillingness of the current management at DOD to correct these pricing abuses, now threatens the national consensus that supports strengthening our national defense.

Democrats have offered, and pushed through the Congress a number of proposals to remedy this management crisis now engulfing the Pentagon. Included in these initiatives have been (1) the establishment of an independent Inspector General's Office for the Pentagon, (2) upgrading and reforming procurement measures, and (3) investigations into the causes of the current financial management crisis. Unfortunately, all these efforts have been opposed strongly by the Administration.

Continuing pressure is required to correct the mismanagement at the Pentagon in order to build a more efficient and stronger national defense posture. The Senate Minority will continue to press the Department of Defense to establish realistic priorities among the numerous hardware systems now under development. For example, Democrats will oppose the diversion of funds for the most advanced of American technologies—the Stealth bomber—to a less capable system such as the B-1 bomber.

The Minority does not believe that knee-jerk military responses are a substitute for a coherent foreign policy which relies upon a judicious blend of diplomacy and military force projection. These are occasions when the deployment of military force, and the commitment to use such force, is important to the achievement of our foreign policy goals. However, the crisis in Lebanon has demonstrated that military force is not any substitute for a coherent and knowledgeable policy.

In the December 12, 1983, edition of the Washington Post, House Republican Whip Trent Lott was quoted in an Evans and Novak column as saying the following about the crisis in Lebanon: "I'm not so much worried about where we are, as where we are headed." That is the very question the Democrats raised on September 29, 1983, when they opposed giving the Administration carte blanche for the continued deployment of U.S. marines in Lebanon in the absence of the President's providing the Congress with a clear statement of our objectives in that country and how those objectives could be achieved.

By a straight party line vote of 55 to 45, the Senate defeated a substitute to the Lebanon resolution offered by Democratic Leader Robert C. Byrd which would have required the President to abide by the War Powers Resolution (currently the law of the land) by submitting a report to the Congress explaining the circumstances necessitating the introduction of U.S. troops into Lebanon, the constitutional and legislative authority for their introduction and the estimated scope and duration of the hostilities or their involvement. In addition, the Minority's alternative called for describing the specific goals of U.S. policy in Lebanon, the specific roles and missions of the U.S. forces in Lebanon, and the specific criteria that were being applied to determinine when the marines has accomplished their role and mission.

Between the time the Senate voted on September 29, 1983, extending U.S. participation in the multinational peacekeeping force by 18 months and February 26, 1984, when the Marines were withdrawn, 264 Americans has lost their lives in Lebanon. However, in order to recoup the Administration suffered as a result of its failed policy, the Secretary of State went on the attack blaming Congress by the Lebanon debacle.

In blaming the Congress George Shultz charged on March 5, 1984.

". . . The congressional debate over the deployment of U.S. Marines in Lebanon just totally took the rug out under U.S. interests" thereby the Syrians to doubt U.S. resolve.

". . . congressional reluctance to deploy U.S. forces where casualties are likely has undercut the credibility of military power as an instrument of U.S. policy."

Democratic Leader Robert C. Byrd responded quickly by noting the Secretary of State "indulged in an exercise of self deception and delusion over American policy is Lebanon which was nothing short of astounding."

Senator Byrd stated "this was just another example of this Administration's attempt to rewrite history for a failed policy." He noted how fragile the policy must have been . . . if simply debating it would somehow destroy it . . ."

The Democratic Leader pointed out that American policy had failed in Lebanon because the assumption upon which it was grounded proved unworkable. "Neither the leadership of President Gemayel nor the viability of the Lebanese armed forces was up to the task of building a strong coalition . . ."

Senator Edward Zorinsky, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee pointed out that the Secretary should be reminded that the eighteen months authorized by Congress for the deployment of U.S. forces in Lebanon had not run out when the President acted to withdraw the troops.

"If the Administration wanted to keep U.S. marines in Beirut, the War Powers Act is not in its way. A more powerful indictment of the functioning of democracy might be that it let us get into Lebanon rather than if forced us out."

Senator Zorinsky stated the Secretary of State should look at the real problem in Lebanon, which was a failed policy from start to finish. "At the beginning of our Lebanon fiasco, the Administration introduced U.S. troops into Lebanon with no clear idea of what mission they were intended to accomplish or how they should proceed. Consequently, it should come as no great surprise at the end of our engagement in Lebanon, that we are faced with an unmitigated disaster."

Senator Claiborne Pell, ranking Democrat on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, pointed out that it was a presidentially appointed Commission, headed by retired Admiral Robert Long, that criticized the Administration for its overemphasis on a military presence in Lebanon and recommended that greater priority be given to a diplomatic solution.

Senator Pell noted that the President very forthrightly took responsibility for the Beirut tragedy that claimed the lives of 264 U.S. servicemen. "The Administration should be just as forthright in accepting responsibility for U.S. policy in Lebanon instead of looking for scapegoats."

Senator Alan Cranston, also a Member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, said the failure of Administration policy in Lebanon had been extremely costly.

"We have lost lives.

"We have squandered resources.

"We have weakened our prestige."

Senator Cranston pointed out that the debate in Congress over the proper role of U.S. military forces in the Lebanese civil war was an essential part of our democratic form of government.

"To suggest that this debate should have been muzzled is to strike at the very root of representative government where power are shared by the Executive and Legislature."

Senator Byrd summed up the views of his Democratic colleagues when he noted:

"Any policy which cannot withstand the scrutiny and examination of the highest representative body of this land—and the body which under the Constitution is the only body that can declare war—is not going to stand the test of time, but will, by definition, be basically flawed and will fail."

The militarization of U.S. foreign policy also is demonstrated graphically by the phenomenal growth in our overseas military programs under this Administration. Since this Administration came into office, grant military aid has grown by 179 percent, and economic aid tied to our security interests has increased by 37 percent. When Democrats joined with Republican Senator Charles McC. Mathias to limit grant military aid to a 10 percent increase in fiscal year 1984 over the amount provided in fiscal year 1983 (rather than an 87 percent increase), they were defeated 46-37, with 83 percent of the Majority voting against the initiative.

Attempts to make even modest cuts in the Administration's foreign aid requests of $100 million and $89 million and transfer those resources to fund vitally needed domestic soil conservation programs were defeated by Senate Republican majorities of 83 percent and 78 percent on each vote.

As the first session of the 98th Congress drew to a close, it was widely observed that this was a Congress which had failed to address the major issues confronting the nation. It is true that bipartisan efforts to pass a major Social Security compromise, a limited jobs bill and most of the regular appropriations bills were successful. (It is a sad state of affairs, indeed, when legislative success in the Senate is measured by the fact that we passed a goodly number of appropriations bills when, prior to 1980, the Senate always passed a like number of bills.) But despite repeated Democratic efforts, the Senate failed to respond except in the most limited way to the human emergencies caused by the recession, to the crisis facing American education, and to the need to propose an aggressive agenda to help America compete in a rapidly changing world economic order. Bipartisan efforts to enact a budget that would make headway against the deficits were ultimately sabotaged by the White House, which steadfastly refused to acknowledge responsibility for the recordbreaking flow of red ink created by its economic policies or to participate in meaningful efforts to bring the deficits under control.

A look at the public laws enacted by this Congress makes the point graphically. Of 215 bills enacted, 53 percent were of a nonsubstantive nature—either administrative, or designed to commemorate an event or a person, or dedicating a day, week, or month to honor some worthwhile cause. This compares to the first sessions of the 95th and 96th Congress, when only 17 percent and 26 percent, respectively, of all public laws enacted were non-substantive in nature.

EXHIBIT 1

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF 97TH AND 98TH CONGRESSES COMPARED WITH 95TH AND 96TH CONGRESSES

SENATE ACTIVITY—97TH AND 98TH CONGRESSES COMPARED WITH 95TH AND 96TH CONGRESSES

A comparison of the last four Congresses regarding Senate floor activity shows a definite slowing in activity and accomplishment. The 97th and 98th Congresses were in session 12 percent fewer days and 15 percent fewer hours than the 95th and 96th.

Even more dramatic is the drop in public law enacted—25 percent fewer public laws enacted from 1981-84 than from 1977-80. While the public law figure will improve some after the President signs the remaining bills sent to him, this figure is not likely to change significantly.

A comparison of the number of bills passed during other Presidential election years show that no other Senate passed so few bills.

SENATE ACTIVITY—COMPARISON OF 95TH, 96TH, 97TH, AND 98TH CONGRESSES (1977-84)

	95th (1977-78)	96th (1979-80)	97th (1981-82)	98th (1983-84) [5]
Days in session	[1] 336	[2] 333	311	280
Hours in session	2510:04	2324:11	2159:09	1947:15
Total measures passed	1,595	1,482	1,209	1,310
Rollcall votes	1,156	[3] 1,055	966	671
Rollcall votes before 12 noon	118	109	154	102
Rollcall votes after 8:00 p.m.	106	94	124	71
Public laws	633	613	473	461
Treaties	13	38	38	33
Confirmations	124,730	154,665	184,844	96,276
Senate average attendance (percent)	87.82	88.68	94.12	92.55
Saturday sessions	7	6	[4] 6	4

[1] The session which began on October 14 and extended until 7:16 p.m. on October 15 is counted as 1 day.

[2] The session which began on December 20 and extend until 3:17 a.m. on December 21 is counted as 1 day.

[3] This includes one vote taken during closed session of the Senate on Sept. 21, 1979, the result of which has not been disclosed.

[4] Includes one Sunday session.

[5] Through October 11.

BILLS PASSED BY SENATE IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION YEARS 1964-84

Congress and session	Bills passed	Dates
88th, second	830	Jan. 7, 1964 to Oct. 3, 1964.
90th, second	766	Jan. 15, 1968 to Oct. 14, 1968.
92d, second	767	Jan. 18, 1972 to Oct. 18, 1972.
94th, second	870	Jan. 19, 1976 to Oct. 1, 1976.
96th, second	831	Jan. 3, 1980 to Dec. 16, 1980.[1]
98th, second	[2] 715	Jan. 23, 1984 to Oct. 11, 1984.

[1] A lameduck session convened after the election.

[2] Includes bills passed through October 11, 1984.

MAJOR LEGISLATION—97TH AND 98TH CONGRESSES COMPARED WITH 95TH AND 96TH CONGRESSES

Under the Republican leadership of the Senate from 1981 to 1984 the number of major bills passed by the Senate declined a drastic 45 percent from the previous 4 years.

The attached listing gives the totals for each session and Congress.

MAJOR LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE SENATE, EXCLUDES ROUTINE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS—1977-84

95th Congress major legislation:	
1977	56
1978	54
Total passed	110
96th Congress major legislation:	
1979	69
1980	57
Total passed	126
97th Congress major legislation:	
1981	36
1982	39
Total passed	75
98th Congress major legislation:	
1983	24
1984	31
Total passed	55

MAJOR LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE SENATE

[Excludes routine appropriations bills]

Date, Bill No., and Title	Vote
1977 (Total 56)	
1-31, S. 474, Natural Gas Emergency	91-2
2-4, S. Res. 4, Senate Committee Reorganization	89-1
2-22, S. Con. Res. 10, Third Budget Resolution, 1977	72-20
3-10, S. 964, Federal Salary Increase Denial	93-1
3-10, H.R. 11, Public Works Employment	74-11
3-30, H.R. 4800, Emergency Unemployment Compensation	84-11
4-1, S. Res. 110, Senate Ethics Code	86-9
4-1, H.R. 4877, Supplemental Appropriations	69-15
4-49, H.R. 3477, Tax Reduction and Simplification	73-7
5-2, H.R. 6889, Economic Stimulus Appropriations	63-15
5-4, S. Con. Res. 19, First Budget Resolution, 1978	56-31
5-17, H.R. 5970, Military Procurement Authorization	90-3
5-18, S. 826, Department of Energy Establishment	74-10
5-20, H.R. 2, Strip Mining	58-8
5-24, S. 275, Omnibus Farm Bill	69-18
5-26, H.R. 6138, Youth Employment and Training	80-3
6-7, H.R. 6655, Housing and Community Development	79-7
6-10, H.R. 6161, Clean Air	73-7
6-13, S. 1340, ERDA Nonnuclear	79-1
6-14, H.R. 5262, International Financial Institutions	59-30
6-15, H.R. 6714, International Development Assistance—Food for Peace	59-32
6-15, H.R. 6884, International Security Assistance	67-18
6-15, H.R. 6689, State Department Authorization	64-21
6-16, H.R. 6179, Arms Control and Disarmament	82-0
6-21, S. 717, Federal Mine Safety	78-18
6-22, H.R. 5885, Rivers and Harbors—Waterway Users Fee	81-9
6-27, S. 555, Ethics in Government	74-5
6-30, H.R. 1139, Child Nutrition Programs	96-0
7-12, S. 1811, ERDA Nuclear Authorization	VV
7-15, S. 9, Outer Continental Shelf	60-18
8-3, S. 926, Campaign Financing Act Amendments	88-1
8-4, H.R. 3199, Water Pollution Control Act	96-0
9-8, H.R. 5146 (S. 977), Coal Utilization/Conversion	74-8
9-9, H. Con. Res. 341, Second Budget Resolution, 1978	63-21
9-13, H.R. 5037 (S. 2057), Energy Conservation Policy	78-4
9-14, S. 1360, Timber Sales	VV
9-15, S. 1750, Saccharin Sales Continuance	87-7
9-16, S. 995, Sex Discrimination—Pregnancy	75-11
9-16, S. 274, Military Unionization	72-3
9-30, H.R. 9290, Public Debt Limit	58-30
10-4, H.R. 5289 (S. 2104), Natural Gas Pricing/Deregulation	50-46
10-6, H.R. 4018 (S. 2114), Public Utility Rates	86-7
10-7, H.R. 3744, Minimum Wage	63-24
10-7, S. 1863, Military Procurement Supplemental	66-1
10-10, S. 1585, Child Pornography	85-1
10-12, H.R. 6666, Legal Services Corporation	77-15
10-12, S. Con. Res. 31, Auto Airbag Disapproval (Tabled)	65-31
10-17, H.R. 3387, Child Care Program	80-0
10-19, H.R. 5383, Age Discrimination in Employment	88-7
10-19, H.R. 8701, Veterans Education Benefits	91-0
10-20, H.R. 3454, Endangered Wilderness Areas	89-3
10-20, H.R. 3816, Federal Trade Commission Reform	90-0
10-25, S. 1771, OPIC	69-12
10-31, H.R. 5263, Energy Taxation	52-35
11-4, H.R. 9346, Social Security Financing	42-25

MAJOR LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE SENATE—Continued

[Excludes routine appropriations bills]

Date, Bill No., and Title	Vote
11-4, H.R. 9418, Medical Students Grants	57-2
1978 (Total 54)	
1-30, S. 1437, Criminal Code Reform	72-15
1-31, S. 1976, Redwood National Park	74-20
2-7, H.R. 8638, Nuclear Nonproliferation	88-3
3-16, Ex. N, 95-1, Panama Canal Neutrality Treaty	68-32
3-21, H.R. 6782, Emergency Agricultural Act	67-26
4-18, Ex. N, 95-1, Panama Canal Treaty	68-32
4-19, S. 2493, Airline Deregulation	83-9
4-20, S. 1566, Foreign Intelligence Surveillance	95-1
4-26, S. Con. Res. 80, First Budget Resolution, 1979	64-27
5-2, H.R. 55104, Farm Credit Improvement	92-0
5-4, H.R. 8309, Water Resources Projects—User Fees	80-13
5-15, S. Con. Res. 86, Mid-East Arms Sales	44-54
6-9, S. 2437, Dam Safety and Inspection	VV
6-26, H.R. 12222, Foreign Aid Authorization	49-30
S. 419, Oil Shale Development	61-23
6-28, H.R. 12598, State Department Authorization	64-17
6-29, H.R. 12426, New York City Loan Guarantee	53-27
7-11, H.R. 10929, Military Procurement (Vetoed)	87-2
7-13, H.R. 2777, National Consumer Cooperative Bank	60-33
7-19, S. 2899, Endangered Species	94-3
7-20, S. 3084, Housing & Community Development	81-3
7-24, H.R. 12255, Older Americans	85-2
7-26, S. 3075, International Security Assistance	73-13
7-31, H.R. 9214, IMF Witteveen Facility	69-16
H.R. 10173, Veterans Pensions	85-0
8-1, S. 3243, Local Public Works Programs	85-5
8-2, H.R. 11445, SBA Programs (Pocket Vetoed)	VV
H.R. 13385, Public Debt Limit	62-31
H.R. 7577, Economic Opportunity Act Amendments	VV
8-15, H.R. 12050, Tuition Tax Credit	65-27
8-16, S. 2539, College Opportunity Grants	68-28
8-22, H.J. Res. 554, D.C. Statehood Constitutional Amendment	67-32
8-24, H.R. 15, Elementary and Secondary Education	86-7
S. 2640, Civil Service Reform	87-1
8-25, S. 2570, CETA	66-10
9-6, H. Con. Res. 683, Second Budget Resolution	56-18
9-7, H.R. 8200, Uniform Bankruptcy Law	VV
S. 1423, Judicial Tenure	43-31
9-11, H.R. 7010, Victims of Crime	VV
9-19, H.R. 12605, Corporation for Public Broadcasting	VV
9-21, H.R. 12467, Vocational Rehabilitation	81-1
9-23, H.R. 2852, Countercyclical Revenue Sharing	44-8
9-28, S. 991, Department of Education	72-11
9-29, S. 2474, Public Health Programs	82-4
9-30, H.R. 10587, Public Grazing Lands	59-7
H.R. 11686, Department of Energy Authorization/Military	68-1
10-3, H.R. 11733, Federal Aid Highway Program	VV
10-5, H.R. 6803, Oil Spill Liability	VV
10-6, H.J. Res. 638, Equal Rights Constitutional Amendment	60-36
10-10, H.R. 13511, Omnibus Tax Act, 1978	86-4
10-11, S. 2, Sunset Review	87-1
10-12, H.R. 5285, Hospital Cost Containment	64-22
H.R. 13750, Sugar Stabilization	50-22
10-13, H.R. 50, Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment	70-19
1979 (Total 69)	
2-22, S. Res. 61, Post Cloture Rule Changes	78-16
2-22, S. Res. 54, Aviation Fuel Decontrol	34-53
3-13, H.R. 2479, Taiwan-U.S. Relations	90-6
3-27, H.R. 2534, Balanced Budget/Public Debt	62-33
4-2, H.R. 2283, Council on Wage and Price Stability	62-22
4-26, H. Con. Res. 107, First Budget Resolution, 1980; Third Budget Resolution, 1979	64-20
4-30, S. 210, Department of Education Creation	72-21
5-1, S. 413, Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement	78-15
5-2, S. Res. 122, Emergency Building Temperature Restrictions	24-70
5-3, S. 429, Military Procurement Supplemental	77-12
5-9, S. Res. 153, Gasoline Rationing	66-30
5-14, S. 1007, Middle East Special Assistance	73-11
5-15, H.R. 3363, State Department Authorization	84-10
5-16, S. 918, SBA Authorization	VV
5-17, S. 662, Multilateral Development Banks	67-24
5-21, S. 241, LEAA Authorization	67-8
5-22, H.R. 3173, International Security Assistance	69-21
5-23, S. 292, Supplemental Food Program (WIC)	91-0
5-24, S. 640, Maritime Programs	85-2
6-4, S. 7, Veterans Health Care	VV
6-4, S. 1157, Department of Justice Authorization	77-2
6-5, S. 1030, Emergency Energy Conservation	77-13
6-7, S. 721, Civil Rights Commission Authorization	91-5
6-13, S. 428, Military Procurement Authorization	89-7
6-13, S. 1143, Endangered Species	91-5
6-14, S. 892, Rural Development—Pilot Energy Projects	VV
6-18, H.R. 3892, Veterans Benefits	VV
6-19, H.R. 3324, International Development Assistance	70-25
6-20, S. 239, VISTA (ACTION)	75-16
6-26, H.R. 4289, Supplemental Appropriations	86-8
6-26, S. Res. 191, Energy Summit	90-3
7-9, S. Res. 140, Reorganization Plan on Foreign Aid	45-51
7-13, H.R. 3875, Housing and Community Development	82-0
7-17, S. 562, Nuclear Regulatory Commission Authorization	97-1
7-21, S. 737, Export Control	74-3
7-23, H.R. 4537, Multilateral Trade Negotiations	90-4
7-23, H.R. 4057, Food Stamp Program	VV
7-26, H.R. 111, Panama Canal Implementing Legislation	64-30
7-31, S. 265, Attorneys Fees	94-3
8-1, S. 914, Economic Development Programs	83-17
8-2, H.R. 3996, Amtrak Authorization	VV
8-3, S. 566, Antirecession and Targeted Fiscal Assistance	69-23
8-3, S. Res. 220, Senate Financial Disclosure Rule	50-29
9-6, S. 643, Refugee Assistance and Admission	85-0

MAJOR LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE SENATE—Continued

[Excludes routine appropriations bills]

Date, Bill No., and Title	Vote
9-10, S. 1125, Federal Crop Insurance	64-27
9-11, S. 1403, Surface Mining	68-26
9-14, S. 14, Reclamation Reform	47-23
9-19, S. Con. Res. 36, Second Budget Resolution	62-36
9-28, H.R. 5369, Public Debt Limit	49-29
10-4, S. 1308, Energy Mobilization Board	68-25
10-12, S.J. Res. 113, Pay Raise Disapproval for Members of Congress	72-12
10-18, H.R. 5386, Higher Education	VV
10-24, H.R. 2440, Surface Transportation	VV
10-29, H.R. 3434, Social Services/Child Welfare Assistance	VV
10-30, S. 1873, Judicial Conduct and Disability	56-33
11-1, H.R. 4986, Banking Deregulation/NOW	76-9
11-20, S. 2009, Idaho Wilderness	69-18
11-26, S. 2031, Oregon Wilderness	VV
11-30, S. 1918, Defense Officer Personnel	87-0
12-3, H.R. 5269, Panama Canal Authorization	VV
12-6, S. 2076, Zimbabwe-Rhodesia Sanctions	90-0
12-14, S. 493, Deep Seabed Mining	VV
12-15, S. Res. 315, Iranian Hostages	93-0
12-17, H.R. 3919, Windfall Profit Tax	74-24
12-18, H.R. 5010, Federal Election Reform	VV
12-19, H.R. 5860, Chrysler Loan Guarantees	53-44
12-20, H.R. 3951, D.C. Metro Construction	66-23
12-20, S. Res. 316, Thailand Assistance for Cambodian Refugees	90-0
12-21, H.J. Res. 467, Chrysler Corporation Appropriations	41-35
1980 (Total 57)	
1-24, H.R. 5288, Veterans' Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments	82-4
H. Con. Res. 204, China Trade	74-8
1-25, S. 1830, Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion	VV
1-29, H. Con. Res. 249, Summer Olympics, 1980 (USSR/Afghanistan)	88-4
S. 2012, Nicaragua and Honduras Economic Assistance	55-34
1-31, H.R. 3236, Disability Insurance	87-1
2-4, H.R. 5168, Armed Services Personnel Pay Increase	VV
2-5, S. 1648, Airport and Airway Development	VV
2-7, H.R. 2313, FTC Authorization and Rulemaking Authority	77-13
2-20, S. 1390, Truck Safety	69-16
2-28, H.R. 10, Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons	55-36
S. 1725, Low Income Energy Assistance	75-5
3-4, S. 2269, Economic Emergency Loan Program	VV
H.R. 4612, Disabled Children/Unemployment Compensation	89-3
3-6, S. 2253, Rock Island Banktuptcy	VV
3-20, S. 2446, Patent Reexamination	VV
3-25, S. Res. 389, Senate Rules Codification	96-0
S. Res. 380, Roth Budget Resolution	56-41
3-26, S. 2427, Grain Excess Assistance (Soviet Grain Embargo)	VV
4-1, S. Res. 374, Age of Nominees for Federal Judgeships	97-0
S. 1946, Railroad Deregulation	91-4
4-15, S. 2245, Trucking Deregulation	70-20
4-22, S. 2177, Home Purchase Assistance	89-5
5-12, H. Con. Res. 307, First Budget Resolution, 1981; Revised Second Budget Resolution, 1980	68-28
5-14, H.J. Res. 545, Urgent Food Stamp Appropriation	70-18
5-15, S. 598, Soft Drink Interbrand	89-3
5-19, H.R. 6081, Nicaragua and Honduras Economic Assistance	44-35
5-22, S. 2511, Civil Rights Commission Authorization	86-5
5-28, S. 2698, Small Business Administration Programs	83-2
6-2, S. 2352, Council on Wage and Price Stability/Inflation	72-11
6-3, S. 2284, Intelligence Oversight	89-1
H.J. Res. 554, FTC Appropriation	78-16
6-4, H.R. 7428, Oil Import Fee Disapproval—Public Debt	67-20
6-6, S. 2730, Railroad Safety	VV
6-12, H.J. Res. 521, Military Registration	58-34
6-13, S. 2337, Legal Services Corporation	55-14
6-16, S. 2727, State Department Supplemental	69-10
S. 2271, International Monetary Fund (Bretton Woods)	55-25
S. 2422, Multilateral Development Banks	53-24
H.R. 6942, Internat'l Development & Security Assistance	58-32
6-19, S. 2377, Justice Department Authorization	86-3
6-21, S. 2719, Housing & Community Development	63-4
6-24, H.R. 5192, Higher Education Programs	92-4
S. 2470, Coal Conversion of Powerplants	86-7
6-25, S. 2720, Urban Mass Transportation	79-15
S. 2725, Clean Water	93-0
6-26, H.J. Res. 569, Public Debt Limit	54-39
6-30, S. 2885, Reconciliation—Spending	89-0
7-2, H.R. 6974, Military Procurement	84-3
9-4, S. 1188, Veterans' Vocational Rehabilitation	86-0
9-15, H.R. 6790, Foreign Service Reform	VV
9-17, H.R. 7765, Reconciliation—Spending and Revenue	VV
9-24, H. Con. Res. 432, Nuclear Fuel Shipments to India Disapproval	46-48
9-30, H.R. 8202, Justice Department Authorization	VV
11-19, H. Con. Res. 448, Second Budget Resolution	48-46
11-24, H.R. 7020, Superfund for Environmental Cleanup	VV
12-9, H.R. 7112, Revenue Sharing	80-3
1981 (Total 36)	
2-6, H.R. 1553, Public Debt Limit Increase	73-18
3-12, S. Res. 89-92, Pay Raise Disapprovals	90-0
3-25, S. 509, Milk Price Supports	88-5
4-2, S. Con. Res. 9, Budget Reconciliation	88-10
4-7, S. 694, Defense Supplemental Authorization	VV
4-8, S. 734, Export Trading Companies	93-0
4-29, S. 786, International Development Association	58-32
5-6, S. 533, Public Buildings	93-0
5-12, H. Con. Res. 115, First Budget Resolution, 1982; Reconciliation	78-20
5-14, S. 815, Military Procurement	92-1
5-21, H.R. 3512, Supplemental Appropriations	95-0
6-3, S. 1197, Housing and Community Development	65-24
6-10, S. 1007, Food Stamps and Commodity Distribution	77-17
6-16, H.R. 3499, Veterans Health Care	99-0

MAJOR LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE SENATE—Continued

[Excludes routine appropriations bills]

Date, Bill No., and Title	Vote
6-17, S. 1195, International Development Banks	65-27
6-18, S. 1193, State Department Authorization 1982-83	88-4
6-25, H.R. 3982, Budget Reconciliation	80-15
7-14, S. Res. 87, Social Security Benefits Taxation	98-0
7-29, H.R. 4242, Tax Cut	89-11
9-11, S. 1181, Military Pay Increase	81-0
9-18, S. 884, Farm Bill	49-32
9-29, H.J. Res. 265, Public Debt Limit Increase	64-34
10-7, S. 898, Telecommunications Competition/Deregulation	90-4
10-15, H.R. 4331, Social Security Minimum Benefits	95-0
10-22, S. 1196, Foreign Aid—Economic and Military	40-33
10-28, H. Con. Res. 194, Saudi AWACS Sale disapproval	48-52
10-29, S. 1503, Standby Petroleum Allocation	85-7
11-2, S. 1086, Older Americans—Social Security Taxation Disapproval	75-0
11-5, H.R. 3455, Military Construction Authorization	95-2
11-12, H.R. 3567, Export Administration Authorization	VV
12-7, S. Res. 236, Mortgage Interest Deductibility	83-0
12-8, S. 881, Small Business Research/Federal Reserve Appointee	90-0
12-8, S. 1700, Federal Courts Improvement	83-6
12-9, S. Con. Res. 50, Second Budget Resolution	49-48
12-9, S. Res. 218, School Lunch Program (Regulations Classifying Condiments as Vegetables)	92-0
12-16, H.R. 5159, Black Lung Benefits/Trust Fund	46-44
1982 (Total 39)	
2-10, H.J. Res. 389, CCC Urgent Supplemental Appropriations, 1982	VV
H.J. Res. 391, Unemployment Compensation Supplemental, Appropriations, 1982	95-0
3-2, S. 951, Department of Justice Authorization	57-37
3-18, H.R. 4, Agent Identities Disclosure	90-6
3-24, S. 1080, Regulatory Reform	94-0
3-30, H.R. 2330, NRC Authorization, 1982-83	97-0
3-31, S. 1629, Broadcast Deregulation	VV
4-21, S. Res. 20, Radio-TV Floor Coverage of Senate Proceedings	VV
4-27, S. 854, Foreign Missions Act	VV
4-29, S. Res. 382, Falkland Islands Policy	79-1
H.R. 3809, National Nuclear Waste Storage Policy	69-9
5-13, S. 2248, Military Procurement Authorization, FY 1983	84-8
5-18, S. Con. Res. 60, FTC Used Car Rule Disapproval Resolution	69-27
5-21, S. Con. Res. 92, First Budget Resolution, FY 1983	49-43
5-26, S. 2332, Energy Emergency Preparedness	88-7
5-27, H.R. 5922, Urgent Supplemental Appropriations, FY 1982	73-19
6-18, H.R. 3112, Voting Rights Act Extension	85-8
6-23, H.J. Res. 519, Public Debt Limit Increase	49-41
6-24, H.R. 6682, Urgent Supplemental Appropriations, FY 1982	59-26
6-29, H.R. 6685, Urgent Supplemental Appropriations, FY 1982	VV
6-30, H.R. 3663, Bus Deregulation	85-10
7-1, S. 2036, Jobs Training	95-0
7-14, H.R. 6590, Tobacco Price Supports	77-17
7-16, H.R. 5539, Reclamation Reform	49-13
7-22, H.R. 4961, Tax Increase/Medicare/Medicaid Cut	50-47
8-4, S.J. Res. 58, Balanced Budget—Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment	69-31
8-5, H.R. 6955, Omnibus Reconciliation, FY 1982—Spending	73-23
8-11, H.R. 6863, Supplemental Appropriations, 1982	VV
8-17, S. 2222, Immigration Reform and Control	80-19
9-21, S.J. Res. 250, Railway Labor-Management Dispute (Rail Strike)	VV
9-23, H.J. Res. 520, Public Debt Limit Increase	50-41
9-30, S. 1688, Armed Career Criminals	93-1
H.R. 3963, Violent Crime and Drug Enforcement	VV
10-1, H.R. 544, Commodity Futures Trading	VV
H.R. 7140, Controlled Substances	VV
H.R. 5238, Orphan Drug Act	VV
12-2, H.R. 7093, Virgin Islands Tax Rates—Social Security Disability Benefits	70-4
12-9, H.R. 4481, Justice Assistance Act of 1982	VV
12-20, H.R. 6211, Highways—Gas Tax—Jobs Program	56-34
1983 (Total 24)	
3-1, S. 47, Shipping Antitrust	64-33
3-17, H.R. 1718, Jobs/Supplemental Appropriations	82-16
3-23, H.R. 1900, Social Security Reform	88-9
5-18, S. 529, Immigration Reform	76-18
5-19, H. Con. Res. 91, First Budget Resolution, 1984	50-49
5-25, S. Con. Res. 26, MX Basing Approval	59-39
6-8, S. 695, IMF Authorization	55-34
6-14, S. 66, Cable Telecommunications	87-9
6-16, H.R. 3069, Supplemental Appropriations 1983	64-33
6-16, H.R. 2973, Repeal of Withholding on Interest and Dividends	86-4
6-20, S. 336, Labor Management Racketeering	75-0
7-26, S. 675, Defense Authorizations	83-15
8-2, H.R. 1646, Railroad Retirement	95-2
9-13, S. 602, Radio Marti	VV
9-21, H.R. 2780, Revenue Sharing	87-6
9-29, S.J. Res. 159, Lebanon Forces—War Powers	54-46
9-30, H.R. 3929, Unemployment Compensation (FSC)	89-0
10-19, H.R. 3706, Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday	78-22
10-20, H.R. 2915, State Department Authorization	VV
10-25, H.R. 3103, Surface Transportation Act	91-2
10-27, H.R. 2959, Supplemental Appropriations, FY 1984—IMF, Multilateral Development Banks, Export-Import Bank, and Omnibus Housing Authorizations	VV
11-14, H.R. 2230, Civil Rights Commission	78-3
11-17, H.J. Res. 308, Permanent Public Debt Limit Increase	58-40
11-18, H.R. 3391, Social Security Disability Insurance	80-0
1984 (total 31)	
1-26, S. 221, Congressional Pay Reduction	66-19
2-2, S. 1762, Comprehensive Crime Control	91-1
2-22, S. 1765, Capital Punishment	63-32
2-27, S. 774, Freedom of Information	VV
2-28, S. 2335, Credit Card Surcharges	84-0

MAJOR LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE SENATE—Continued

[Excludes routine appropriations bills]

Date, Bill No., and Title	Vote
3-1, S. 979, Export Administration Act Amendments	VV
3-22, H.R. 4072, Wheat and Other Price Supports	78-10
4-5, H.J. Res. 492, Supplemental Appropriations, 1984	76-19
4-5, H.R. 4169, Budget Reconciliation Act	67-26
4-25, H.R. 4325, Child Support Enforcement	94-0
5-17, H.R. 4170, Deficit Reduction Tax Act of 1984	74-23
5-22, H.R. 1961, Veterans—Agent Orange	VV
5-24, S. 837, Washington Wilderness	VV
5-24, H.R. 1149, Oregon Wilderness	VV
6-19, H.R. 5174, Bankruptcy Court Jurisdiction—Federal Judgeships	VV
6-20, H.R. 5167, Omnibus Defense Authorization, FY 1985	82-6
6-27, H.R. 1310, Math-Science Education—Equal Access	VV
6-29, H.R. 5953, Public Debt Limit	VV
7-25, S. 757, Solid Waste Disposal Amendments	93-0
7-26, H.R. 1904, Child Abuse Prevention, Treatment, and Adoption Reform	89-0
7-26, H.R. 1428, Social Security Cost of Living Adjustments	VV
7-31, S. 1841, R&D Antitrust	97-0
7-31, H.R. 4280, Women's Pension Equity	VV
8-7, H.R. 4209, Small Business R&D	94-0
8-8, H.R. 6040, Second Supplemental Appropriations, 1984	62-32
8-9, H.R. 1437, California Wilderness	VV
9-20, H.R. 3398, Trade and Tariff Matters	96-0
9-26, H.R. 2838, Timber Contracts	94-2
10-2, H.R. 5688, Veterans Compensation Increase	VV
10-4, S. 3024, Federal Aid Highways	VV
10-11, H.R. 5361, Imputed Interest Rates/Budget Freeze	VV

PUBLIC LAWS

97TH AND 98TH CONGRESSES COMPARED WITH 95TH AND 96TH CONGRESSES

A listing of public laws enacted during the 97th and 98th Congresses shows that more than half were of a non-substantive or administrative nature. Of the 246 laws enacted this session, 64 percent fit into this category. Most of these laws commemorate an event or person or dedicate a day, week, or month for some worthwhile cause. The 97th and 98th Congresses under Senate Republican Leadership compare very unfavorably with the two previous Congresses which were under Democratic leadership:

98th Congress (1983-84)—Out of 461 public laws, 272 or 59 percent were nonsubstantive.

97th Congress (1981-82)—Out of 473 public laws, 227 or 45 percent were nonsubstantive.

96th Congress (1979-80)—Out of 613 public laws, 219 or 36 percent were nonsubstantive.

95th Congress (1977-78)—Out of 633 public laws, 164 or 26 percent were nonsubstantive.

A look at the bills enacted this year raises the serious question whether Congress is carrying out its legislative responsibilities. Many of the bills enacted were of a cosmetic nature. Debate and passage of separate authorizations for many important programs languished on the Senate Calendar or in Committee while some high-sounding proclamation was signed into law. For this reason, Senators were compelled to try to amend the Continuing Resolution with everything from Superfund provisions to "cop-killer" bullets.

At the same time the Administration cut education programs severely, it wrote into law the "Year of Excellence in Education", and the President announced that he will send a teacher to be the first civilian in space.

While the Senate failed to assure the civil rights of women and the handicapped and other minorities with the passage of Grove City on which cloture was invoked by 92 Senators, it sent the President S.J. Res. 220, National Arts with the Handicapped Week, and S.J. Res. 227, National Women Veterans Recognition Month.

Although the Senate never got to consider ERA, it passed Women's History Week and National Women Veteran' Recognition Month.

The same occurred with regard to health programs. While pressing for cuts to public health programs, the President signed the following 15 measures:

S.J. Res. 148, National Tuberous Sclerosis Week.

S.J. Res. 198, National Nursing Home Residents Day.

S.J. Res. 225, National Eye Donor Month.

S.J. Res. 228, National Digestive Diseases Awareness Week.

S.J. Res. 232, National Physical Fitness and Sports Month.

S.J. Res. 239, Lupus Awareness Week.

S.J. Res. 322, Mental Illness Awareness Week.

S.J. Res. 244, National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week.

S.J. Res. 261, Helen Keller Deaf-Blind Awareness Day.

S.J. Res. 254, National Down's Syndrome Month.

S.J. Res. 275, National Spina Bifada Month.

S.J. Res. 407, National Hearing Impaired Awareness Week.

S.J. Res. 432, Parkinson's Disease Awareness Week.

S.J. Res. 451, National Alzheimer's Disease Week.

S.J. Res. 587, Ostomy Awareness Month.

PUBLIC LAWS, 98TH CONGRESS (272 OUT OF 461 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 59 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
	1ST SESSION (JAN. 3, 1983-NOV. 18, 1983; 114 OUT OF 215 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 53 PERCENT WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)	
1	98-1, S.61, Nancy Hanks Center	Feb. 15, 1983.
2	98-2, H.J. Res. 60, Lithuanian Independence Day	Feb. 16, 1983.
3	98-3, S.J. Res. 37, Women's History Week	Mar. 8, 1983.
	98-4, H.R. 1296, Agricultural Land Diversion Tax Treatment Program (PIK).	Mar. 11, 1983.
4	98-5, S.J. Res. 15, National Eye Donor Month	Do.
5	98-6, H.R. 1572, Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA).	Mar. 16, 1983.
6	98-7, S.J. Res. 21, National Child Abuse Prevention Month.	Do.
	98-8, H.R. 1718, Emergency Jobs/Supplemental Appropriations, FY 1983.	Mar. 24, 1983.
7	98-9, S.J. Res. 35, National Mental Health Counselors Week.	Do.
8	98-10, S.J. Res. 65, Afghanistan Day	Do.
	98-11, S. 271, National Scenic and Historic Trails	Mar. 28, 1983.
	98-12, H.R. 2112, Defense Production Act Extension.	Mar. 29, 1983.
	98-13, H.R. 2369, Federal Unemployment Compensation (FSC).	Do.
	98-14, H.R. 1936, Enlistment and Reenlistment Bonuses Extension.	Mar. 30, 1983.
9	98-15, S.J. Res. 64, 200th Anniversary of the Signing of the Treaty of Amity and Commerce between Sweden and the U.S.	April 4, 1983.
10	98-16, H.J. Res. 175, National Amateur Baseball Month.	Do.
	98-17, S. 926, Commercial Motor Vehicles Width Limitation.	April 5, 1983.
11	98-18, S.J. Res. 32, National Arthritis Month	Do.
12	98-19, S.J. Res. 52, National Mental Health Week	April 15, 1983.
13	98-20, H.J. Res. 80, Jewish Heritage Week	April 19, 1983.
	98-21, H.R. 1900, Social Security Reform	April 20, 1983.
	98-22, S. 89, Saccharin Study and Labeling	April 22, 1983.
14	98-23, S.J. Res. 53, National Physical Fitness and Sports Month.	April 26, 1983.
	98-24, S. 126, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Authorization, FY 1983-84.	Do.
15	98-25, S. 304, Burns Paiute Tribe Trust Lands	May 2, 1983.
16	98-26, H.J. Res. 245, Enrollment Corrections—Emergency Jobs Appropriations, FY 1983.	May 4, 1983.
17	98-27, S.J. Res. 62, National Parkinson's Disease Week.	Do.
18	98-28, H.R. 2600, Congressman Phillip Burton Golden Gate National Recreation Area.	May 10, 1983.
	98-29, S. 1011, Federal Deposit Insurance of Income Capital Certificates.	May 16, 1983.
19	98-30, S.J. Res. 51, Andrei Sakharov Day	May 18, 1983.
20	98-31, H.J. Res. 219, Soccer World Cup	May 20, 1983.
21	98-32, S. 287, Harry S. Truman National Historic Site, Missouri.	May 23, 1983.
22	98-33, S. 957, Congressional Award Board Membership Increase.	May 25, 1983.

PUBLIC LAWS, 98TH CONGRESS (272 OUT OF 461 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 59 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
	98-34, H.R. 2990, Public Debt Limit Permanent Increase.	May 26, 1983.
	98-35, H.J. Res. 265, Mortgage Insurance Authorities Extension.	Do.
	98-36, S. 653, Foundation for the Advancement of Military Medicine.	Do.
	98-37, S. 967, National Transportation Safety Board Authorization, FY 1984-86.	June 6, 1983.
	98-38, H.R. 2681, Securities Brokers/Dealers Required to Join National Securities Association.	Do.
23	98-39, H.J. Res. 201, Baltic Freedom Day	June 13, 1983.
24	98-40, S.J. Res. 75, National Scleroderma Week	June 14, 1983.
25	98-41, H.J. Res. 234, National Childrens' Liver Disease Awareness Week.	June 20, 1983.
26	98-42, S.J. Res. 42, Alaska Statehood Day	June 22, 1983.
	98-43, S. 639, Lebaonon Emergency Development and Military Asssitance.	June 27, 1983.
27	98-44, S. 295, Atlantic Salmon Convention—Technical Corrections.	July 12, 1983.
	98-45, H.R. 3133, HUD Appropriations, FY 1984	Do.
28	98-46, S.680, Gladys Noon Spellman Parkway	Do.
	98-47, S.273, Small Business Administration Pilot Procurement Program Extension.	July 31, 1983.
	98-48, H.R. 1746, Navajo-Hopi Indian Relocation Commission Authorization, FY 1983-84.	Do.
	98-49, H.R. 2713, Public Health Emergencies Revolving Fund.	Do.
	98-50, H.R. 3132, Energy Water Appropriations, FY 1984.	July 14, 1983.
	98-51, H.R. 3135, Legislative Appropriations, FY 1984.	Do.
	98-52, H.R. 2065, NASA Authorization, FY 1984	July 15, 1983.
	98-53, H.R. 1271, El Salvador—Presidential Certifications.	Do.
29	98-54, S.J. Res. 68, National Atomic Veterans' Day	Do.
30	98-55, S.J. Res. 18, American Business Women's Day.	July 19, 1983.
31	98-56, S.J. Res. 34, National Reye's Syndrome Week.	Do.
	98-57, S. 929, Canal Zone Biological Area Authorization.	July 22, 1983.
32	98-58, S.J. Res. 96, Helsinki Human Rights Day	July 25, 1983.
	98-59, H.R. 3392, Tobacco Price Support Freeze	Do.
33	98-60, S.J. Res. 77 National Animal Agriculture Week.	July 27, 1983.
34	98-61, S. 459, American Falls Land Relocation	July 28, 1983.
35	98-62, H.J. Res. 258 National Paralyzed Veterans Recognition Day.	July 29, 1983.
	98-63, H.R. 3069, Supplemental Appropriations, FY 1983.	July 30, 1983.
	98-64, S. 419, Per Capita Payments to Indians	Aug. 2, 1983.
	98-65, H.R. 2637, D.C. Federal Payment	Do.
	98-66, H.R. 1935, Matagorda Island National Wildlife Refuge, Texas.	Aug. 4, 1983.
	98-67, H.R. 2973, Repeal of Withholding on Interest and Dividends—Caribbean Basin Initiative.	Aug. 5, 1983.
36	98-68, S.J. Res. 56, National Child Support Enforcement Month.	Do.
37	98-69, S.J. Res. 67, National Respiratory Therapy Week.	Aug. 8, 1983.
38	98-70, S. 143, Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Luiseno Mission Indian Trust Lands.	Do.
39	98-71, H.J. Res. 139, Federal Credit Union Week	Aug. 11, 1983.
	98-72, S. 272, Small Business Access to Federal Procurement Information.	Do.
40	98-73, S. 930, Smithsonian Institution Land Purchase Authorization.	Do.
41	98-74, S. 727, Fort Berthold Reservation Judgment Funds.	Do.
42	98-75, H.J. Res. 321, 200th Anniversary of the Treaty of Paris National Celebration Day.	Do.
	98-76, H.R. 1646, Railroad Retirement Solvency	Aug. 12, 1983.
	98-77, H.R. 2355, Veterans' Emergency Job Training.	Aug. 15, 1983.
	98-78, H.R. 3329, Transportation Appropriations, FY 1984.	Do.
	98-79, H.R. 3394, Federal Student Loan Program	Do.
43	98-80, S. 1696, Additional Assistant Administrators, EPA.	Aug. 23, 1983.
44	98-81, S. 1797, Jack D. Watson Post Office Building, Fort Worth, Texas.	Do.
45	98-82, S.J. Res. 85, National Historically Black Colleges Day.	Do.
46	98-83, S.J. Res. 98, National Housing Week	Do.
47	98-84, S.J. Res. 116, Youth of America Week	Do.
48	98-85, H.R. 2895, Phillip Burton Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, California.	Aug. 26, 1983.
49	98-86, H.R. 3232, Payment for Special Agents of Department of Justice.	Do.
50	98-87, H.J. Res. 297, Jeannine Smith Clark Appointments to Smithsonian Regents.	Do.
	98-88, H.R. 3190, Extra Long Staple Cotton	Do.
	98-89, S. 46, Marine Safety and Seaman's Welfare	Do.
	98-90, H.R. 3677, Medicare Hospice Reimbursement.	Aug. 29, 1983.
	98-91, H.R. 3549, Bankruptcy Amendments	Aug. 30, 1983.
	98-92, H.R. 3409, Federal Unemployment Compensation (FSC).	Sept. 2, 1983.
51	98-93, S.J. Res. 131, National Cystic Fibrosis Week	Sept. 20, 1983.
	98-94, S. 675, DOD Authorizations, FY 1984	Sept. 24, 1983.
	98-95, S. 1872, Challenge Grant Amendments	Sept. 26, 1983.

PUBLIC LAWS, 98TH CONGRESS (272 OUT OF 461 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 59 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
52	98-96, H.J. Res. 132, National Adult Day Care Center Week.	Sept. 27, 1983.
53	98-97, H.J. Res. 218, National Sewing Month	Do.
	98-98, H.J. Res. 353, Soviet Destruction of Korean Airliner Condemnation.	Sept. 28, 1983.
54	98-99, H.J. Res. 229, National Organ Donation Awareness Week.	Do.
	98-100, H.R. 3914, Crop Wheat and Feed Grain Program Announcement, 1984-85.	Sept. 29, 1983.
55	98-101, S. 118, Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution.	Do.
56	98-102, S.J. Res. 82, National Alzheimer's Disease Month.	Sept. 30, 1983.
57	98-103, S.J. Res. 119, National Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Week.	Do.
	98-104, S. 1625, D.C. Retirement Reform	Do.
	98-105, S. 1850, VA Medical Services in Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands.	Do.
58	98-106, H.J. Res. 284, Twenty-fifth Anniversary of NASA.	Oct. 1, 1983.
	98-107, H.J. Res. 368, Continuing Appropriations, FY 1984.	Do.
	98-108, H.R. 3962, Export Administration Act Extension.	Do.
	98-109, H.J. Res. 366, Mortgage Insurance Authorities Extension.	Do.
59	98-110, S.J. Res. 81, World Food Day	Oct. 3, 1983.
	98-111, S. 602, Radio Broadcasting to Cuba	Oct. 4, 1983.
60	98-112, S.J. Res. 142, National Productivity Improvement Week.	Do.
61	98-113, S.J. Res. 140, Myasthenia Gravis Awareness Week.	Oct. 5, 1983.
62	98-114, H.J. Res. 137, National Schoolbus Safety Week.	Oct. 7, 1983.
	98-115, H.R. 2972, Military Construction Authorization, FY 1984.	Oct. 11, 1983.
	98-116, H.R. 3263, Military Construction Appropriations, FY 1984.	Do.
	98-117, H.R. 3871, Civil Service Wage Adjustments.	Do.
	98-118, H.R. 4101, Federal Unemployment Compensation (FSC).	Do.
	98-119, S.J. Res. 159, Lebanon—Multinational Force, War Powers.	Oct. 12, 1983.
	98-120, H.R. 3813, International Coffee Agreement Implementation.	Do.
63	98-121, S. 1465, Charles A. Halleck Federal Building.	Do.
64	98-122, S. 1724, Harold L. Runnels Federal Building.	Do.
65	98-123, S. 884, Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians Judgment Funds.	Oct. 13, 1983.
66	98-124, S. 1148, Assiniboine Tribe, Montana Tribal Funds Distribution.	Do.
	98-125, H.R. 3415, D.C. Appropriations, FY 1984	Do.
67	98-126, S.J. Res. 102, Lupus Awareness Week	Do.
	98-127, S. 216, Penalties for Crimes Involving the Tampering with Food, Drug, Cosmetic, and other Products.	Do.
68	98-128, H.R. 3379, Edwin D. Eshleman Post Office Building.	Oct. 14, 1983.
	98-129, H.R. 2840, Federal Management of Pribilof Islands Termination.	Do.
69	98-130, S.J. Res. 128, Metropolitan Opera Day	Do.
70	98-131, H.R. 3835, William A. Steiger Post Office Building.	Oct. 17, 1983.
71	98-132, S. 1894, Henry M. Jackson Foundation for the Advancement of Military Medicine.	Do.
72	98-133, H.R. 1556, Conveyance of Liberty Ship John W. Brown to John W. Brown Preservation Project.	Oct. 18, 1983.
73	98-134, S. 1499, Mashantucket Pequot Indians Claims.	Do.
	98-135, H.R. 3929, Federal Unemployment Compensation (FSC).	Oct. 24, 1983.
74	98-136, H.R. 3321, Louisiana World Exposition Commemorative Medals.	Do.
75	98-137, H.R. 1062, Land Conveyance in Lane County, Oregon.	Oct. 25, 1983.
76	98-138, H.R. 3044, Connecticut River Atlantic Salmon Agreement.	Oct. 28, 1983.
	98-139, H.R. 3913, Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations, FY 1984.	Oct. 31, 1983.
	98-140, S. 96, Lee Metcalf Wilderness Area, Montana.	Do.
	98-141, H.R. 1213, Public Lands and National Parks.	Do.
77	98-142, S.J. Res. 57, National Drug Abuse Education Week.	Nov. 1, 1983.
	98-143, S.J. Res. 189, Export-Import Bank Extension.	Do.
	98-144, H.R. 3706, Martin Luther King, Jr., Holiday.	Nov. 2, 1983.
78	98-145, S.J. Res. 121, National Diabetes Month	Nov. 3, 1983.
	98-146, H.R. 3363, Interior Appropriations, FY 1984.	Nov. 4, 1983.
79	98-147, S.J. Res. 45, National Family Week	Do.
80	98-148, S. 552, George W. Whitehurst Federal Court Building.	Nov. 7, 1983.
81	98-149, S. 1944, Transfer of U.S. Submarine Albacore to Portsmouth Memorial Submarine Association.	Do.

PUBLIC LAWS, 98TH CONGRESS (272 OUT OF 461 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 59 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
	98-150, S. 461, Office of Government Ethics Authorization, FY 1984-89.	Nov. 11, 1983.
	98-151, H.J. Res. 413, Continuing Appropriations, FY 1984.	Nov. 14, 1983.
82	98-152, H.J. Res. 283, National Disabled Veterans Week.	Nov. 15, 1983.
83	98-153, S.J. Res. 122, National Home Care Week	Do.
84	98-154, S.J. Res. 188, National Christmas Seal Month.	Nov. 16, 1983.
85	98-155, H.J. Res. 408, Anti-Defamation League Day.	Do.
86	98-156, H.J. Res. 383, Florence Crittenton Week	Nov. 17, 1983.
87	98-157, S. 448, Belle Fourche Irrigation Project, South Dakota.	Do.
88	98-158, S.J. Res. 92, Municipal Clerk's Week	Do.
89	98-159, H.R. 3348, Gold Medal to Family of Congressman Leo J. Ryan.	Nov. 18, 1983
	98-160, H.R. 2920, Veterans' Health Care and Programs Improvement.	Nov. 21, 1983.
	98-161, H.J. Res. 308, Public Debt Limit Permanent Increase.	Do.
90	98-162, S.J. Res. 139, Eleanor Roosevelt's Centennial Birthday Commemoration.	Do.
91	98-163, H.R. 2910, Pima Maricopa Indian Lands	Nov. 22, 1983.
	98-164, H.R. 2915, State Department Authorization, FY 1984-85.	Do.
92	98-165, H.R. 3885, Grand Ronde Tribes, Oregon	Do.
	98-166, H.R. 3222, Commerce-Justice-State-Judiciary Appropriations, FY 1984.	Nov. 28, 1983.
	98-167, S. 376, Debt Collection	Nov. 29, 1983.
	98-168, H.R. 2077, Physicians Comparability Allowances—Supplemental Civil Service Retirement for Federal Employees Covered by Social Security.	Do.
93	98-169, H.R. 2592, Catalogue of Domestic Assistance Programs, OMB-GSA.	Do.
94	98-170, S. 807, Cumberland Island National Seashore Boundaries, Georgia.	Do.
	98-171, H.R. 2590, Agricultural Adjustments: Filberts, Hazelnuts, and Potatoes.	Do.
95	98-172, H.J. Res. 93, Recognition of the Humanitarian Efforts of Danny Thomas.	Do.
96	98-173, S. 1168, Kaw Tribe, Oklahoma Trust Lands.	Do.
97	98-174, S. 1837, Henry M. Jackson Memorial Building.	Do.
98	98-175, H.R. 24, U.S. Land in New York to Become Part of the Green Mountain National Forest.	Do.
99	98-176, H.R. 594, NOAA Claims Settlement Authority.	Do.
	98-177, H.R. 4013, Small Business Development Centers.	Do.
100	98-178, H.J. Res. 168, National Tourism Week	Do.
101	98-179, H.J. Res. 421, Convening of 98th Congress, 2d Session, January 23, 1983.	Do.
	98-180, H.R. 3385, Dairy and Tobacco Program Adjustments.	Do.
	98-181, H.R. 3959, Supplemental Appropriations—IMF, Multilateral Development Banks, Export-Import Bank, and Omnibus Housing Authorizations, FY 1984.	Nov. 30, 1983.
102	98-182, S.J. Res. 44, National Surveyors Week	Do.
	98-183, H.R. 2230, Civil Rights Commission	Do.
103	98-184, H.R. 2479, Incorporation of D.C. Masonic Mutual Relief Association, Known Now as Acacia Mutual Life Insurance.	Do.
	98-185, H.R. 2780, Revenue Sharing	Do.
	98-186, S. 450, Mail Order Consumer Protection Amendments.	Do.
104	98-187, S.J. Res. 141, Carrier Alert Week	Do.
105	98-188, H.J. Res. 324, National Fetal Alcohol Syndrome Week.	Do.
	98-189, H.R. 2196, National Historical Publications and Records Commission Authorization, FY 1984-88.	Do.
106	98-190, H.R. 4294, James Van Zandt Veterans Medical Center and Carl Vinson Veterans Medical Center.	Do.
	98-191, H.R. 2293, Office of Federal Procurement Policy.	Dec. 1, 1983.
	98-192, S. 726, Tribally-Controlled Community Colleges.	Do.
	98-193, S. 1046, Product Liability Risk Retention	Do.
	98-194, S. 2129, Rural Health Clinic Reimbursement.	Do.
107	98-195, S. 1503, Release of Agricultural Lands in Delaware.	Do.
108	98-196, S. 577, Land Conveyance in Idaho	Do.
109	98-197, H.J. Res. 405, Presidential Commission for the German-American Bicentennial.	Do.
110	98-198, S.J. Res. 111, Child Health Mortality	Do.
	98-199, S. 1341, Education of the Handicapped Authorization.	Dec. 2, 1983.
	98-200, H.R. 2395, Migratory Bird Conservation Fund.	Do.
	98-201, H.R. 2785, FIFRA	Do.
	98-202, H.R. 2906, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Authorization, FY 1984-85.	Do.
111	98-203, H.R. 3765, Las Vegas Pauite Indian Trust Lands.	Do.
	98-204, H.R. 4252, Puerto Rico Nutrition	Do.

PUBLIC LAWS, 98TH CONGRESS (272 OUT OF 461 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 59 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
112	98-205, S. 505, Juliette Gordon Low Federal Building, Savannah, Georgia.	Do.
113	98-206, H.J. Res. 311, National Agriculture Day	Do.
	98-207, H.R. 4476, Export Administration Extension.	Dec. 5, 1983.
114	98-208, H.J. Res. 381, Samuel Curtis Johnson Appointed to Smithsonian Board of Regents.	Do.
	98-209, S. 974, Military Justice System Improvement.	Dec. 6, 1983.
	98-210, S. 1099, NOAA Marine Fisheries Program Authorization, FY 1984.	Do.
	98-211, H.R. 1035, Education Consolidation and Improvement Act Amendments.	Dec. 8, 1983.
	98-212, H.R. 4185, Department of Defense Appropriations, FY 1984.	Do.
	98-213, S. 589, Guam Capital Improvement Projects Authorization, FY 1984.	Do.
	98-214, H.R. 2755, Federal Communications Commission Authorization, FY 1984-85.	Do.
	98-215, H.R. 2968, Intelligence Authorization, FY 1984.	Dec. 9, 1983.

2D SESSION (Jan. 23, 1984-Oct. 10, 1984; 158 out of 246 public laws, or 64 percent, were nonsubstantive or administrative)

1	98-216, H.R. 2727, Money, Finance, Transportation Law Codification.	Feb. 14, 1984.
2	98-217, H.R. 3969, Secretary of Defense Participation in Panama Canal Commission.	Do.
3	98-218, H.J. Res. 290, XXIII Olympiad 1984	Feb. 17, 1984.
4	98-219, H.R. 2898, Utah Paiute Indian Trust Lands	Do.
5	98-220, S.J. Res. 146, National Energy Education Day.	Feb. 21, 1984.
	98-221, S. 1340, Vocational Rehabilitation—GI Bill	Feb. 22, 1984.
	98-222, H.R. 4956, Export Administration Act Extension.	Feb. 29, 1984.
	98-223, S. 1388, Veterans Compensation and Program Improvements.	Mar. 2, 1984.
	98-224, H.R. 4336, Civil Service Amendments	Do.
6	98-225, S.J. Res. 184, National Beta Club Week	Do.
7	98-226, S.J. Res. 193, Frozen Food Day	Mar. 5, 1984.
8	98-227, H.J. Res. 442, Women's History Week	Do.
9	98-228, H.J. Res. 292, National Theatre Week	Mar. 7, 1984.
	98-229, H.R. 4957, Interstate Highway Construction.	Mar. 9, 1984.
10	98-230, S.J. Res. 161, National Child Abuse Prevention Month.	Mar. 12, 1984.
11	98-231, S. 2354, Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness.	Mar. 14, 1984.
12	98-232, S.J. Res. 112, National Social Work Month	Do.
13	98-233, S.J. Res. 225, National Eye Donor Month	Do.
14	98-234, S.J. Res. 205, National Employ the Older Worker Week.	Mar. 16, 1984.
	98-235, H.R. 3655. Raising Retirement Age for Certain Court Judges.	Mar. 19, 1984.
	98-236, H.R. 2173, Contract Services for Drug Dependent Federal Offenders Act Authorization.	Mar. 20, 1984.
	98-237, S. 47, Shipping Antitrust	Do.
15	98-238, S.J. Res. 132, National Correctional Officers Week.	Do.
	98-239, H.R. 4194, Antitrust Exemption for Oil Companies Participating in IEP.	Mar. 20, 1984.
16	98-240, H.J. Res. 200, National Single Parents Day	Mar. 21, 1984.
	98-241, S. 820, Earthquake Hazards Reduction Authorization, FY 1984-86.	Mar. 22, 1984.
	98-242, S. 684, Water Resources Program	Do.[1]
17	98-243, S. 912, Richard B. Russell Dam and Lake Project.	Mar. 26, 1984.
	98-244, H.R. 2809, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.	Do.
18	98-245, H.J. Res. 454, Contribution of Blacks to American Independence.	Mar. 27, 1984.
19	98-246, S.J. Res. 250, National Photo Week	Do.
20	98-247, S.J. Res. 241, Jewish Heritage Week	Mar. 28, 1984.
	98-248, H.J. Res. 493, Urgent Supplemental Appropriations—Low Income Energy Assistance.	Mar. 30, 1984.
21	98-249, S. 2507, Bankruptcy Act Extension	Mar. 31, 1984.
	98-250, S. 1530, Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance.	April 3, 1984.
22	98-251, H.J. Res. 271, National Inventors Day	April 6, 1984.
23	98-252, H.J. Res. 443, Student Awareness of Drunk Driving Month.	Do.
24	98-253, S. 1365, Harry Porter Control Tower Designation.	Do.
25	98-254, S.J. Res. 203, National Mental Health Counselors Week.	April 9, 1984.
26	98-255, H.J. Res. 432, Parkinson's Disease Awareness Week.	Do.
27	98-256, S. 2392, FAA Appointment of Donald E. Engen.	April 10, 1984.
	98-257, H.R. 3249, National Academy of Public Administration.	Do.
	98-258, H.R. 4072, Wheat and other Price Supports.	Do.
	98-259, H.R. 4206, Income Tax Exemption of U.S. Employees Who Die Overseas.	Do.
28	98-260, H.R. 4202, John G. Fary Tower, Midway Airport, Chicago.	April 13, 1984.
29	98-261, S.J. Res. 148, National Tuberous Sclerosis Week.	Do.

PUBLIC LAWS, 98TH CONGRESS (272 OUT OF 461 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 59 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
30	98-262, S.J. Res. 171, National POW/MIA Recognition Day.	Do.
31	98-263, H.J. Res. 407, National Hearing Impaired Awareness Week.	Do.
32	98-264, H.J. Res. 520, Education Day, USA	Do.
	98-265, S. 1852,	Defense Production Act Extension April 17, 1984.
33	98-266, H.R. 4835, Clement J. Zablocki Memorial Outpatatient Facility, Krakow, Poland.	Do.
34	98-267, H.J. Res. 466, Older Americans Month,	Do.
35	98-268, S.J. Res. 173, Commendation of Historic American Buildings Survey.	Do.
36	98-269, H.R. 596, Miller Act Payment Bonds Transfer of Responsibility from Comptroller General.	April 18, 1984.
	98-270, H.R. 4169, Omnibus Reconciliation	Do.
37	98-271, S. 2570, Bankruptcy Act Extension	April 30, 1984.
38	98-272, S.J. Res. 210, Year of Excellence in Education.	May 3, 1984.
39	98-273, H.R. 3867, Perishable Agricultural Commodities.	May 7, 1984.
40	98-274, H.J. Res. 478, National Week of the Ocean.	Do.
41	98-275, S.J. Res. 136, Volunteer Firefighters Recognition Day.	May 8, 1984.
42	98-276, H.R. 5298, White House Conference on Small Business.	Do.
43	98-277, S. 2460, Edmund S. Muskie Federal Building.	Do.
44	98-278, S. 2597, Congressional Gold Medals to Harry S. Truman's Daughter, Lady Bird Johnson, and Elie Wiesel.	Do.
45	98-279, S. 2461, Margaret Chase Smith Federal Building.	Do.
	98-280, H.R. 3555, Seneca Indian Lands, New York.	May 9, 1984.
46	98-281, S.J. Res. 244, National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week.	May 11, 1984.
	98-282, H.R. 3376, Makah Indian Trust Lands, Washington.	May 14, 1984.
47	98-283, S.J. Res. 232, National Physical Fitness and Sports Month.	May 15, 1984.
48	98-284, H.R. 2733, Guayule Rubber Production	May 16, 1984.
49	98-285, H.R. 3240, Medal to the Widow of Roy Wilkins.	May 17, 1984.
50	98-286, S.J. Res. 220, National Arts with the Handicapped Week.	Do.
51	98-287, S. 597, Conveyance of Lands to Show Low, Arizona.	May 21, 1984.
	98-288, S. 1129, Community Volunteer Service	Do.
	98-289, S. 64, Irish Wilderness—Mark Twain National Forest, Missouri.	Do.
52	98-290 H.R. 4176, Southern Ute Indian Reservation, Colorado.	Do.
53	98-291, S. 1188, GAO Audit Requirements for Disabled Veterans Programs.	Do.
	98-292, H.R. 3635, Child Protection Act	Do.
54	98-293, H.J. Res. 537, Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge.	May 22, 1984.
55	98-294, S.J. Res. 198, National Nursing Home Residents Day.	Do.
56	98-295, S.J. Res. 228, National Digestive Diseases Awareness Week.	Do.
57	98-296, H.R. 4107, Maude R. Toulson Federal Building.	May 24, 1984.
58	98-297, H.R. 5576, Mary Woodard Lasker Center for Health Research and Education.	Do.
59	98-298, S.J. Res. 252, Missing Children Day	Do.
	98-299, H.R. 5174, Bankruptcy Act Amendments	May 25, 1984.
	98-300, H.R. 2211, Exemption of Electric and Telephone Facilities from Certain Right-of-Way Rental Payments.	Do.
60	98-301, H.R. 5515, Medal of Honor to Unknown American Who Died in Vietnam.	Do.
	98-302, H.R. 5692, Public Debt Limit Increase	Do.
61	98-303, H.J. Res. 526, National Animal Health Week.	Do.
62	98-304 S. 2079, AMVETS Charter Amendment	May 31, 1984.
	98-305, S. 422, Criminal Penalty for Robbery of a Controlled Substance.	Do.
	98-306, H.R. 2751, National Endowment for the Humanities, Arts, and the Institute of Museum Services Authorization.	Do.
63	98-307, S.J. Res. 94, Family Reunion Month	Do.
64	98-308, S.J. Res. 211, National Family Week	Do.
65	98-309, S.J. Res. 239, Lupus Awareness Week	Do.
66	98-310 H.J. Res. 451, National Alzheimer's Disease Week.	Do.
67	98-311, H.J Res. 487, D-Day National Remembrance.	Do.
	98-312, H.R. 5287, Higher Education Act Amendments.	June 12, 1984.
	98-313, S. 518, Pollution Assistance	Do.
68	98-314, S. 2413, American Gold Star Mothers Recognition.	Do.
	98-315, H.R. 3547, D.C. Loan Authority	Do.
	98-316, H.R. 5308, D.C. Federal Payment	Do.
69	98-317, S.J. Res. 285, Harmon Killebrew Day	June 15, 1984.
70	98-318, S.J. Res. 296, Baltic Freedom Day	Do.
71	98-319, S.J. Res. 289, National Child Passenger Safety Awareness Day.	June 18, 1984.

PUBLIC LAWS, 98TH CONGRESS (272 OUT OF 461 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 59 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
72	98-320, S.J. Res. 261, Helen Keller Deaf-Blind Awareness Day.	Do.
	98-321, H.R. 3578, Wisconsin Wilderness	June 19, 1984.
	98-322, H.R. 4198, Vermont Wilderness	Do.
	98-323, H.R. 3921, New Hampshire Wilderness	Do.
	98-324, H.R. 3960, North Carolina Wilderness	Do.
73	98-325, S. 2776, Bankruptcy Act Extension	June 20, 1984.
74	98-326, H.R. 5517, GAO Positions	June 22, 1984.
	98-327, H.R. 1723, Minnesota Valley and San Francisco Bay Wildlife Refuges.	June 25, 1984.
	98-328, H.R. 1149, Oregon Wilderness	June 26, 1984.
	98-329, H.R. 4201, Removes the Drug Methaqualone from Public Use.	June 29, 1984.
75	98-330, S.J. Res. 297, Veterans' Preference Month	June 30, 1984.
76	98-331, S.J. Res. 257, Year of the Ocean	July 2, 1984.
	98-332, H.J. Res. 492, Urgent Supplemental—Argrculture, FY 1984.	Do.
77	98-333, S.J. Res. 298, National Ice Cream Month	Do.
78	98-334, S. 1135, Goose Leg Basin Compact, Oregon.	Do.
79	98-335, S.J. Res. 59, Hugo Lafayette Black Day	July 3, 1984.
80	98-336, S.J. Res. 150, Coast Guard Day	Do.
81	98-337, S.J. Res. 230, National Birds of Prey Conservation Week.	Do.
82	98-338, S.J. Res. 303, National Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Week.	Do.
83	98-339, S. 837, Washington National Forest Lands	Do.
84	98-340, H.R. 5565, Transportation Improvements of Federal Property.	Do.
85	98-341, S.J. Res. 270, National Duck Stamp Week	Do.
	98-342, H.R. 5953, Public Debt Limit Increase	July 6, 1984.
86	98-343, S.J. Res. 238, National Adoption Week	July 9, 1984.
87	98-344, S. 2403, Pueblo de Cochiti Trust Lands	Do.
88	98-345, H.J. Res. 555, Space Exploration Day	Do.
89	98-346, H.J. Res. 544, National Schoolage Childcare Awareness Week.	Do.
90	98-347, H.R. 4921, Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge.	Do.
91	98-348, S.J. Res. 278, Commeration of the 100th Anniversary of BLS.	Do.
92	98-349, S.J. Res. 306, Food for Peace Day	Do.
93	98-350, H.J. Res. 566, National Neighborhood Housing Services Week.	Do.
94	98-351, H.J. Res. 604, African Refugees Relief Day	Do.
	98-352, S. 2375, Secondary Market for SBA Loans	July 10, 1984.
	98-353, H.R. 5174, Bankruptcy Act Amendments	Do.
95	98-354, H.R. 5404, William R. Gianella—Panama Canal Commission Service.	Do.
96	98-355, H.R. 5950, Quadrennial Political Party Conventions.	July 11, 1984.
97	98-356, H.J. Res. 567, Day and Year of the St. Lawrence Seaway.	Do.
98	98-357, H.R. 3825, Black Canyon Boundary, Gunnison National Monument.	July 13, 1984.
99	98-358, H.R. 4308, Compact for a System of High-Speed Intercity Rail Service.	Do.
100	98-359, H.R. 3922, Postal Savings System Statute of Limitations Act.	Do.
	98-360, H.R. 5653, Energy-Water Development Appropriations, FY 1985.	July 16, 1984.
	98-361, H.R. 5154, NASA Authorization, FY 1984	Do.
	98-362, H.R. 3075, SBA Computer Security and Education Act.	Do.
	98-363, H.R. 4616, Highway Safety Programs Encouraging Use of Child Restraint Systems, FY 1985-6.	July 16, 1984.
	98-364, H.R. 4977, Marine Mammal Protection Authorization, FY 1985-88.	Do.
	98-365, H.R. 5155, Land Remote Sensing Satellite Commercialization.	Do.
101	98-366, H.R. 5740, Barrow Gas Field Transfer Act	Do.
	98-367, H.R. 5753, Legislative Branch Appropriations, FY 1985.	Do.
102	98-368, H.J. Res. 548, President's Commission on Organized Crime to Compel Attendance and Testimony of Witnesses.	Do.
	98-369, H.R. 4170, Deficit Reduction Act of 1984	July 18, 1984.
	98-370, H.R. 3169, Renewable Energy Industry Development Act.	Do.
	98-371, H.R. 5713, HUD Appropriations, FY 1985	Do.
103	98-372, H.R. 29, Polish Legion of American Veterans.	July 23, 1984.
	98-373, S. 373, Arctic Research	July 31, 1984.
104	98-374, H.J. Res. 577, Polish-American Heritage Month.	Aug. 7, 1984.
105	98-375, H.R. 1492, Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Jubilee Act.	Do.
	98-376, H.R. 559, Insider Trading Sanctions	Aug. 10, 1984.
	98-377, H.R. 1310, Education for Economic Security Act.	Aug. 11, 1984.
	98-378, H.R. 4325, Child Support Enforcement Act	Aug. 16, 1984.
	98-379, H.R. 4952, Assistance to Indians Near MX Missile Deployment Sites.	Do.
106	98-380, S.J. Res. 302, National Sewing Month	Aug. 17, 1984.
	98-381, S. 268, Hoover Power Plant Act	Do.
107	98-382, S. 1145, Catholic War Veterans of the U.S., Inc.	Do.
108	98-383, S.J. Res. 248, Hawaii Statehood Silver Jubilee Day.	Do.
109	98-384, S.J. Res. 272, Anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising of WWII.	Do.

PUBLIC LAWS, 98TH CONGRESS (272 OUT OF 461 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 59 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
110	98-385, H.J. Res. 529, National Drug Abuse Education and Prevention Week.	Aug. 21, 1984.
111	98-386, H.J. Res. 574, National Community Leadership Week.	Do.
112	98-387, H.J. Res. 583, National Jerome Kern Day	Do.
113	98-388, H.J. Res. 587, Ostomy Awareness Month	Do.
114	98-389, H.J. Res. 597, Youth of America Week	Do.
115	98-390, S. 1224, Creek Indian Judgment Funds	Do.
116	98-391, S. 1806, Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A., Inc.	Do.
	98-392, S. 2556, American Folklife Center Authorization, FY 1985-86.	Do.
117	98-393, S. 2820, Carl Albert Federal Building, Oklahoma.	Do.
118	98-394, S.J. Res. 338, Congratulations to the U.S. Olympic Athletes for the 1984 Winter Olympics in Yugoslavia, and the 1984 Summer Olympics in Los Angeles.	Do.
	98-395, S. 1429, Small Business Development Center Improvement Act.	Do.
	98-396, H.R. 6040, Second Supplemental Appropriations, FY 1984.	Do.
	98-397, H.R. 4280, Women's Pension Equity	Aug. 23, 1984.
119	98-398, S. 746, Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor, Illinois.	Aug. 24, 1984.
120	98-399, H.R. 5890, Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday Commission.	Aug. 27, 1984.
121	98-400, S. 1547, Land Grant to Olathe, Colorado	Do.
122	98-401, S. 2036, Land Conveyance in Utah	Do.
123	98-402, H.R. 4596, Amendment to Section 1601 of Public Law 96-607.	Aug. 28, 1984.
	98-403, S. 2085, Cotton Classing Costs	Do.
	98-404, H.R. 1652, Reclamation Safety of Dams Amendments.	Do.
	98-405, H.R. 3787, National Trails System Amendments.	Do.
	98-406, H.R. 4707, Arizona Wilderness Lands	Do.
	98-407, H.R. 5604, Military Construction Authorizations, FY 1985.	Do.
124	98-408, S. 2201, Zuni Indian Tribe Lands	Do.
	98-409, H.R. 4214, State Mining and Mineral Resources Research Institute.	Aug. 29, 1984.
125	98-410, H.J. Res. 452, Importance of Arts to Education.	Do.
	98-411, H.R. 5712, Commerce-Justice-State and the Judiciary Appropriations, FY 1985.	Aug. 30, 1984.
126	98-412, H.J. Res. 600, Agriculture-Related Trade and Export Policies Study Commission.	Do.
127	98-413, H.J. Res. 505, National Adult Day Care Center Week.	Sept. 21, 1984.
128	98-414, H.J. Res. 545, Emergency Medicine Week	Sept. 24, 1984.
129	98-415, S.J. Res. 333, World War I Aces and Aviators Day.	Do.
130	98-416, S.J. Res. 340, National Historically Black Colleges Week.	Do.
	98-417, S. 1538, Patent Law Amendments	Do.
131	98-418, S.J. Res. 275, National Spina Bifada Month.	Sept. 25, 1984.
	98-419, S. 1546, Deepwater Port Amendments	Do.
132	98-420, H.R. 5177, Amendment to Wheeling Creek Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention District Compact.	Do.
133	98-421, S. 806, Okefenokee Rural Electric Membership.	Do.
134	98-422, S.J. Res. 25, St. Croix Island International Historic Site.	Do.
135	98-423, S.J. Res. 334, National Hospice Month	Do.
136	98-424, S.J. Res. 335, National Tourism Week	Do.
	98-425, H.R. 1437, California Wilderness	Sept. 28, 1984.
	98-426, S. 38, Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation.	Do.
137	98-427, S. 2418, Library of Congress Deacidification Facility.	Do.
	98-428, S. 2155, Utah Wilderness	Do.
138	98-429, S.J. Res. 336, A Time of Remembrance	Do.
	98-430, H.R. 9, National Wilderness Preservation System, Florida.	Do.
139	98-431, H.J. Res. 453, National High-Tech Week	Do.
140	98-432, S. 1735, Shoalwater Bay Dexter by the Sea Indian Settlement, Washington.	Do.
141	98-433, H.J. Res. 153, National Children's Week	Do.
	98-434, H.R. 71, Groundwater Recharge Study	Do.
	98-435, H.R. 1250, Voting Accessibility for Elderly and Handicapped.	Do.
142	98-436, S.J. Res. 304, National Quality Month	Do.
143	98-437, S.J. Res. 254, National Down's Syndrome Month.	Do.
144	98-438, S.J. Res. 227, National Women Veterans Recognition Month.	Do.
145	98-439, S. 598, Land Conveyance, Arizona	Do.
	98-440, S. 2040, Secondary Mortgage Market Credit.	Oct. 3, 1984.
146	98-441, H.J. Res. 653, Continuing Appropriations, FY 1985 (2-day extension).	Do.
147	98-442, H.J. Res. 392, National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day.	Do.
	98-443, H.R. 5297, Civil Aeronautics Board Sunset Act.	Do.
148	98-444, S. 2732, Ausable River/Lamprey Eel Control on Pere Marguette River, Mich.	Oct. 4, 1984.
	98-445, H.R. 5147, Eastern Pacific Ocean Tuna Fishery Agreement Implementation.	Do.

PUBLIC LAWS, 98TH CONGRESS (272 OUT OF 461 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 59 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
149	98–446, H.J. Res. 554, Women in Agriculture Week	Do.
150	98–447, H.J. Res. 605, U.S. Opposition to Torture by Foreign Governments.	Do.
151	98–448, H.J. Res. 606, National Housing Week	Do.
	98–449, S. 2614, Indian Financing Act Amendments.	Do.
152	98–450, S. 32, Audio-Visual Materials Rental	Do.
	98–451, S. 2000, Variable Interest Rates for Indian Trust Funds.	Do.
153	98–452, S. 1770, Extension of Federal Oil and Gas Lease U–39711.	Do.
154	98–453, H.J. Res. 656, Continuing Appropriations, FY 1985 (4-day extension).	Oct. 5, 1984.
	98–454, H.R. 5561, Guam, Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Northern Mariana Islands Economic Development.	Do.
155	98–455, H.J. Res. 659, Continuing Appropriations, FY 1985 (2-day extension).	Oct. 6, 1984.
156	98–456, H.J. Res. 649, Changing the Date for Counting Electoral Votes.	Oct. 9, 1984.
	98–457, H.R. 1904, Child Abuse Amendments	Do.
157	98–458, S.J. Res. 322, Mental Illness Awareness Week.	Do.
	98–459, S. 2603, Older Americans Act Amendments.	Do.
	98–460, H.R. 3755, Social Security Disability Benefits Reform.	Do.
158	98–461, H.J. Res. 663, Continuing Appropriations, FY 1985 (2-day extension).	Oct. 10, 1984.

[1] Without approval.

PUBLIC LAWS, 97TH CONGRESS (227 OUT OF 473 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 48 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
	1ST SESSION (JAN. 3, 1981—DEC. 16, 1981; 61 OUT OF 145 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 42 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)	
1	97–1, S.J. Res. 16, Day of Thanksgiving to Honor Returned Iranian Hostages.	Jan. 26, 1981.
	97–2, H.R. 153, Public Debt Limit Increase	Feb. 7, 1981.
2	97–3, S. 253, Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians.	Feb. 10, 1981.
3	97–4, S. 272, Joint Committee on Printing Membership Increase.	Feb.17, 1981.
	97–5, H.R. 2166, Antitrust Exemption for Oil Company Participation in IEP.	Mar. 13, 1981.
	97–6, S. 509, Milk Price Supports	Mar. 31, 1981.
	97–7, S. 840, Justice Department FY 1981 Authorization.	Apr. 9, 1981.
4	97–8, S.J. Res. 61, African Refugee Relief Day	Do.
5	97–9, H.J. Res. 182, National Recognition Day for Veterans of the Vietnam Era.	Apr. 14, 1981.
6	97–10, H.J. Res. 155, Jewish Heritage Week	May 1, 1981.
	97–11, S. 730, Crop Insurance	May 22, 1981.
	97–12, H.R. 3512, Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions, 1981.	June 5, 1981.
7	97–13, S.J. Res. 50, POW–MIA Day	June 12, 1981.
	97–14, S. 1070, CETA-Youth Employment Demonstration Programs.	June 16, 1981.
	97–15, H.R. 2156, VA Medical Schools	June 17, 1981.
	97–16, S. 1213, Ocean Dumping Authorization, FY 1982.	June 23, 1981.
8	97–17, H.J. Res. 288, Correcting Public Law 97–12.	June 29, 1981.
	97–18, H.R. 3991, Food Stamps Authorization Increase, FY 1981.	June 30, 1981.
9	97–19, S. 1123, Senate Office Equipment	July 6, 1981.
10	97–20, S. 1124, Senate Computer Programming Services Contracts.	Do.
	97–21, H.J. Res. 238, Virgin Islands Constitution	July 9, 1981.
11	97–22, H.R. 3807, Defense Officer Personnel Management Act/Technical Corrections.	July 10, 1981.
	97–23, H.R. 3520, Steelmaking Facilities Compliance with Clean Air Act.	July 17, 1981.
	97–24, S. 1395, Wheat Marketing Quota	July 23, 1981.
	97–25, H.R. 31, Cash Discounts; Credit Card Surcharge Ban.	July 27, 1981.
	97–26, H.J. Res. 308, Health and Human Services Urgent Supplemental, FY 1981.	July 29, 1981.
12	97–27, H.J. Res. 84, National Diabetes Week	Aug. 4, 1981.
13	97–28, S.J. Res. 28, Women's History Week	Do.
14	97–29, H.J. Res. 191, National Children's Day	Aug. 6, 1981.
	97–30, S. 1040, Federal Payment to D.C.	Do.
15	97–31, H.R. 4074, Maritime Administration Transfer from Commerce to Transportation Department.	Do.
16	97–32, S.J. Res. 64, National Blinded Veterans Recognition Day.	Do.
	97–33, S. 1104, International Investment Survey Authorization, FY 1982.	Aug. 7, 1981.
	97–34, H.R. 4242, Tax Cut (Economic Recovery Tax Act—ERTA).	Aug. 13, 1981.
	97–35, H.R. 3982, Omnibus Budget Reconciliation, FY 1981-Spending Committees.	Do.

PUBLIC LAWS, 97TH CONGRESS (227 OUT OF 473 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 48 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
17	97–36, H.J. Res. 141, Schoolbus Safety Week	Aug. 14, 1981.
	97–37, H.R. 1100, Prisoners of War Benefits and Health Care Services.	Do.
18	97–38, S. 547, Siletz Indians	Do.
	97–39, S. 694, Military Procurement and Construction Supplemental Authorization, FY 1981.	Do.
	97–40, S. 640, D.C. Borrowing Authority	Do.
19	97–41, S. 875, Palo Verde Irrigation District Diversion Dam.	Do.
	97–42, S. 1278, Saccharine Study and Labeling	Do.
20	97–43, S.J. Res. 87, Commodore John Barry Day	Aug. 20, 1981.
21	97–44, S.J. Res. 62, Cystic Fibrosis Week	Sept. 17, 1981.
	97–45, H.R. 2120, Product Liability Risk Retention	Sept. 25, 1981.
	97–46, H.R. 4416, Emergency Agricultural Assistance.	Do.
	97–47, H.R. 2903, Defense Production Extension	Sept. 30, 1981.
	97–48, H.J. Res. 266, Public Debt Limit Increase	Do.
	97–49, H.J. Res. 265, Public Debt Limit Increase	Do.
	97–50, S. 1475, Antitrust Exemption for Oil Company Participation in IEP.	Do.
	97–51, H.J. Res. 325, Continuing Appropriations, FY 1982.	Oct. 1, 1981.
22	97–52, S.J. Res. 78, American Enterprise Day	Oct. 2, 1981.
23	97–53, S.J. Res. 103, National Port Week	Do.
24	97–54, S.J. Res. 65, Raoul Wallenberg Honorary Citizenship.	Oct. 5, 1981.
25	97–55, H.R. 618, Land Conveyance	Oct. 6, 1981.
26	97–56, H.R. 2218, Land Conveyance	Do.
27	97–57, H.J. Res. 263, Nurses Recognition Day	Oct. 9, 1981.
	97–58, H.R. 4084, Marine Mammal Protection	Do.
28	97–59, S. 1033, North and South Carolina Lateral Seaward Boundary Agreement.	Do.
	97–60, S. 1181, Military Pay Increase	Oct. 14, 1981.
29	97–61, S.J. Res. 98, World Food Day	Do.
	97–62, S. 1712, Wheat Marketing Quota Referendum.	Do.
30	97–63, S. 304, National Tourism Policy	Oct. 16, 1981.
31	97–64, H.R. 4048, Kansas/Missouri Boundary Agreement.	Do.
	97–65, H.R. 3136, OPIC Authorization	Do.
	97–66, S. 917, Veteran's Disability Compensation, Housing, and Memorial Benefits.	Oct. 17, 1981.
	97–67, H.R. 4612, Milk Price Supports	Oct. 20, 1981.
32	97–68, S. 1191, Commercial Fishermen Reimbursements.	Oct. 26, 1981.
	97–69, S. 1224, Congressional Franking Law	Do.
33	97–70, S. 1687, International Investment Survey Act/Technical Corrections.	Do.
34	97–71, H.J. Res. 268, Hungarian Freedom Fighters Day.	Do.
	97–72, H.R. 3499, Veterans Health Care	Nov. 3, 1981.
	97–73, S. 1209, Kennedy Center Authorization	Do.
	97–74, S. 1000, Transportation Safety Board Authorization, FY 1982–83; Supplemental, FY 1981.	Do.
35	97–75, S.J. Res. 4, National Family Week	Do.
	97–76, H.R. 4608, Justice Department Authorization, FY 1981.	Nov. 5, 1981.
	97–77, S. 1322, Milk Price Supports; Wheat and Cotton Marketing Quota Referendum Extensions; Robey Wentworth Harned Laboratory.	Nov. 13, 1981.
	97–78, H.R. 3975, Oil Production from Tar Sands	Nov. 16, 1981.
	97–79, S. 736, Control of Illegally-Taken Fish and Wildlife.	Do.
	97–80, S. 999, Federal Fire Prevention and Control; Earthquake Hazard Reduction; and Multi-Hazard Resources Planning and Mitigation Authorizations, FY 1982.	Nov. 20, 1981.
	97–81, H.R. 4792, Military Justice System Improvement.	Do.
36	97–82, H.R. 4734, Italian-American War Veterans Federal Charter.	Do.
37	97–83, S. 195, U.S. Submarine Veterans of WW II Federal Charter.	Do.
38	97–84, S. 1672, Holocaust Memorial Council	Do.
	97–85, H.J. Res. 368, Continuing Appropriations, FY 1982.	Nov. 23, 1981.
	97–86, S. 815, Military Procurement Authorization, FY 1982.	Dec. 1, 1981.
	97–87, S. 1133, National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere Authorization, FY 1982.	Do.
	97–88, H.R. 4144, Energy-Water Appropriations, FY 1982.	Dec. 4, 1981.
	97–89, H.R. 3454, Intelligence Activities Authorizations, FY 1982.	Do.
	97–90, H.R. 3413, Energy National Security Authorization, FY 1982–83.	Do.
	97–91, H.R. 4522, D.C. Appropriations, FY 1982	Do.
	97–92, H.J. Res. 370, Continuing Appropriations, 1982.	Dec. 15, 1981.
	97–93, S.J. Res. 115, Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System.	Do.
	97–94, H.R. 4591, Mineral Leasing Laws	Dec. 17, 1981.
39	97–95, S.J. Res. 136, San Carlos Indian Tribe of Arizona Judgment Funds.	Do.
	97–96, S. 1098, NASA Authorization, FY 1982	Dec. 21, 1981.
40	97–97, H.R. 4845, Robert V. Denney Federal Building and Courthouse.	Do.
	97–98, S. 884, Omnibus Farm Bill-Price Supports	Dec. 22, 1981.
	97–99, H.R. 3455, Military Construction Authorization, FY 1982.	Dec. 23, 1981.
	97–100, H.R. 4035, Interior Appropriations, FY 1982.	Do.

PUBLIC LAWS, 97TH CONGRESS (227 OUT OF 473 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 48 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
	97–101, H.R. 4034, HUD Appropriations, FY 1982	Do.
	97–102, H.R. 4209, Transportation Appropriations, FY 1982.	Do.
	97–103, H.R. 4119, Agriculture Appropriations, FY 1982.	Do.
41	97–104, H.R. 3484, George Washington Commemorative Coins.	Do.
	97–105, H.R. 4910, D.C. Bond Authority	Do.
	97–106, H.R. 4241, Military Construction Appropriations, FY 1982.	Do.
42	97–107, H.R. 5273, George Washington University Revenue Bonds.	Do.
	97–108, H.R. 1465, CBO Cost Estimates on Reported Legislation Having Economic Consequences on State and Local Governments.	Do.
	97–109, S. 1003, Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Authorization, FY 1982–83.	Dec. 26, 1981
	97–110, H.R. 4879, International Banking Facility Deposit Insurance.	Do.
43	97–111, S. 1948, Farm Credit Administration Borrowing Authority.	Do.
44	97–112, H.R. 4894, Lac Courte Orielles Indians Trust Funds.	Dec. 29, 1981
	97–113, S. 1196, Foreign Assistance Authorization, 1982.	Do.
	97–114, H.R. 4995, Defense Appropriations, FY 1982.	Do.
	97–115, S. 1086, Older Americans	Do.
	97–116, H.R. 4327, Immigration and Nationality Laws.	Do.
	97–117, H.R. 4503, Municipal Wastewater Treatment Construction Authorization, FY 1982–85.	Do.
45	97–118, H.R. 4506, Melvin Price Lock and Dam	Do.
	97–119, H.R. 5159, Black Lung Benefits	Do.
46	97–120, S. 657, Herbert Clark Hoover Department of Commerce Building.	Do.
	97–121, H.R. 4559, Foreign Aid Appropriations, FY 1982.	Do.
47	97–122, H.R. 4431, Michael E. Roll Post Office	Do.
	97–123, H.R. 4331, Social Security Minimum Benefits.	Do.
	97–124, H.R. 3799, National Guard Tort Claims	Do.
48	97–125, S. 1192 Union Station Redevelopment	Do.
49	97–126, H.R. 2494, John Archibald Campbell U.S. Courthouse.	Do.
50	97–127, S. 1946, Czechoslovakian Claims Settlement.	Do.
51	97–128, S. 1493, Army Corps of Engineers Water Resource Projects Deauthorization.	Do.
	97–129, S. 1211, Toxic Substances Control Authorizatrion, FY 1982.	Do.
	97–130, S. 271, International Record Carrier Competrition (Western Union).	Do.
52	97–131, S.J. Res. 34, National Patriotism Week	Do.
	97–132, S.J. Res. 100, Mideast Peace Treaty International Force.	Do.
53	97–133, H.J. Res. 377, Convening of 2d Session, 97th Congress.	Do.
	97–134, H.R. 3210, Federal Aid Highway Authorization, FY 1982–85.	Do.
54	97–135, S.J. Res. 57, National Schleroderma Week	Do.
	97–136, S. 831, Coast Guard Authorization, FY 1982.	Do.
55	97–137, H.R. 2241, Bandom Marsh National Wildlife Refuge, Oregon.	Do.
56	97–138, S.J. Res. 84, National Energy Education Day.	Do.
57	97–139, S.J. Res. 121, Bicentennial Year of the American Bold Eagle; Bold Eagle Day.	Do.
58	97–140, H.R. 779, Benbrook Dam, Texas Municipal Water Storage.	Do.
	97–141, S. 1551, Physician Comparability Contracts	Do.
59	97–142, H.R. 4926, Osage Indian Mineral Interests	Do.
60	97–143, S. 1976, U.S. Capitol Grounds Regulations	Do.
61	97–144 S.J. Res. 117, National Jaycees Week	Do.
	97–145, H.R. 3567, Export Administration Authorization, FY 1982–83.	Do.
	2D SESSION (JAN. 25, 1982—DEC. 23, 1982; 166 OUT OF 328 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 51 PERCENT WERE NON-SUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)	
	97–146, H.J. Res. 382, ICA Film Broadcast Authorization.	Jan. 30, 1982.
	97–147, H.J. Res. 389, Urgent Agriculture Supplemental Appropriations, 1982.	Feb. 15, 1982.
	97–148, H.J. Res. 391, Urgent Labor Supplemental Appropriations, 1982.	Feb. 22, 1982.
	97–149, S.J. Res. 134, Year of Disabled Persons	Feb. 26, 1982.
3	97–150, S.J. Res. 122, National Construction Industry Week.	Mar. 1, 1982.
4	97–151, S.J. Res. 142, Afghanistan Day	Mar. 10, 1982.
5	97–152, H.R. 5021, Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians Reporting Extension.	Mar. 16, 1982.
6	97–153, S.J. Res. 91, National Peach Month	Do.
7	97–154, S.J. Res. 105, National PTA Membership Month.	Do.
8	97–155, H.R. 4625, Transfer of German Art Works	Mar. 17, 1982.
9	97–156, S.J. Res. 148, Agriculture Day	Mar. 18, 1982.
	97–157, H.J. Res. 373, Soviet Persecution of Soviet Jews.	Mar. 22, 1982.

PUBLIC LAWS, 97TH CONGRESS (227 OUT OF 473 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 48 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
10	97-158, H.J. Res. 348, Gold Medal/Queen Beatrix	Do.
11	97-159, S. 2166, ICA Slide Show-Montana; The People Speak.	Mar. 24, 1982
	97-160, S. 2254, Federal Flexitime Extension	Mar. 26, 1982.
	97-161, H.J. Res. 409, Continuing Appropriations, 1982.	Mar. 31, 1982.
	97-162, S. 892, Federal Grants and Cooperative Agreements.	April 1, 1982.
	97-163, S. 1937, Antitrust Exemption for Oil Company Participation in IEP.	Do.
	97-164, H.R. 4482, Federal Courts Improvement	April 2, 1982.
12	97-165, H.J. Res., 272, Medic Alert Week	April 3, 1982.
13	97-166, H.J. Res 447, National Day of Reflection	Do.
14	97-167, H.J. Res. 435, American Salute to Cabanantaun Prisoner of War Memorial Day.	April 6, 1982.
15	97-168, S. 634, Idaho/Wyoming Land Conveyance	Do.
16	97-169, S.J. Res. 102, Parliamentary Emphasis Month.	Do.
17	97-170, H.J. Res. 410, Dutch-American Friendship Day.	April 12, 1982.
18	97-171, S. 2333, Charitable Contributions from Tax Exempt Organizations to Government Employees Injured During Assassination Attempts.	April 13, 1982.
19	97-172, S.J. Res. 67, Nurse-Midwifery Week	April 16, 1982.
20	97-173, H.J. Res. 448, Jewish Heritage Week	April 28, 1982.
	97-174, S. 266, VA-DOD Medical Resources Sharing.	May 4, 1982.
	97-175, S. 2373, White Sands Space Harbor	May 11, 1982.
	97-176, S. 2244, Northern Pacific Ocean and Bering Sea Halibut Fishery Protection.	May 17, 1982.
	97-177, S. 1131, Interest Penalty for Late Federal Payments.	May 21, 1982.
21	97-178, H.J. Res. 412, Amelia Earhart Day	Do.
	97-179, H.R. 2863, Public Lands Sale	May 24, 1982.
	97-180, S. 691, Piracy and Counterfeiting of Records, Tapes and Films.	Do.
22	97-181, H.J. Res. 361, International Ballet Competition, Jackson, Mississippi.	Do.
23	97-182, S.J. Res. 170, National Hospice Week	Do.
24	97-183, S.J. Res. 145, National Orchestra Week	Do.
25	97-184, S. 146, Historic Preservation of Camden, South Carolina.	Do.
	97-185, H.R. 6038, Mortgage Insurance Authorities Extension.	Do.
26	97-186, S. 1611, Lands Leased to Foreign Governments for Legations.	May 25, 1982.
27	97-187, S.J. Res. 53, Working Mothers Day	June 1, 1982.
28	97-188, S.J. Res. 59, Designation of Square Dance as U.S. National Folk Dance.	Do.
29	97-189, S.J. Res. 160, POW-MIA Recognition Day	Do.
	97-190, S. 2575, Antitrust Exemption for Oil Company Participation in IEP.	Do.
	97-191, S. 2575, Foreign Fish Processing in Internal Waters.	Do.
30	97-192, H.R. 4769, American Council of Learned Societies.	Do.
31	97-193, S.J. Res. 149, National Child Abuse Prevention Week.	June 15, 1982.
32	97-194, S.J. Res. 131, National Theatre Week	June 16, 1982.
33	97-195, S. 1808, Under Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs.	Do.
34	97-196, S.J. Res. 201, Baltic Freedom Day	June 18, 1982.
35	97-197 S. 896, Omlie Tower	June 21, 1982.
36	97-198, S.J. Res. 140, National Inventors Day	Do.
37	97-199, H.R., 6132, Smithsonian Institution Interest Rate Adjustment.	June 22, 1982.
	97-200, H.R. 4, Agent Identities Disclosure	June 23, 1982.
38	97-201, H.R. 5432, Admiral Rickover Gold Medal	Do.
	97-202, H.R. 5566, Kennedy Center Authorization, FY 1983.	June 24, 1982
	97-203, H.R. 5659, Museum of African Art/Center for Eastern Art Construction.	Do.
	97-204, H.J. Res. 519, Public Debt Limit Increase	June 28, 1982.
	97-205, H.R. 3112, Voting Rights Act Extension	June 29, 1982.
	97-206, H.R. 3863, Turkey Processing and Inspection.	June 30, 1982.
39	97-207, H.R. 4569, William R. Cotter Federal Building.	Do.
	97-208, H.R. 6631, Lebanon Emergency Relief Authorization.	Do.
40	97-209, H.J. Res. 230, Soviet Emigration of Gluzman Family.	Do.
41	97-210, H.J. Res. 518, NCO/Petty Officer Week	Do.
	97-211, S. 1519, Florida Keys Wilderness	Do.
	97-212, H.R. 3816, Fishermen's Contingency Fund	Do.
42	97-213, H.R. 4903, Mississippi/Louisiana Rapid Rail Transit Service Compact.	Do.
	97-214, H.R. 6451, Military Construction and Family Housing.	July 12, 1982.
	97-215, H.R. 6198, Copyright Law Manufacturing Clause Extension.	July 13, 1982.[1]
	97-216, H.R. 6685, Urgent Supplemental Appropriations, 1982.	July 18, 1982.
	97-217, S. 2651, Antitrust Exemption for Oil Company Participation in IEP.	July 19, 1982.
	97-218, H.R. 6590, Tobacco Price Supports	July 20, 1982.
	97-219, S. 881, Small Business Innovation Research.	July 22, 1982.
43	97-220, S. 1230, Olympic Coins	Do.
	97-221, S. 2240, Federal Flexitime Extension	July 23, 1982.
	97-222, H.R. 4935, Bankruptcy Laws	July 27, 1982.
44	97-223, H.J. Res. 225, Management Week in America.	Do.
45	97-224, S.J. Res. 95, Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial.	July 28, 1982.
46	97-225, H.J. Res. 444, National Navaho Code Talkers Day.	Do.
	97-226, H.R. 4688, Military Personnel and Civilian Employees Claims.	Do.
	97-227, H.R. 6663, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.	Aug. 2, 1982.
47	97-228, H.J. Res. 526, National Purple Heart Week	Do.
	97-229, S. 2332, Energy Emergency Preparedness	Aug. 3, 1982.
	97-230, S. 2706, U.S. Magistrates Bar Membership Requirements.	Aug. 6, 1982.
48	97-231, S. 2317, National Federal of Music Clubs Federal Charter.	Aug. 9, 1982.
	97-232, S. 2218, Gateway National Recreation Area Improvement.	Do.
	97-233, H.J. Res. 494, El Salvador—Presidential Certifications.	Aug. 10, 1982.
49	97-234, H.R. 5380, American Ex-Prisoners of War Federal Charter.	Do.
50	97-235, S.J. Res. 190, National Family Week	Aug. 16, 1982.
51	97-236, S.J. Res. 183, Lupus Awareness Week	Aug. 17, 1982.
52	97-237, H.J. Res. 541, Space Shuttle Program Commendation.	Aug. 20, 1982.
53	97-238, S. 2154, Land Conveyance	Do.
54	97-239, H.J. Res. 516, National Coin Week	Do.
55	97-240, S.J. Res. 123, National Disabled Veterans Week.	Do.
	97-241, S. 1193, State Department Authorization, FY 1982-83.	Aug. 24, 1982.
56	97-242, S. 2073, USPS Size and Weight Limitations.	Do.
	97-243, H.R. 6530, Mt. Saint Helens National Volcanic Area.	Aug. 26, 1982.
	97-244, H.R. 2160, Potato Research and Promotion	Do.
57	97-245, H.R. 6033, Congressional Cemetery Preservation.	Do.
58	97-246, H.R. 4647, Fred Waring, Louis L'Amour, and Mrs. Joe Lewis Gold Medals.	Do.
	97-247, H.R. 6260, Patent and Trademark Office Authorization, FY 1983-85; Supplemental FY 1982.	Aug. 27, 1982.
	97-248, H.R. 4961, Tax Increase; Medicare-Medicaid Cut (Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act, TEFRA).	Sept. 3, 1982.
	97-249, H.R. 6732, International Safe Container Amendments.	Sept. 8, 1982.
59	97-250, S. 1119, Crater Lake National Park Boundary.	Do.
	97-251, H.R. 6350, VA Nurse Recruitment	Do.
	97-252, S. 2248, Military Procurement Authorization, FY 1983.	Do.
	97-253, H.R. 6955, Omnibus Budget Reconciliation, FY 1982-Spending Committees.	Do.
60	97-254, H.R. 6409, Louisiana World Exposition, 1984.	Do.
	97-255, H.R. 1526, Federal Financial Integrity	Do.
	97-256, H.R. 3345, Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons; Patent and Trademark Laws.	Do.
	97-257, H.R. 6863, Supplemental Appropriations, FY 1982.	Sept. 10, 1982.
	97-258, H.R. 6128, U.S. Code Revisions and Codifications (Money and Finance).	Sept. 13, 1982.
	97-259, H.R. 3239, National Telecommunications and Information Administration Authorization.	Do.
61	97-260, S.J. Res. 194, Smithsonian Institutional Board of Regents.	Sept. 18, 1982.
	97-261, H.R. 3663, Bus Deregulation	Sept. 20, 1982.
	97-262, S.J. Res. 250, Railway Labor Management Dispute (Rail Strike).	Sept. 22, 1982.
62	97-263, H.R. 1710, Franking Privileges—House of Representatives Law Revision Counsel.	Sept. 24, 1982.
63	97-264, S. 2582, Oliver Wendell Homes Devise Fund.	Do.
64	97-265, S.J. Res. 186, National Cystic Fibrosis Week.	Do.
65	97-266, S.J. Res. 205, National Sewing Month	Do.
	97-267, S. 923, Pretrial Services	Sept. 27, 1982.
	97-268, H.R. 3620, Federal Property Transfer	Do.
	97-269, H.R. 6068, DOD Intelligence Activities Authorizaiton, FY 1983.	Do.
	97-270, H.J. Res. 520, Public Debt Limit Increase	Sept. 30, 1982.
	97-271, H.R. 3517, Virgin Islands Nomimmigrant Aliens.	Do.
	97-272, H.R. 6956, HUD Appropriations, FY 1983	Do.
	97-273, H.R. 4347, South Dakota Water Resource Development (WEB Rural Water Project).	Do.
	97-274, H.R. 7065, Community Services Block Grants.	Do.
	97-275, S. 1628, Bureau of Reclamation Emergency Fund.	Oct. 1, 1982.
	97-276, H.J. Res. 599, Continuing Appropriations, FY 1983.	Oct. 2, 1982.
66	97-277, H.J. Res 496, Alzheimer's Disease Week	Oct. 4, 1982.
67	97-278, H.R. 5288, Solid Waste Disposal—New Hampshire/Vermont Interstate Compact.	Do.
68	97-279, S.J. Res. 193, Respiratory Therapy Week	Do.
69	97-280, S.J. Res. 165, Year of the Bible	Do.
70	97-281, H.J. Res. 568, Spinal Cord Injury Month	Oct. 5, 1982.
71	97-282, S.J. Res. 174, World Food Day	Do.
72	97-283, S. 2405, Cibola National Forest-Sandia Wilderness Boundary.	Do.
73	97-284, H.J. Res. 486, Schoolbus Safety Week of 1982.	Do.
74	97-285, S. 907, Penalties for Crimes Against Cabinet Members.	Oct. 6, 1982.
	97-286, S. 2271, National Bureau of Standards/National Technical Information Service Authorization, FY 1983.	Do.
74	97-287, H.R. 3589, Navajo Tribe/BLM Land Exchange.	Do.
75	97-288, H.R. 5081, Washoe Indian Tribe Land Transfer.	Do.
76	97-289, H.J. Res. 612, Housing and Community Development Insurance Programs Temporary Extension.	Do.
	97-290, S. 734, Export Trade	Oct. 8, 1982.
	97-291, S. 2420, Victims Protection	Oct. 12, 1982.
	97-292, H.R. 6976, Missing Children and Deceased Persons Computer Information System.	Do.
	97-293, S. 1409, Reclamation Reform; Buffalo Bill Dam and Reservoir; Papago Indians Water Rights.	Do.
77	97-294, S.J. Res. 239, Newspaper Carriers Appreciation Day.	Do.
78	97-295, H.R. 4623, Military Laws Codifications	Do.
	97-296, H.R. 5154, Lanham Trademark Act Amendments.	Do.
	97-297, H.R.6168, Penalties for Threats Against Former President, Presidential Candidates, and Their Families.	Do.
	97-298, H.R. 6454, Anti-Arson Act	Do.
79	97-299, H.J Res. 207, Joseph Rosenthal Plaque	Do.
	97-300, S. 2036, Jobs Training	Oct. 13, 1982.
	97-301, S. 2852, Guaranteed Student Loans (Sallie Mae).	Do.
80	97-302, H.R. 3881, Land Conveyance	Do.
	97-303, H.R. 6156, SEC Jurisdiction	Do.
	97-304 H.R. 6133, Endangered Species Research Authorization, FY 1983-85.	Do.
81	97-305, S. 188, Land Conveyance	Oct. 14, 1982.
	97-306 H.R. 6782, Veterans' Disability Compensation and Survivors' Benefits.	Do.
82	97-307, S. 2874, Migratory Bird and Conservation Stamp Contest.	Do.
	97-308, H.R. 4468, Secret Service Protection Zones.	Do.
	97-309, H.R. 5930, Federal Aviation Insurance	Do.
83	97-310, H.R. 7293, Wolf Trap Foundation Authorization.	Do.
84	97-311, H.R. 6422, Land Conveyance	Do.
	97-312, H.R. 2035, Animal Quarantine Law Enforcement.	Do.
	97-313, H.R. 5658, Citizenship Program Educational Block Grants.	Do.
85	97-314, H.R. 5941, Clement Haynsworth, Jr. Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse.	Do.
86	97-315, H.J. Res. 588, Head Start Awareness Month.	Do.
87	97-316, S.J. Res. 113, Home Health Care Week	Do.
88	97-317, S.J. Res. 197, Myasthenia Gravis Awareness Week.	Do.
89	97-318, S.J. Res. 235, Agriculture Day	Do.
90	97-319, S.J. Res. 249, Spinal Cord Injury Month	Do.
	97-320, H.R. 6267, Depository Institutions	Oct. 15, 1982.
	97-321, S. 2586, Military Construction Authorization, FY 1982.	Do.
	97-322, S. 2252, Coast Guard Authorization, FY 1983-84.	Do.
	97-323, H.R. 6968, Military Construction Appropriations, FY 1983.	Do.
	97-334, H.R. 5890, NASA Authorization, FY 1983	Do.
	97-325, H.R. 6164, Agreement on International Carriage of Perishable Foodstuffs Implementing Legislation.	Do.
	97-326, S. 2386, Geographical Distribution of Federal Funds.	Do.
	97-327, S. 2574, Federal-Aid Highway Authorization, FY 1983-86.	Do.
	97-328, H.R. 6276, District of Columbia Educational Revenue Bonds.	Do.
91	97-329, S. 246, Mary McLeod Bethune Council House National Historic Site.	Do.
92	97-3330, H.R. 4476, Administrative Conference of the U.S. Authorization, FY 1983-86.	Do.
	97-331, H.R. 6273, National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Programs Authorization, FY 1983-85.	Do.
	97-332, H.R. 2528, Interagency Contract Procedures.	Do.
	97-333, H.R. 1486, Protection Island National Wildlife Refuge.	Do.
	97-334, H.R. 2457, District of Columbia Federal Payments.	Do.
93	97-335, S. 1777, Acadia National Park Permanent Boundary.	Do.
	97-336, S. 2375, Defense Production Act Extension	Do.
	97-337, H.R. 3278, Military Retirees Health Facilities Reapportionment.	Do.
	97-338, H.R. 6188, Nebraska Water Resource Development.	Do.
	97-339, H.R. 3467, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Authorization.	Do.
94	97-340, H.R. 1281, Land Conveyance	Do.

PUBLIC LAWS, 97TH CONGRESS (227 OUT OF 473 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 48 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
95	97-341, S. 1872 Capitol Reef National Park, Utah—Grazing Privileges.	Do.
96	97-342, H.R. 7115, Naval Vessels Transfer	Do.
97	97-343, S.J. Res. 241, Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Week.	Do.
98	97-344, S. 478, Indian Lands Partitioning	Do.
99	97-345, S. 1573, Lake Oswego, Oregon	Do.
	97-346, H.R. 5145, Capitol Architect/Botanic Garden Employee Training; FY 1982 Omnibus Reconciliation Civil Service Provisions Clarifications.	Do.
	97-347, H.R. 5662, Fish and Wildlife Programs Extension.	Oct. 18, 1982.
	97-348, S. 1018, Coastal Barrier Resources Conservation.	Do.
100	97-349, S.J. Res. 261, National Housing Week	Do.
	97-350, S. 1210, Environmental Quality Improvement Authorization, FY 1983-84.	Do.
	97-351, H.R. 5228, Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material Implementing Legislation.	Do.
	97-352, H.R. 6865, Perishable Agricultural Commodities Marketing Practices.	Do.
101	97-353, S.J. Res. 257, National Diabetes Month	Oct. 19, 1982.
	97-354, H.R. 6055, Small Business Corporations Tax Law Revisions.	Do.
102	97-355, S.J. Res. 262, National Christmas Seal Month.	Do.
103	97-356, H.R. 6029, Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Land Exchange.	Do.
	97-357, H.R. 5139, U.S. Territories Authorization	Do.
	97-358, H.R. 6142, Surplus Agricultural Commodities Disposal.	Oct. 21, 1982.
	97-359, S. 1698, Child Immigration—Preferential Treatment of Amerasians.	Oct. 22, 1982.
	97-360, H.R. 4828, Naval Vessels Set-Aside Program.	Do.
	97-361, H.R. 3787, Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Michigan.	Do.
	97-362, H.R. 4717, Miscellaneous Revenue Act	Oct. 25, 1982.
	97-363, H.R. 5879, Refugee Assistance	Do.
	97-364, H.R. 6170, State Alcohol Traffic Safety Programs.	Do.
	97-365, H.R. 4613, Debt Collection	Do.
104	97-366, H.R. 4441, Library of Congress Copyright Office Fees.	Do.
105	97-367, H.R. 792, White House Conference on Productivity.	Do.
106	97-368, H.J. Res. 595, Fiorello H. LaGuardia Memorial Day.	Dec. 17, 1982.
	97-369, H.R. 7019, Transportation Appropriations, FY 1983.	Dec. 18, 1982.
	97-370, H.R. 7072, Agriculture Appropriations, FY 1983.	Do.
107	97-371, H.R. 6403, Wyandot Indian Judgment Funds.	Dec. 20, 1982.
108	97-372, H.R. 5795, Shawnee Tribe Judgment Funds.	Do.
	97-373, S. 2177, Colorado River Basin Project	Do.
109	97-374, S. 764, John Sack Cabin	Do.
	97-375, H.R. 6005, Federal Agency Reporting Requirements.	Dec. 21, 1982.
110	97-376, H.R. 5553, Miami Indian Judgment Funds	Do.
	97-377, H.J. Res. 631, Continuing Appropriations, FY 1983.	Do.
	97-378, H.R. 7144, D.C. Appropriations, FY 1983	Dec. 22, 1982.
111	97-379, H.R. 6417, Capitol Grounds Boundary Revision.	Do.
112	97-380, S. 1444, Federal Surplus Property Donations.	Do.
113	97-381, S. 1681, Robert B. Griffin Water Project	Do.
	97-382, S. 1894, Indian Tribal Mineral Resources	Do.
114	97-383, S. 2034, Robert F. Henry Lock and Dam	Do.
	97-384, S. 2710, Charles C. Deam Wilderness Area	Do.
115	97-385, H.R. 2329, Cherokee, Chickasaw and Choctaw Indians Lands Claims.	Dec. 23, 1982.
116	97-386, H.R. 4364, Pascua Yaqui Trust Lands	Do.
117	97-387, S. 2611, Peace Corps Volunteers Minimum Monthly Readjustment Allowance.	Do.
118	97-388, S. 3073, USIA Film Distribution Authorization.	Do.
	97-389, H.R. 3942, Commercial Fisheries Research and Development.	Dec. 29, 1982.
119	97-390, H.R. 6204, Supreme Court Police	Do.
120	97-391, H.R. 6588, Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe Recognition.	Do.
	97-392, H.R. 6758, Defense Sales	Do.
	97-393, S. 816, Antitrust Reciprocity	Do.
	97-394, H.R. 7356, Interior Appropriations, FY 1983.	Dec. 30, 1982
121	97-395, S. 823, Tris Claims	Do.
	97-396, H.R. 1952, Military Reserations and Public Lands Conservation Programs Authorization, FY 1983-85.	Dec. 31, 1982.
122	97-397, H.R. 5204, Sycuan Band of Mission Indians.	Do.
	97-398, H.R. 6946, Penalties for False Identification Related Crimes.	Do.
123	97-399, H.R. 7155, Florida Indian Land Claims Settlement.	Do.
124	97-400, H.R. 7377, Joe Poole Lake	Do.
125	97-401, S. 187, Land Conveyance	Do.
126	97-402, S. 1340, Clallam Indian Judgment Funds	Do.
127	97-403, S. 1735, Pembina Chippewa Judgment Funds.	Do.
128	97-404, S. 3113, Jobs Training-Technical Amendments.	Do.
129	97-405, S. 625, Voyageurs National Park Boundary	Jan. 3, 1983
	97-406, S. 1501, Educational Mining	Do.
	97-407, S. 1965, Paddy Creek Wilderness	Do.
130	97-408, S. 1986, Indian Tribe Funds Use and Distribution.	Do.
131	97-409, S. 2059, Ethics in Government-Special Prosecutor Appointments.	Do.
	97-410, S. 2355, Telephone Service for the Hearing Impaired.	Do.
	97-411, S. 2955, Cheaha Wilderness, Alabama	Do.
132	97-412, S. 3103, Executive Exchange Program Participation Fees.	Do.
133	97-413, S.J. Res. 270, Air and Space Flight Bicentennial.	Do.
	97-414, H.R. 5238, Incentives for Development of Drugs for Rare Diseases or Conditions (Orphan Drugs).	Jan. 4, 1983.
	97-415, H.R. 2330, Nuclear Regulatory Commission Authorization, FY 1982-83.	Do.
	97-416, H.R. 6120, Deep Seabed Hard Minerals Resources, FY 1983-85.	Do.
	97-417, H.R. 6804, Coast Guard Officer Candidate Program Subsistance Allowances.	Do.
	97-418, H.R. 6254, Secret Service Uniformed Division-Protection of Foreign Diplomatic Missions.	Do.
134	97-419, S.J. Res. 258 Closed Caption Television Month.	Do.
135	97-420, H.J. Res. 619, Public Employees Appreciation Day.	Do.
136	97-421, H.J. Res. 683, Green County Missouri 150th Anniversary.	Do.
137	97-422, H.R. 7420, Don H. Clausen Fish Hatchery	Do.
138	97-423, H.R. 7406, Paul Findley Building	Do.
	97-424, H.R. 6211, Highways-Gas Tax-Jobs Program.	Jan. 6, 1983.
	97-425, H.R. 3809, Nuclear Waste Policy	Jan. 7, 1983
139	97-426, H.R. 2475, Withdrawal of Certain Lands	Jan. 8, 1983
140	97-427, H.R. 7423, Recognition of Organization of Former Members of Congress.	Do.
141	97-428, H.R. 4001, Navajo Trust Lands	Do.
142	97-429, H.R. 4496, Texas Band of Kickapoo Indians Tribal Recognition.	Do.
143	97-430, H.R. 5027, Walter E. Hoffmann U.S. Courthouse.	Do.
144	97-431, H.R. 4568, Land Conveyance	Do.
145	97-432, H.R. 5456, Plant Quarantine Act—Elimination of Public Hearing Requirements.	Do.
	97-433, H.R. 7316, National Park System Visitor Facilities Fund.	Do.
146	97-434, H.R. 5916, Ramah Band of Navajo Tribe Trust Lands.	Do.
147	97-435, H.R. 6419, Land Conveyance	Do.
148	97-436, H.R. 6243, Warm Springs Indian Judgment Funds.	Do.
149	97-437, H.R. 6519, Internal Revenue Service Internships.	Do.
	97-438, H.R. 7143, Agricultural and Productive Credit and Self-Help Community Development Programs Extension.	Do.
	97-439, H.R. 7005, Turf Seed Mixture Labelling and Importation.	Do.
	97-440, H.R. 7159, Water Pollution Control	Do.
150	97-441, S.J. Res. 101, High School Activities Week	Do.
151	97-442, S.J. Res. 240, Jacee Week	Do.
152	97-443, S.J. Res. 264, Children and Television Week.	Do.
	97-444, H.R. 5447, Commodity Futures Trading Commission.	Jan. 11, 1983.
153	97-445, H.J. Res. 459, American Indian Day	Jan. 12, 1983.
	97-446, H.R. 4566, Tariff Schedule Revisions	Do.
154	97-447, H.R. 4491, U.S. Capitol Historical Society Tax Exemption.	Do.
155	97-448, H.R. 6056, Tax Law Technical Corrections	Do.
	97-449, H.R. 6993, Transportation Law Revisions	Do.
156	97-450, H.R. 5029, B.F. Sisk Federal Building	Do.
	97-451, H.R. 5121, Oil and Gas Royalty Management.	Do.
157	97-452, H.R. 7378, U.S. Code Revisions and Codifications (Money and Finance).	Do.
	97-453, H.R. 5002, Fishery Conservation and Management.	Do.
	97-454, H.R. 7410, FTC Quarterly Financial Report—Transferring Responsibility to Secretary of Commerce.	Do.
	97-455, H.R. 7093, Tax Rates; Social Security Disability Benefits/Medicare Coverage.	Do.
	97-456, H.R. 6094, U.S. International Trade Commission, U.S. Trade Representative, U.S. Customs Service Authorizations, FY 1983.	Do.
158	97-457, S.J. Res. 271, Banking Laws Technical Corrections.	Do.
159	97-458, H.R. 3731, Indian Tribe Funds Use and Distribution.	Do.
160	97-459, S. 503, Devils Lake Sioux Indian Tribe Lands.	Do.
161	97-460, S. 1540, Saratoga National Historical Park Boundary.	Do.
	97-461, H.R. 6679, Livestock and Plant Disease Control.	Do.
	97-462, H.R. 7154, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.	Do.
162	97-463, S. 2863, Federal Jurors—Compensation Benefits.	Do.
	97-464, S. 2273, Earthquake Hazard Reduction Authorization, FY 1983.	Do.
163	97-465, S. 705, Land Conveyance	Do.
	97-466, H.R. 5161, Cranberry Wilderness, West Virginia.	Jan. 13, 1983.
164	97-467, H.R. 6538, Tennyson-Guyer Federal Building.	Jan. 14, 1983.
	97-468, H.R. 3420, Natural Gas and Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Authorization, FY 1982-83.	Do.
165	97-469, H.J. Res. 635, Budget and Economic Report Submission Deadline.	Do.
	97-470, H.R. 7102, Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Workers Protection.	Do.
	97-471, S. 3105, West Virginia Judicial Districts Realignments.	Do.
166	97-472, S.J. Res. 260, Tricentennial Year of German Settlement in America.	Do.
	97-473, H.R. 5470, Periodic Payment Settlements; Virgin Islands Source Income Reduction; Highway Trust Fund Tax Collection Extension.	Do.

[1] Without approval.

PUBLIC LAWS, 96TH CONGRESS (219 OUT OF 613 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 36 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)

	Public Law No., Bill No., and Title	Approved
	1ST SESSION (JAN. 15, 1979-DEC. 20, 1979; 50 OUT OF 187 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 27 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)	
1	96-1, H.J. Res. 1, President's Economic Report	Jan. 22, 1979.
2	96-2, H.R. 1902, Carson City Silver Dollars	Mar. 7, 1979.
3	96-3, S. 37, Financial Privacy Notification Repeal	Do.
	96-4, H.R. 2301, District Court Realignment	Mar. 30, 1979.
	96-5, H.R. 2534, Public Debt Limit Extension—Balanced Budget.	Apr. 2, 1979.
	96-6, H.R. 1147, Countervailing Duty Extension	Apr. 3, 1979.
	96-7, H.R. 2439, First Budget Rescission, 1979	Apr. 9, 1979.
	96-8, H.R. 2479, U.S.-Taiwan Relations	Apr. 10, 1979.
	96-9, H.J. Res. 283, NATO Support	Apr. 19, 1979.
	96-10, H.R. 2283, Council on Wage and Price Stability.	May 10, 1979.
4	96-11, H.J. Res. 262, Museum Day	May 18, 1979.
	96-12, S.J. Res. 80, Three Mile Island Commission	May 23, 1979.
5	96-13, S.J. Res. 71, Historic Preservation Week	May 24, 1979.
6	96-14, S. 532, President's Commission on Pension Policy.	Do.
7	96-15, S. 631, Gold Medal: John Wayne	May 26, 1979.
	96-16, H.R. 1787, NASA Supplemental Authorization, 1979.	June 4, 1979.
	96-17, H.R. 2520, Ocean Pollution Research and Development Authorization, 1980.	Do.
	96-18, H.R. 3404, Federal Reserve Bank's Purchase of U.S. Obligations.	June 8, 1979.
	96-19, H.R. 2805, Ethics in Government Amendments.	June 13, 1979.
8	96-20, S. 348, Gold Medal: Transatlantic Balloonists.	Do.
9	96-21, S. 613, Gold Medal: Hubert H. Humphrey	Do.
	96-22, S. 7, Veterans' Health Care	Do.
	96-23, S. 709, Coast Guard Authorization, 1980	Do.
	96-24, H.R. 3915, Employee Retirement Income Security (ERISA).	June 19, 1979.
	96-25, S. 199, Shipping Rebate Practices	Do.
	96-26, H.R. 3577, National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere Authorization, 1980-1981.	June 21, 1979.
	96-27, H.R. 3879, D.C. Temporary Commission on Financial Oversight.	Do.
	96-28, S. 869, Ethics in Government Amendments	June 22, 1979.
	96-29, S. 429, Military Procurement Supplemental Authorization, 1979.	June 27, 1979.
	96-30, S. 1317, Oil Company Participation in IEP	June 30, 1979.
	96-31, S. 984, Peanut Marketing Penalty Reduction	July 7, 1979.
10	96-32, S.J. Res. 14, Printing Error in Public Law 96-613.	July 10, 1979.
	96-33, H.R. 4556, State Health Planning Agencies	July 16, 1979.
11	96-34, H.J. Res. 353, United States Space Observance.	July 17, 1979.
	96-35, S. 1007, Mideast Arms Sales	July 20, 1979.
	96-36, S. 927, Smithsonian Authorization, 1980	Do.
	96-37, H.R. 3978, Savings and Loan Exemptions from FTC.	July 23, 1979.
	96-38, H.R. 4289, Supplemental Appropriations, 1979.	July 25, 1979.
	96-39, H.R. 4537, Multilateral Trade Agreements	July 26, 1979.
	96-40, H.R. 3661, Navajo-Hopi Relocation Commission.	July 30, 1979.
	96-41, H.R. 2154, National Defense Stockpile	Do.

PUBLIC LAWS, 96TH CONGRESS (219 OUT OF 613 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 36 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and Title	Approved
	96–42, H.R. 4712, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and Evidence.	July 31, 1979.
	96–43, S. 961, Speedy Trials	Aug. 2, 1979.
	96–44, H.R. 2729, National Science Foundation Authorization, 1980.	Do.
12	96–45, H.J. Res. 373, Polish Resistance During World War II.	Aug. 3, 1979.
13	96–46, H.R. 4591, Education Technical Amendments.	Aug. 6, 1979.
	96–47, S. 976, International Affairs of Treasury Authorization, 1980.	Aug. 8, 1979.
	96–48, H.R. 1786, NASA Authorization 1980	Do.
	96–49, H.R. 4476, Higher Education Amendments	Aug. 13, 1979.
14	96–50, H.J. Res. 19, Lupus Week	Do.
15	96–51, H.J. Res. 209, Diabetes Week	Do.
	96–52, S. 1318, 1980 Census	Do.
	96–53, H.R. 3324, Foreign Aid—Development Assistance Authorization. 1980.	Aug. 14, 1979.
16	96–54, H.R. 4616, Title V—United States Code/ Technical and Clerical Changes.	Do.
17	96–55, H.R. 4811, Land Conveyance: Nenana, Alaska.	Do.
	96–56, H.R. 2807, Bankruptcy Code Treatment of Student Loans.	Do.
	96–57, H.R. 3914, District of Columbia Metro Construction.	Do.
	96–58, H.R. 4057, Food Stamp Program	Do.
18	96–59, S. 41, Land Conveyance: Bell County, Kentucky.	Do.
	96–60, H.R. 3360, State Department Authorization, 1980–1981; Supplemental, 1979.	Aug. 15, 1979.
	96–61, S. 917, Fishery Conservation and Management Authorization, 1980-1982.	Do.
19	96–62, H.R. Res. 244, Grandparents Day	Sep. 6, 1979.
	96–63, S. 1146, Safe Drinking Water Authorization, 1980-1982.	Do.
	96–64, S. 1646, Foreign Banks Insurance	Sep. 14, 1979.
20	96–65, H.J. Res. 367, Meals on Wheels Week	Sept. 19, 1979.
	96–66, H.R. 2774, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Authorization, 1980-1981.	Sep. 21, 1979
	96–67, S. 1019, Ugandan Aid	Do.
	96–68, H.R. 4392, State-Justice-Commerce Appropriations, 1980.	Sep. 24, 1979.
	96–69, H.R. 4388, Energy-Water Appropriations, 1980.	Sep. 25, 1979.
	96–70, H.R. 111, Panama Canal Implemental Legislation.	Sep. 27, 1979.
	96–71, S.J. Res. 105, Mortgage Insurance Authorities Extention.	Sep. 28, 1979.
	96–72, S. 737, Export Control	Sep. 29, 1979.
	96–73, H.R. 3996, Amtrak Authorization, 1980-1982.	Do.
	96–74, H.R. 4393, Treasury-Postal Service Appropriations, 1980.	Do.
	96–75, H.R. 5380, Justice Department Authorization Extension, 1980.	Do.
	96–76, S. 230, Nurse Training Authorization, 1980	Do.
	96–77, H.J. Res. 406, Defense Production Extension	Do.
	96–78, H.R. 5369, Public Debt Limit Extension	Do.
	96–79, S. 544, Health Planning Authorization, 1980-1982.	Oct. 4, 1979.
21	96–80, H.J. Res. 303, Port Week	Oct. 6, 1979.
	96–81, S. 721, Civil Rights Commission Authorization, 1980.	Do.
	96–82, S. 237, U.S. Magistrates Jurisdication	Oct. 10, 1979.
	96–83, S. 756, Federal Procurement Policy Authorization, 1980-1982.	Do.
	96–84, H.R. 3920, Unemployment Compensation Commission.	Do.
	96–85, S. 233, U.S. Travel Service	Do.
	96–86, H.J. Res. 412, Continuing Appropriations, 1980.	Oct. 12, 1979.
22	96–87, H.R. 5419, Goodloe Byron Memorial—Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site.	Do.
	96–88, S. 210, Department of Education	Oct. 17, 1979.
	96–89, S. 817, Smithsonian Canal Zone Biological Area.	Oct. 19, 1979.
	96–90, H.R. 1301, Lottery Export	Oct. 13, 1979.
	96–91, S. 567, U.S. Attorney's for Eastern District, New York.	Oct. 25, 1979.
	96–92, H.R. 3173, Foreign Aid—Security Assistance Authorization, 1980.	Oct. 29, 1979.
	96–93, H.R. 4580, District of Columbia Appropriations, 1980.	Oct. 30, 1979.
	96–94, H.R. 5506, Oil Company Participation in IEP	Oct. 31, 1979.
	96–95, H.R. 1825, Archaeological Resources Protection.	Do.
	96–96, H.R. 5386, Higher Education Amendments	Do.
	96–97, S. 436, Tennessee Valley Authority Debt Limit.	Do.
	96–98, H.R. 3923, National Historical Publications and Records Commission.	Nov. 1, 1979.
23	96–99, H.J. Res. 3, Will Rogers Day	Nov. 2, 1979.
	96–100, S. 975, Intelligence Activities Authorization, 1980; Supplemental Authorization, 1979.	Do.
	96–101, S. 1905, Milwaukee Railroad	Nov. 4, 1979.
	96–102, S. 1030, Emergency Energy Conservation—Gasoline Rationing.	Nov. 5, 1979.
	96–103, H.R. 4394, HUD Approprations, 1980	Do.
	96–104, H.R. 2515, Agricultural Loan Limitations	Do.
	96–105, S.J. Res. 117, Mortgage Insurance Authorities Extension.	Nov. 8, 1979.
	96–106, H.R. 4249, Transportation Laws Amendments—Uranium Mill Tailings.	Nov. 9, 1979.
	96–107, S. 428, Military Procurement Authorization, 1980.	Do.
	96–108, H.R. 4387, Agriculture Appropriations, 1980.	Do.
	96–109, H.R. 5218, Caribbean Hurricane Relief Assistance.	Do.
	96–110, H.R. 4955, Refugee and Migration Assistance for Southeast Asia.	Nov. 13, 1979.
	96–111, S. 1281, U.S. Cruise Vessels	Nov. 15, 1979.
	96–112, S. 640, Maritime Authorization, 1980	Nov. 16, 1979.
24	96–113, H.R. 998, Marketing Quota Penalties Exemption for State Prison Farms.	Do.
25	96–114, H.R. 2196, Congressional Award Program	Do.
26	96–115, H.J. Res. 68, Family Week	Do.
27	96–116, H.R. 5279, ICA George Meany Film	Do.
28	96–117, H.J. Res. 199, Technical Corection: Santa Ana Pueblo Indians Land Trust.	Do.
	96–118, S. 838, Anadromous Fish Conservation Act Authorization, 1980–1982.	Do.
29	96–119, H.J. Res. 428, Child Abuse Prevention Month.	Do.
30	96–120, S. 1728, Wood Federal Courthouse	Do.
	96–121, S. 1160, Federal Fire Prevention and Control Authorization.	Do.
	96–122, S. 1037, District of Columbia Retirement Reform.	Nov. 17, 1979.
	96–123, H.J. Res. 440, Continuing Appropriations, 1980.	Nov. 20, 1979.
	96–124, H.R. 5811, District of Columbia Interest Rates.	Do.
	96–125, S. 1319, Military Construction Authorization, 1980.	Nov. 26, 1979.
	96–126, H.R. 4930, Interior Appropriations, 1980	Nov. 27, 1979.
	96–127, H.R. 4167, Milk Price Supports	Nov. 28, 1979.
	96–128, H.R. 2282, Veterans' and Survivors' Benefits.	Do.
	96–129, S. 411, Pipeline Safety	Nov. 30, 1979.
	96–130, H.R. 4391, Military Construction Appropriations, 1980.	Do.
	96–131, H.R. 4440, Transportation Appropriations, 1980.	Do.
	96–132, S. 1157, Justice Appropriations, 1980	Do.
	96–133, S. 1871, Oil Company Participation in IEP	Do,
31	96–134, S. 1686, Boggs Building	Dec. 5, 1979.
	96–135, H.R. 1885, Indian Preference Laws	Do.
32	96–136, H.J. Res. 448, Scouting Recognition Week	Dec. 7, 1979.
	96–137, H.R. 3354, Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves.	Dec. 12, 1979.
33	96–138, H.R. 4259, Gold Metal: American Red Cross.	Do.
34	96–139, S. 1491, Parkinson Federal Building	Do.
35	96–140, S. 1535, Keating Federal Building	Do.
36	96–141, S. 1655, Perkins Department of Labor Building.	Do.
	96–142, S. 497, Emergency Medical Assistance Authorization, 1980–1982—Sudden Infant Death.	Do.
	96–143, S. 239, Domestic Volunteer Services (ACTION).	Dec. 13, 1979.
	96–144, H.R. 5871, Interstate System Apportionments.	Do.
37	96–145, H.R. 3407, Army Awards	Dec. 14, 1979.
38	96–146, H.R. 4732, Architect of the Capitol Pay	Do.
39	96–147, H.J. Res. 458, Unity Day	Dec. 16, 1979.
	96–148, S. 901, Industrial Cost Recovery Payment Moratorium.	Do.
	96–149, S. 1788, Consumer Cooperative Bank	Do.
40	96–150, H.R. 5163, Naval Vessel Sale	Dec. 20, 1979.
	96–151, H.R. 3892, Veterans' Health Resources Programs Extension.	Do.
41	96–152, H.R. 5651, Capitol Police Chief	Do.
	96–153, H.R. 3875, Housing and Community Development.	Dec. 21, 1979.
	96–154, H.R. 5359, Defense Appropriations, 1980	Do.
42	96–155, S. 1874, American Legion Membership	Do.
	96–156, S. 716, Federal Employees Health Benefits	Dec. 27, 1979.
	96–157, S. 241, LEAA Appropriations, 1980–83	Do.
43	96–158, H.R. 5645, Land Conveyance Little Sisters of the Poor.	Do.
	96–159, S. 1143, Endangered Species Appropriations, 1980–1982.	Dec. 28, 1979.
	96–160, H.R. 5537, District of Columbia Borrowing Authority.	Do.
	96–161, H.R. 4998, Banking Institutions Authorities—State Usury Laws.	Do.
	96–162, S. 585, Yakima River Basin Feasibility Study.	Do.
44	96–163, H.R. 4943, Interstate Industrial Development Compact: New York–New Jersey Port Authority.	Do.
	96–164, S. 673, Department of Energy Military Appropriations, 1980.	Dec. 29, 1979.
45	96–165, H.R. 600, Federal Charter: United Service Organizations, Inc.	Do.
	96–166, H.R. 5015, Federal Physicians' Comparability Allowance.	Do.
	96–167, H.R. 5224, Tax Treatment of Fringe Benefits.	Do.
46	96–168, H.J. Res. 462, White House Preservation Fund.	Do.
47	96–169, H.R. 5079, Energy Expo 1982	Do.
	96–170, H.R. 3343, District of Columbia Civil Suits for Civil Rights Violations.	Do.
48	96–171, H.R. 3948, Pilots' Mandatory Age Retirement Study.	Do.
49	96–172, H.R. 2771, Lake Texana	Do.
	96–173, H.R. 5025, CHAMPUS	Do.
	96–174, H.R. 5174, White House Fellows and Executive Exchange Programs.	Do.
	96–175 H.R. 595, National Defense Stockpile Acquisitions and Disposals: Tin and Industrial Diamonds.	Do.
	96–176, H.R. 5523, Extra Long Staple Cotton Loan Levels.	Dec. 31, 1979
	96–177, H.R. 2727, Beef and Veal Import Quotas	Do.
	96–178, H.R. 3091, Tax Treatment of State Legislators' Residences-Social Services Amendments.	Jan. 2, 1980
	96–179, H.R. 2584, Civil Service Annuities	Do.
	96–180, S. 440, Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention Programs Authorization, 1980–1981.	Do.
	96–181, S. 525, Drug Abuse and Treatment Programs Authorization, 1980–1981.	Do.
	96–182, H.R. 2043, Waterbank Program Payment Adjustments.	Do.
	96–183, H.J. Res. 467, Chrysler Appropriations	Do.
	96–184, H.R. 3951, District of Columbia Metro Construction.	Jan. 3, 1980
	96–185, H.R. 5860, Chrysler Loan Guarantee	Jan. 7, 1980
50	96–186, H.J. Res. 468, President's Economic Report.	Jan. 8, 1980
	96–187, H.R. 5010, Federal Election Campaign Reform.	Do.

2D SESSION (JAN. 2, 1980–DEC. 28, 1980; 169 OUT OF 426 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 40 PERCENT, WERE NON-SUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)

	96–188, H.J. Res. 478, Defense Production Extension.	Jan. 28, 1980.
1	96–189, H.R. 4320, Bear River Compact	Feb. 8, 1980.
	96–190, S. 423, Consumer Controversies	Feb. 12, 1980.
2	96–191, H.R. 5176, GAO Personnel System	Feb. 15, 1980.
	96–192, S. 1300, International Air Fares	Do.
	96–193, H.R. 2440, Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement.	Feb. 18, 1980.
3	96–194, S.J. Res. 108, Indian Judgment Funds	Feb. 21, 1980.
	96–195, S. 1452, War Risk Insurance	Feb. 25, 1980.
4	96–196, H.J. Res. 469, Iwo Jima Commemoration Day.	Feb. 28, 1980.
5	96–197, H.J. Res. 477, Disneyland Silver Anniversary.	Do.
6	96–198, H.J. Res. 267, Teacher Day	Mar. 5, 1980.
7	96–199, H.R. 3757, Channel Islands National Park	Do.
8	96–200, S.J. Res. 109, American Enterprise Day	Mar. 6, 1980.
9	96–201, H.R. 6374, Gold Medal: Ambassador Kenneth Taylor.	Do.
10	96–202, S.J. Res. 43, Energy Education Day	Mar. 8, 1980.
11	96–203, S. 1850, Land Conveyance: Hot Springs, Arkansas.	Mar. 10, 1980.
12	96–204, H.J. Res. 434, Medic Alert Week	Mar. 11, 1980.
	96–205, H.R. 3756, Omnibus Territories	Mar. 12, 1980.
13	96–206, S.J. Res. 149, USS Carl Vinson	Mar. 13, 1980.
14	96–207, H.J. Res. 493, Smithsonian Institution Board of Regents Appointment: William G. Bowen.	Do.
15	96–208, H.J. Res. 494, Smithsonian Institution Board of Regents Appointment: Carisle H. Humelsine.	Do.
16	96–209, H.R. 4337, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.	Mar. 14, 1980.
	96–210, H.R. 5913, Shipbuilding Contracts	Mar. 17, 1980.
17	96–211, S. 1792, Gold Medal: Simon Wiesenthal	Do.
	96–212, S. 643, Refugee Assistance and Admission	Do.
	96–213, H.R. 3398, Target Prices for Wheat and Corn.	Mar. 18, 1980.
18	96–214, S. 2225, Senate Sales	Mar. 24, 1980.
	96–215, S. 1454, NOAA Corps Status Equalization	Mar. 25, 1980.
19	96–216, S. 1682, Indian Lands Restriction	Mar. 27, 1980.
20	96–217, S. 2222, Indian Tribal Claims	Do.
21	96–218, H.J. Res. 414, Bicycling Day	Mar. 28, 1980.
	96–219, H.J. Res. 514, FTC Funding, 1980	Do.
	96–220, S. 2269, Economic Emergency Loan Program.	Mar. 30, 1980.
	96–221, H.R. 4986, Banking Institutions—"NOW" Accounts.	Mar. 31, 1980.
22	96–222, H.R. 2797, Technical Corrections—Targeted Jobs Credit.	Apr. 1, 1980.
	96–223, H.R. 3919, Windfall Profit Tax	Apr. 2, 1980.
23	96–224, H.J. Res. 463, Diabetes Week	Do.
	96–225, H.J. Res. 520, Defense Production Extension.	Apr. 3, 1980.
	96–226, H.R. 24, GAO Audit of Unvouchered Expenses.	Do.
24	96–227, H.R. 4996, Paiute Indian Tribe Restoration	Do.
25	96–228, S. 1515, Bicentennial Medals	Do.
	96–229, H.R. 2676, EPA Authorization, 1980	Apr. 7, 1980.
	96–230, H.R. 6585, Reorganization Authority Extension.	Apr. 8, 1980.
26	96–231, S.J. Res. 131, ORT Centennial Day	Do.
27	96–232, H.R. 5794, Denton Building	Apr. 10, 1980.
28	96–233, S.J. Res. 97, Victims of the Holocaust	Do.
	96–234, S. 2427, Grain Reserves	Apr. 11, 1980.

PUBLIC LAWS, 96TH CONGRESS (219 OUT OF 613 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 36 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and Title	Approved
	96–235, H.R. 3824, D.C. Housing Revenue Bonds	Apr. 12, 1980
	96–236, H.R. 6029, International Sugar Agreement Implementing Legislation.	Apr. 22, 1980.
29	96–237, H.J. Res. 474, Jewish Heritage Week	Apr. 24, 1980.
30	96–238, H.R. 6464, Michigan Land Transfer: Lance Army Missile Plant.	Apr. 24, 1980.
	96–239, H.R. 7140, Employee Retirement Income Security.	Apr. 30, 1980.
	96–240, H.J. Res. 541, FTC Funding, 1980	May 1, 1980.
31	96–241, S. 2637, Secretary of State Salary	May 3, 1980.
	96–242, H.R. 4197, Wool Products Labeling	May 5, 1980.
	96–243, H.J. Res. 545, Urgent Food Stamp Supplemental Appropriation, 1980.	May 16, 1980.
	96–244, H.R. 126, National Park Service Funds	May 19, 1980.
32	96–245, H.R. 5673, National Labor Relations Board Mailings.	May 21, 1980.
	96–246, H.R. 6839, Endangered Species Section 6 Authorization.	May 23, 1980.
	96–247, H.R. 10, Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons.	Do.
33	96–248, H.R. 3928, Cibola National Forest	Do.
	96–249, S. 1309, Food Stamp Program	May 26, 1980.
	96–250, S.J. Res. 175, Defense Production Extension.	Do.
34	96–251, S. 668, Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians.	Do.
	96–252, H.R. 2313, Federal Trade Commission Authorization, 1980–82.	May 28, 1980
	96–253, S. 2648, Federal Election Commission Authorization, 1981.	May 29, 1980.
	96–254, S. 2253, Rock Island Bankruptcy	May 30, 1980.
	96–255, H.R. 6615, Ocean Pollution Research and Development.	Do.
	96–256, H.R. 7471, Public Debt Limit Extension	Do.
	96–257, H.R. 6081, Nicaragua and Honduras Economic Assistance.	May 31, 1980.
35	96–258, H.R. 3807, Transportation Laws Codifications.	June 3, 1980.
	96–259, S. 662, Multilateral Development Banks	Do.
36	96–260, H.R. 4088, Vessels Sale	June 3, 1980.
	96–261, H.J. Res. 554, Federal Trade Commission Appropriations, 1980.	June 4, 1980.
	96–262, H.R. 4890, Commercial Fisheries	June 5, 1980.
	96–263, H.R. 3789, Great Plains Conservation	June 6, 1980.
	96–264, H.R. 7428, Public Debt Limit Extension—Oil Import Fee Disapproval.	Do.[1]
	96–265, H.R. 3236, Disability Insurance	June 9, 1980.
37	96–266, H.J. REs. 445, Cystic Fibrosis Week	Do.
	96–267, H.R. 6727, Bon Secour Wildlife Refuge	Do.
	96–268, S. 1786, Smithsonian Authorization, 1981—Museum Serices.	June 13, 1980.
38	96–269, S. 2517, Library of Congress Buildings	Do.
	96–270, S. 1658, Asbestos Hazard Detection	June 14, 1980.
	96–271, S. 2666, Rubber Agreement Implementation Legislation.	June 16, 1980.
	96–272, H.R. 3434, Child Adoption Assistance and Welfare—Social Services.	June 17, 1980.
	96–273, H.R. 4453, Saccharin Usage	Do.
39	96–274, H.R. 2102, Standing Rock Sioux Land Inheritance.	Do.
	96–275, H.R. 6842, Shipper's Export Declarations	Do.
	96–276, H.R. 6285, Egg Research and Consumer Information—Silver Commodities.	Do.
	96–277, H.R. 3979, Indian Trade	Do.
40	96–278, S.J. Res. 127, Helen Keller Day	Do.
41	96–279, H.J. Res. 442, Athletic Boosters Week	June 18, 1980.
	96–280, S.J. Res. 89, Low-Enriched Uranium Exports.	Do.
42	96–281, S.J. Res. 183, Sons of Italy	June 19, 1980.
	96–282, H.J. Res. 521, Military Registration, 1980	June 27, 1980.
	96–283, H.R. 2759, Deep Seabed Mining	June 28, 1980.
	96–284, S. 2460, Uniformed Services Health Professionals Special Pay.	Do.
	96–285, H.R. 6022, Tensas River Wildlife Refuge	Do.
	96–286, H.J. Res. 569, Public Debt Limit Extension	Do.
	96–287, H.R. 5926, Biscayne and Valley Forge National Parks—Fort Jefferson National Monument.	Do.
	96–288, H.R. 6169, Bogue Chitto Wildlife Refuge	Do.
	96–289, H.R. 6614, National Sea Grant Program	Do.
	96–290, H.R. 4887, San Francisco Bay Wildlife Refuge.	Do.
	96–291, H.R. 4889, Great Dismal Swamp Wildlife Refuge.	Do.
43	96–292, H.R. 5259, Montoya Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse—Water Resources Project.	Do.
	96–293, H.R. 7685, Employee Retirement Income Security.	June 30, 1980.
	96–294, S. 932, Synfuels—Energy Security	Do.
	96–295, S. 562, Nuclear Regulatory Commission Authorization, 1980.	Do.
	96–296, S. 2245, Trucking Deregulation	July 1, 1980.
	96–297, S.J. Res. 119, Vietnam Veterans Memorial	Do.
	96–298, H.R. 7477, Aviation Excise Taxes Extension.	Do.
44	96–299, S.J. Res. 115, Porcelain Art Month	July 2, 1980.
45	96–300, S.J. Res. 188, National Commission on Air Quality.	Do
	96–301, H.R. 5751, Archeological Resources Protection.	Do.
	96–302, S. 2698, Small Business Administration Authorization, 1981–82.	Do.

PUBLIC LAWS, 96TH CONGRESS (219 OUT OF 613 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 36 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and Title	Approved
	96–303, H.R. 5997, U.S. Government Code of Ethics.	July 3, 1980.
	96–304, H.R. 7542, Supplemental Appropriations, 1980.	July 8, 1980.
	96–305, S. 751, Navajo-Hopi Relocation	Do.
46	96–306, H.R. 7482, Summer Olympic Team Medals, 1980.	Do.
47	96–307, S.J. Res. 168, POW–MIA Recognition Day	Do.
	96–308, S. 598, Soft Drink Interbrand	July 9, 1980.
48	96–309, S. 2546, Bessemer Ditch, Colorado	Do.
	96–310, H.R. 7474, Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion.	July 17, 1980.
49	96–311, H.R. 7573, Cook Inlet Land Exchange	Do.
	96–312, S. 2009, Idaho Wilderness	July 23, 1980.
50	96–313, S.J. Res. 180, Smithsonian Board of Regents Appointment: William A.M. Bunde.	July 25, 1980.
51	96–314, S.J. Res. 181, Smithsonian Board of Regents Appointment: Murray Gell-Mann.	Do.
	96–315, S. 2382, Tinicum National Environmental Center.	Do.
	96–316, S. 2240, NASA Authorization, 1981	July 30, 1980.
	96–317, S. 1647, Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians.	July 31, 1980.
52	96–318, S. 1466, Delaware Indian Judgment Funds	Aug. 1, 1980.
53	96–319, S. 2508, Gila River Pima-Maricopa Indian Judgment Distribution.	Do.
	96–320, S. 2492, Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion.	Aug. 3, 1980.
	96–321, S. 2995, Heat Crisis Program	Aug. 4, 1980.
	96–322, H.R. 6666, Coast Guard Reserve	Do.
	96–323, H.R. 5580, NATO Support	Do.
	96–324, H.R. 1198, Coast Guard Authority to Establish Lines of Demarcation.	Aug. 8, 1980.
	96–325, H.R. 6613, Maritime Labor Agreements	Do.
54	96–326, H.R. 827, Postal Service Dispute Resolution.	Do.
	96–327, S. 1916, OPIC Authorization—China	Do.
	96–328, H.R. 5748, National Guard Accountability Standards.	Do.
55	96–329, H.R. 7786, Secret Service Protection of Candidates Spouses.	Aug. 11, 1980.
	96–330, H.R. 7102, Veterans' Health Care	Aug. 26, 1980.[1]
56	96–331, S. 1863, NS Savannah	Aug. 28, 1980.
	96–332, S. 1140, Marine Protection	Aug. 29, 1980.
57	96–333, S. 1730, Ramah Band of Navajos	Do.
	96–334, H.J. Res. 589, Export-Import Bank Funds Extension, 1980.	Do.
	96–335, H.R. 507, Trinity River Fish Habitat	Sept. 4, 1980.
	96–336, S. 496, Colorado River Basin Salinity Control.	Do.
58	96–337, S.J. Res. 83, Campfire Girls Memorial	Do.
59	96–338, S. 1998, Tule River Indian Tribe	Do.
	96–339, S. 2549, Atlantic Tunas Conservation Commission.	Do.
60	96–340, S. 2055, Siletz Indians	Do.
61	96–341, H.R. 8010, Clements Job Corps Center	Sept. 8, 1980.
	96–342, H.R. 6974, Military Procurement Authorization, 1981.	Do.
	96–343, H.R. 5168, Defense Officer Personnel Management.	Do.
	96–344, S. 2680, Historic Sites	Do.
	96–345, H.R. 5892, Wind Energy Commercialization	Do.
	96–346, H.R. 7072, Federal Employees Travel Expenses.	Sept. 10, 1980.
	96–347, H.R. 1781, Civilian Air Traffic Controllers Retirement.	Sept. 12, 1980.
62	96–348, H.R. 1967, White River National Forest	Do.
	96–349, S. 390, Antitrust Procedural Improvements	Do.
	96–350, H.R. 2538, Coast Guard Enforcement of Drug Laws.	Sept. 15, 1980.
	96–351, H.R. 4627, Armed Forces Enlistments of Citizens of Northern Marianas.	Do.
	96–352, H.J. Res. 607, Urgent VA and Census Bureau Supplemental Appropriations, 1980.	Sept. 17, 1980.
63	96–353, H.J. Res. 594, Brumidi Day	Sept. 19, 1980.
	96–354, S. 299, Federal Rulemaking	Do.
	96–355, S. 670, Rural Development Policy	Sept. 24, 1980.
64	96–356, S. 1625, Hay Transportation	Do.
	96–357, H.R. 5766, ROTC Scholarships	Do.
	96–358, S. 261, Agricultural Subterminal Storage Facilities.	Sept. 25, 1980.
	96–359, H.R. 6940, Infant Formula	Sept. 26, 1980.
65	96–360, H.R. 3210, Las Vegas Valley Water District, Nevada.	Do.
66	96–361, H.R. 6511, Staggers Federal Building	Do.
	96–362, S. 1650, Aquaculture Policy	Do.
67	96–363, S. 2223, Indian Land Inheritance	Do.
	96–364, H.R. 3904, Employee Income Retirement Security.	Do.
	96–365, S. 1125, Crop Insurance	Do.
	96–366, H.R. 3292, Fish and Wildlife Conservation	Sept. 29 1980.
	96–367, H.R. 7590, Energy-Water Appropriations, 1981.	Oct. 1, 1980.
	96–368, S. 2443, High Level Nuclear Waste Management Project, New York.	Do.
	96–369, H.J. Res. 610, Continuing Appropriations, 1981.	Do.
	96–370, H.R. 7825, Ice Age National Scenic Trail	Oct. 3, 1980.
68	96–371, H.J. Res. 551, Port Week	Do.
	96–372, S.J. Res. 209, Mortgage Insurance Authorities Extension.	Do.

PUBLIC LAWS, 96TH CONGRESS (219 OUT OF 613 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 36 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and Title	Approved
	96–373, H.R. 6395, Consumer Product Safety Commission Postemployment Rules.	Do.
	96–374, H.R. 5192, Higher Education Programs, Authorization, 1981–85.	Do.
	96–375, H.R. 5278, Feasibility Investigations	Do.
	96–376, S. 2489, Coast Guard Authorization, 1981	Do.
	96–377, H.R. 7478, Public Debt Limit Management	Do.
	96–378, H.R. 5164, Vessel Inspection and Manning Laws.	Oct. 6, 1980.
69	96–379, S. 1895, Santa Rosa Lake and Dam-Clarks Hill Dam and Lake.	Do.
70	96–380, H.R. 6242, Towing Safety Advisory Committee.	Do.
	96–381, S. 1123, Ocean Pollution	Do.
	96–382, H.R. 3748, Maritime Tort Claims	Do.
71	96–383, H.R. 8018, Harsha Lake and Dam	Do.
72	96–384, H.R. 8024, Roberts Lake	Do.
	96–385, H.R. 7511, Veterans' Disability Compensation and Housing Benefits.	Oct. 7, 1980.
	96–386, H.R. 6308, Magnetic Fusion	Do.
73	96–387, S. 1442, Vessel Documentation	Do.
74	96–388, H.R. 8081, Holocaust Memorial Council	Do.
	96–389, S. 2271, International Monetary Fund (Bretton Woods).	Do.
75	96–390, H.R. 4792, Casey Federal Building—U.S. Courthouse.	Do.
	96–391, H.R. 5410, Civil Service Annuities—Secret Service Retirement.	Do.
76	96–392, H.R. 5732, Fisher Federal Building	Do.
77	96–393, H.R. 6531, Minton-Capehart Federal Building.	Do.
78	96–394, H.R. 7414, Jones Federal Building	Do.
79	96–395, H.R. 7450, Monagan Federal Building	Do.
80	96–396, H.R. 7782, Secret Service Pay	Do.
	96–397, H.R. 8202, Justice Department Authorization, 1980.	Do.
	96–398, S. 1177, Mental Health Systems	Do.
	96–399, S. 2719, Housing and Community Development.	Oct. 8, 1980
	96–400, H.R. 7831, Transportation Appropriations, 1981.	Oct. 9, 1980
81	96–401, S. 2126, Cheyenne Indian Reservation Coal Leases.	Do.
	96–402, S. 91, Veterans Survivors' Benefits	Do.
	96–403, H.R. 7670, Social Security Tax Adjustments.	Do.
82	96–404, S. 341, Fort Berthold Reservation Claim	Do.
83	96–405, S. 1795, Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribal Claim.	Do.
84	96–406, S. 2398, Umatilla and Wallowa National Forests.	Do.
85	96–407, H.R. 3956, Congressional Consent of Honorary Consul of Honduras.	Do.
86	96–408, H.R. 7130, Hanley Federal Building	Do.
87	96–409, H.R. 7309, Green-Wyatt Federal Building	Do.
88	96–410, H.R. 7544, Giaimo Federal Building	Do.
89	96–411, H.R. 7588, Cleveland Federal Building	Do.
90	96–412, H.R. 7770, Briedenback Environmental Research Center.	Do.
91	96–413, H.R. 8161, Moorhead Federal Building	Do.
92	96–414, H.J. Res. 472, 200th Anniversary of Surrender of Lord Cornwallis.	Do.
93	96–415, S. 2801, Albert Indian Health Facility	Do.
94	96–416, H.J. Res. 560, Agriculture Day	Do.
95	96–417, S. 1654, Customs Court	Oct. 10, 1980
	96–418, H.R. 7301, Military Construction Authorization, 1981.	Do.
96	96–419, S.J. Res. 201, Lupus Week	Do.
97	96–420, H.R. 7919, Indian Claims Settlement, Maine.	Do.
98	96–421, S.J. Res. 82, Patriotism Week	Do.
	96–422, H.R. 7859, Refugee Educational Assistance (Cubans and Haitians).	Do.
	96–423, S. 2730, Railroad Safety	Do.
	96–424, S. 3180, Refugee Educational Assistance (Cubans and Haitians).	Do.
	96–425, S. 2475, Automobile Efficiency—Fuel Economy.	Do.
99	96–426, S. 3148, Carlson Federal Building	Do.
	96–427, H.R. 7666, Federal Employees' Life Insurance.	Do.
100	96–428, H.R. 7218, Martin Luther King, Jr. Historic Site.	Do.
101	96–429, S. 3044, Ribicoff Federal Building	Do.
102	96–430, H.R. 7434, Boston African American National Historic Site.	Do.
	96–431, H.R. 6065, Military Leave	Do.
103	96–432, H.R. 6331, Capitol Grounds	Do.
	96–433, H.R. 7939, Securities Investor Protection	Do.
104	96–434, S. 1796, Assiniboine Tribal Claim	Do.
105	96–435, H.R. 7411, Adams National Historic Site	Do.
	96–436, H.R. 7592, Military Construction Appropriations, 1981.	Oct. 13, 1980
106	96–437, H.R. 5546, Grain Export Weighing	Do.
	96–438, S. 985, Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Loans.	Do.
	96–439, H.R. 7779, Tax Court Judges	Do.
	96–440, S. 1790, Privacy Protection	Do.
	96–441, H.R. 8103, National Museums of American Art and American History.	Do.
107	96–442, H.R. 5048, Manassas National Battlefield Park.	Do.

PUBLIC LAWS, 96TH CONGRESS (219 OUT OF 613 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 36 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and Title	Approved
108	96–443, H.J. Res. 568, Italian-American Heritage Week.	Do.
109	96–444, S. 2936, Capitol Employees	Do.
110	96–445, H.R. 6440, China Claims	Do.
111	96–446, S. 2185, Federal Use of Bequests	Do.
	96–447, S. 2511, Civil Rights Commission Authorization, 1981.	Do.
	96–448, S. 1946, Railroad Deregulation	Oct. 14, 1980
	96–449, H.R. 7085, Iranian Hostage Relief	Do.
	96–450, S. 2597, Intelligence Activities Authorization—Intelligence Oversight.	Do.
	96–451, H.R. 4310, Boating Safety	Do.
	96–452, H.R. 7665, Circuit Court Division	Do.
	96–453, H.R. 5451, Maritime Education and Training.	Oct. 15, 1980
	96–454, S. 1798, Household Moving Industry	Do.
112	96–455, H.R. 4273, Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.	Do.
113	96–456, S. 1482, Classified Information Procedures	Do.
	96–457, S. 1640, Water Resource Research—Saline Water Conversion.	Do.
	96–458, S. 1873, Judicial Conduct and Disability	Do.
	96–459, H.R. 6554, Maritime Authorization, 1981	Do.
	96–460, H.R. 4417, Chesapeake Bay Research	Do.
	96–461, S. 2320, National Bureau of Standards Authorization, 1981–82.	Do.
	96–462, H.R. 8178, District Court Realignment	Do.
	96–463, S. 2412, Waste Oil Recycling	Do.
	96–464, S. 2622, Coastal Zone Management	Oct. 17, 1980.
	96–465, H.R. 6790, Foreign Service Reform	Do.
	96–466, H.R. 5288, Veterans' Vocational Rehabilitation—GI Bill Amendments.	Do.
	96–467, H.R. 3122, Duty Suspensions	Do.
	96–468, H.R. 6593, Swine Health Protection	Do.
	96–469, S. 2043, Animal Cancer Research	Do.
	96–470, H.R. 6686, Agency Reorting Requirements	Oct. 19, 1980.
	96–471, H.R. 6883, Installment Sales Revision	Do.
	96–472, S. 1393, Earthquake Hazard Reduction	Do.
	96–473, H.R. 5295, Social Security Benefits	Do.
114	96–474, H.R. 5326, Land Conveyance: Lousiana	Do.
	96–475, H.R. 6816, Federal Coal Leases	Do.
	96–476, S. 3072, Rattlesnake Wilderness	Do.
	96–477, H.R. 7554, Small Business Ivestment Incentives—SEC Authorization.	Oct. 21, 1980.
	96–478, H.R. 6665, Ocean Pollutioni (MARPOL) Implementing Legislation.	Do.
	96–479, H.R. 2743, Materials and Minerals Policy	Do.
115	96–480, S. 1250, Office of Industrial Technology	Do.
	96–481, H.R. 5612, Small Business Administration Minority Business Expansion—Export Expansion—Attorney Fees.	Do.
	96–482, S. 1156, Solid Waste Disposal	Do.
	96–483, S. 2725, Clean Water	Do.
116	96–484, H.R. 7212, Pamunkey Tribe/Southern Railway Land Settlement.	Nov. 24, 1980.
117	96–485, S.J. Res. 156, Family Week	Nov. 26, 1980.
	96–486, S. 2357, Federal Question Jurisdiction	Dec. 1, 1980.
	96–487, H.R. 39, Alaksa Lands	Dec. 2, 1980.
118	96–488, H.R. 8329, USS Intrepid Memorial Museum.	Do.
119	96–489, S. 43, Federal Charter: National Ski Patrol System.	Do.
	96–490, H.R. 7942, Customs Valuation Agreement	Do.
120	96–491, S. 1135, Moapa Indian Reservation	Do.
121	96–492, H.R. 8112, Ute Indians	Do.
	96–493, S. 2251, Gasohol Competition	Do.
	96–494, H.R. 3765, Walnuts and Olives Marketing—Wheat and Feed Grains Price Supports.	Dec. 3, 1980.
122	96–495, H.R. 4084, Suisun Marsh, California	Do.
	96–496, S. 1386, National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities—Museum Service Authorization, 1981–85.	Dec. 4. 1980.
123	96–497, S. 1179, Federal Charter: Gold Star Wives, Inc..	Do.
124	96–498, S. 3193, Javits Federal Building	Do.
	96–499, H.R. 7765, Budget Reconciliation—Spending and Revenue.	Dec. 5, 1980.
	96–500, H.R. 2510, Disability Retirement Determinations Review.	Do.
	96–501, S. 885, Pacific Northwest Power Planning and Conservation.	Do.
	96–502, H.R. 8117, Safe Drinking Water	Do.
125	96–503, H.J. Res. 634, Secret Service Protection for Vice President and Mrs. Mondale.	Do.
	96–504, H.R. 2583, Federal Judges Annuities	Do.
126	96–505, H.R. 5108, Alaskan Native Roll	Do.
	96–506, S. 3152, Public Works—EDA	Dec. 8, 1980.
	96–507, H.R. 4892, LEA Act Repeal	Do.
	96–508, S. 2352, Council on Wage and Price Stability.	Do.
	96–509, S. 2441, Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.	Do.
	96–510, H.R. 7020, Superfund for Environment Cleanup.	Dec. 11 1980.
	96–511, H.R. 6410, Paperwork Reduction	Do.
	96–512, H.R. 6889, Methane Transportation Research, Development and Demonstration.	Dec. 12, 1980.
	96–513, S. 1918, Defense Officer Personnel Management.	Do.
	96–514, H.R. 7724, Interior Appropriations, 1981	Do.
	96–515, H.R. 5496, National Historic Preservation	Do.
	96–516, S. 568, National Science Foundation Authorization, 1981.	Do.
	96–517, H.R. 6933, Patent and Trademark Laws	Do.
127	96–518, S.J. Res. 213, Magnuson Clinical Center	Do.
	96–519, H.R. 6086, Civilian and Military Claims	Do.
128	96–520, H.R. 8228, Non-Navigable Waters	Do.
129	96–521, H.R. 6211, New Mexico Patents	Do.
130	96–522, H.R. 7805, American Folklife Center	Do.
	96–523, H.R. 7466, Handicapped Employees—Congressional Campaign Committees Employees Retirement.	Do.
131	96–524, H.R. 7815, Post Office Designations	Do.
	96–525, H.R. 8388, Italian Earthquake Assistance	Do.
	96–526, H.R. 7631, HUD Appropriations, 1981	Dec. 15, 1980.
	96–527, H.R. 8105, Defense Appropriations, 1981	Do.
	96–528, H.R. 7591, Agriculture Appropriations, 1981.	Do.
132	96–529, H.J. Res. 205, Bunche Monument	Do.
	96–530, H.R. 8061, District of Columbia Appropriations, 1981.	Do.
133	96–531, H.R. 6243, Heard Park	Do.
134	96–532, S. 2134, Supreme Court Grounds	Do.
	96–533, H.R. 6942, Foreign Aid—Security and Development Assistance Authorization, 1981.	Dec. 16, 1980.
135	96–534, S. 1835, Joint Funding Simplification	Do.
136	96–535, H.R. 5856, Virgin Islands National Guard	Do.
	96–536, H.J. Res. 644, Continuing Appropriations, 1981.	Do.
	96–537, S. 2728, Indian Health Care	Dec. 17, 1980.
137	96–538, S. 988, Health Sciences Promotion	Do.
	96–539, H.R. 7018, FIFRA	Do.
	96–540, S. 3074, DOE Military Authorization, 1981	Do.
	96–541, H.R. 6975, Tax Treatment Extensions	Do.
	96–542, S. 3235, Customs Courts	Do.
138	96–543, H.R. 7385, Bureau of Mines Facilities Transfers.	Do.
	96–544, H.J. Res. 601, International Monetary Fund Appropriations, 1981.	Do.
139	96–545, H.R. 1298, Christie Federal Building—Appalachian Child Development Programs.	Dec. 18, 1980.
140	96–546, H.R. 8173, ICA LBJ Films	Do.
	96–547, S. 1391, Climate Program	Do.
141	96–548, H.R. 8404, Moss Federal Building—U.S. Courthouse.	Do.
142	96–549, S. 1972, Sangre de Cristo Development Corporation.	Do.
	96–550, H.R. 8298, New Mexico Wilderness	Dec. 19, 1980.
143	96–551, H.R. 8235, Interstate Compact: Tahoe Regional Planning.	Do.
	96–552, H.R. 3551, CHAMPUS	Do.
	96–553, S. 2318, Crater Lake National Park	Do.
	96–554, S. 1996, Wood Utilization	Do.
144	96–555, H.R. 5182, Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission.	Do.
	96–556, H.J. Res. 570, Public Debt Limit Extension	Do.
145	96–557, H.R. 7147, Mdewakanton Sioux Indians	Do.
146	96–558, S. 2069, Architect of the Capitol: Contracting Authority.	Do.
147	96–559, H.R. 2170, Legal Expenses Reimbursement for Fairfax, Virginia.	Dec. 22, 1980.
	96–560, H.R. 5487, Colorado Wilderness	Do.
	96–561, S. 2163, Salmon and Steelhead Resources Conservation.	Do.
148	96–562, S. 1824, Larkins Federal Building	Do.
149	96–563, H.J. Res. 615, Smithsonian Institution Board of Regents Appointment: David C. Acheson.	Do.
150	96–564, S. 2227, Interstate Compact: Red River	Do.
	96–565, H.R. 7217, Kaluapapa National Historical Park.	Do.
151	96–566, H.J. Res. 642, Adjournment Resolution	Do.
	96–567, H.R. 7865, Nuclear Reactor Safety	Do.
	96–568, S. 3027, Disaster Relief Programs	Do.
	96–569, S. 2726, EPA Authorization, 1981	Do.
152	96–570, H.R. 2111, Central Valley Project, California.	Do.
	96–571, S. 1784, Alaska Federal-Civilian Energy Efficiency.	Do.
	96–572, S. 1148, Ocean Pollution	Do.
	96–573, S. 2189, Nuclear Waste Policy	Do.
	96–574, H.R. 999, Plant Variety Protection	Do.
153	96–575, H.R. 4941, North San Gabriel Dam/Lake Georgetown-Public Buildings.	Do.
154	96–576, H.R. 8345, McEwen U.S. Customs House—President Pro Tempore Appointees.	Do.
155	96–577, H.J. Res. 377, Inventors Day	Do.
	96–578, H.R. 7709, Cigarette Duties	Dec. 23, 1980.
	96–579, H.R. 7626, Military Pay and Allowances	Do.
156	96–580, S. 3096, St. Croix Scenic Riverway	Do.
157	96–581, S. 1985, Land Conveyance	Do.
	96–582, H.R. 8195, Railroad Retirement Fund	Do.
	96–583, H.R. 6796, CETA	Do.
	96–584, H.R. 7682, Armed Forces Reserves	Do.
158	96–585, H.R. 7814, Fire Island Wilderness	Do.
159	96–586, H.R. 7306, Tahoe Basin	Do.
	96–587, S. 1142, Kennedy Center Authorization, 1980–81.	Do.
160	96–588, S. 3212, McIntyre Federal Building—Colomery O'Neil VA Medical Center Wyman Forest Experiment Station.	Dec. 24, 1980.
	96–589, H.R. 5043, Bankruptcy Tax Rules	Do.
	96–590, S. 3261, Communications Act Amendment—Hawaii.	Do.
161	96–591, H.R. 6671, Inland Navigation	Do.
	96–592, S. 1465, Farm Credit System	Do.
	96–593, H.R. 4774, Labor Organizations—Conscientious Objectors.	Do.
162	96–594, H.R. 1196, Vessel Documentation	Do.
163	96–595, H.R. 4968, Real Estate Investment Trust Net Operating Loss Carryover.	Do.
	96–596, H.R. 5391, Second Tier Excise Taxes	Do.
	96–597, H.R. 8444, Omnibus Territories	Do.
	96–598, H.R. 3317, Excise Tax Treatment of Tread Rubber and Wine—Tax Treatment on Sale of Residence and Entertainment Expenses.	Do.
164	96–599, H.R. 3637, International Coffee Agreement Implementing Legislation.	Do.
165	96–600, H.R. 7694, Guam, Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico DOD Civilian Employees.	Do.
166	96–601, H.R. 5505, Administrative Tax Provisions	Do.
167	96–602, S. 1803, Cibola National Forest	Dec. 28, 1980.
	96–603, H.R. 4155, Student Loan Default Disclosure.	Do.
	96–604, H.R. 7112, Revenue Sharing	Do.
	96–605, H.R. 7956, Miscellaneous Revenue Act	Do.
	96–606, H.R. 5737, Vietnam Claims Settlement	Do.
	96–607, S. 2363, National Parks and Historic Site	Do.
	96–608, H.R. 5973, Tax Treatment of Americans Abroad.	Do.
	96–609, H.R. 5047, Duty Suspensions	Do.
168	96–610, S. 2729, National Visitor Center (Union Station).	Do.
	96–611, H.R. 8406, Pneumonia Vaccine Foster Care and Adoption Assistance AFDC and SSI Benefits—Parental Kidnaping.	Do.
169	96–612, S. 2261, Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.	Do.
	96–613, H.R. 7171, Miscellaneous Tax Law Changes.	Do.

[1] Without approval.

PUBLIC LAWS, 95TH CONGRESS (164 OUT OF 633 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 26 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
	1ST SESSION (JAN. 4, 1977–DEC. 15, 1977; 37 OUT OF 223 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 17 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)	
	95–1, S.J. Res. 12, Secret Service Protection of Former Federal Officials,.	Jan. 19, 1977.
	95–2, S. 474, Natural Gas Emergency	Feb. 2, 1977.
	95–3, H.J. Res. 277, Urgent Power Supplemental Appropriations, 1977.	Feb. 16, 1977.
1	95–4, S. 649, Senate Staff Employee Pay	Do.
	95–5, S.J. Res. 10, American Indian Policy Review Commission.	Feb. 17, 1977.
	95–6, H.J. Res. 240, Fishery Conservation Zone Transition.	Feb. 21, 1977.
2	95–7, H.J. Res. 239, President's Joint Economic Report.	Feb. 23, 1977.
	95–8, H.R. 3753, Fishery Conservation Zone Transition.	Mar. 3, 1977.
3	95–9, H.J. Res. 132, Marian Anderson Medal	Mar. 9, 1977.
	95–10, H.R. 3347, Budget Rescission—Helium Purchases.	Mar. 10, 1977.
4	95–11, S. 776, William O. Douglas Memorial	Mar. 15, 1977.
	95–12, H.R. 1746, Rhodesian Chrome	Mar. 18, 1977.
	95–13, H.J. Res. 269, Urgent Disaster Supplemental Appropriations, 1977.	Mar. 21, 1977.
	95–14, H.R. 2647, Small Business Loan Ceilings	Mar. 24, 1977.
	95–15, H.R. 3839, Second Budget Rescission, 1978	Mar. 25, 1977.
	95–16, H.J. Res. 351, Continuing Appropriations, 1977.	April 1, 1977.
	95–17, S. 626, Presidential Reorganization Authority.	April 6, 1977.
	95–18, S. 925, Drought Emergency Authority	April 7, 1977.
	95–19, H.R. 4800, Emergency Unemployment Compensation.	April 12, 1977.
	95–20, S. 1025, Securities and Exchange Commission Authorization, 1977.	April 13, 1977.
	95–21, H.R. 5717, Romanian Earthquake Authorization.	April 18, 1977.
	95–22, H.R. 3365, Regulation Q—Federal Credit Unions.	April 19, 1977.
	95–23, S. 489, Portugal—Military Assistance	April 30, 1977.
	95–24, H.R. 3843, Supplemental Housing Authorization, 1977.	Do.
5	95–25, S. 385, Gerald R. Ford Building	May 4, 1977.
	95–26, H.R. 4877, Supplemental Appropriations, 1977.	Do.
6	95–27, S.J. Res. 44, Printing Resolution	Do.
	95–28, H.R. 11, Public Works Employment—Water Resource Projects.	May 13, 1977.
	95–29, H.R. 4876, Economic Stimulus Appropriations, 1977.	Do.
	95–30, H.R. 3477, Tax Reduction and Simplification, 1977.	May 23, 1977.

PUBLIC LAWS, 95TH CONGRESS (164 OUT OF 633 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 26 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
	95-31, S. 1279, Drought Emergency Relief	Do.
7	95-32, H.R. 5562, Eleanor Roosevelt National Historic Site.	May 26, 1977.
	95-33, H.R. 6205, Atlantic Tunas	Do.
	95-34, H.J. Res. 424, Kennedy Presidential Library	Do.
8	95-35, H.R. 3662, Mississippi-Louisiana Bridge Construction Compact.	June 1, 1977.
	95-36, H.R. 6401, Deepwater Ports	Do.
	95-37, S. 853, Defense Production Extension	Do.
	95-38, S. 1433, Privacy Protection Study Commission Extension.	Do.
	95-39, S. 36, ERDA Nonnuclear Authorization—Civilian, 1977.	June 3, 1977.
	95-40, H.R. 3437, Vocational Education Amendments.	Do.
	95-41, H.R. 6752, River Basins	June 6, 1977.
	95-42, H.R. 5306, Land and Water Conservation Fund.	June 10, 1977.
	95-43, H.R. 6774, Higher Education Amendments	June 15, 1977.
	95-44, H.R. 2992, CETA	Do.
	95-45, H.R. 5040, State Department Supplemental Authorization, 1977.	Do.
	95-46, H.R. 4390, Reclamation Projects	Do.
	95-47, S. 955, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Capital.	July 16, 1977.
	95-48, S. 1240, Wheat Referendum	June 17, 1977.
	95-49, H.R. 6692, Education of the Handicapped	Do.
	95-50, S. 521, Kennedy Center Authorization, 1978	June 20, 1977.
	95-51, H.R. 6197, Disaster Relief Programs	Do.
	95-52, H.R. 5840, Export Administration—Arab Boycott.	June 22, 1977.
	95-53, H.R. 6206, Commercial Fisheries	Do.
	95-54, H.R. 3416, Tobacco Quotas	June 25, 1977.
9	95-55, H.R. 7606, Bull Run Reserve	Do.
10	95-56, S.J. Res. 63, Federal Home Loan Bank Board Members.	June 29, 1977.
	95-57, H.R. 583, Military Enlistment and Reenlistment Bonuses.	Do.
	95-58, H.R. 4301, Sea Grant Program	Do.
	95-59, H.R. 1404, Smith College Carillon—Social Services Programs Extensions.	June 30, 1977.
	95-60, H.J. Res. 525, Mortgage Insurance	Do.
	95-61, H.R. 6823, Coast Guard Authorization, 1978	July 1, 1977.
	95-62, H.R. 3695, Veterans' Care in State Homes	July 5, 1977.
	95-63, H.R. 3849, National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere.	Do.
11	95-64, H.J. Res. 539, Indian Claims	July 11, 1977.
	95-65, H.R. 6668, Nutrition Programs for the Elderly—Age Discrimination Report.	Do.
	95-66, S. 964, Federal Comparability Increases	Do.
	95-67, H.R. 6893, State Taxation of Members of Congress.	July 19, 1977.
	95-68, H.R. 4992, Indian Business Development Programs.	July 20, 1977.
	95-69, H.R. 4585, Indian Claims Commission	Do.
	95-70, S. 1468, Federal Energy Administration Authorization, 1978.	July 21, 1977.
12	95-71, H.R. 1551, Sabine River Compact	July 23, 1977.
13	95-72, H.J. Res. 24, Lupus Week	July 25, 1977.
	95-73, H.R. 5638, Fishery Agreement With Canada	July 26, 1977.
	95-74, H.R. 7636, Interior Appropriations, 1978	Do.
	95-75, H.R. 186, Regulations to Prevent Collisions at Sea.	July 27, 1977.
	95-76, H.R. 4088, NASA Authorization, 1978	July 30, 1977.
	95-77, H.R. 2502, Federal Oil and Gas Leases	Do.
	95-78, H.R. 5864, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.	Do.
	95-79, H.R. 5970, Military Procurement Authorization, 1978.	Do.
	95-80, S.J. Res. 77, Mortgage Insurance	July 31, 1977.
	95-81, H.R. 7552, Treasury-Postal Service Appropriations, 1978.	Do.
	95-82, S. 1474, Military Construction Authorization, 1978.	Aug. 1, 1977.
	95-83, H.R. 4975, Public Health Programs—Biomedical Research.	Do.
	95-84, H.R. 4746, Water Research and Development—Saline Water Conversion.	Aug. 2, 1977.
	95-85, H.R. 7557, Transportation Appropriations, 1978.	Do.
	95-86, H.R. 7556, State-Justice-Commerce Appropriations, 1978.	Do.
	95-87, H.R. 2, Strip Mining Control and Reclamation.	Aug. 3, 1977.
	95-88, H.R. 6714, International Development Assistance—Food for Peace.	Do.
	95-89, H.R. 692, Small Business Amendments—Disaster Relief Loans.	Aug. 4, 1977.
	95-90, S.J. Res. 79, Federal Home Loan Bank Board Members.	Do.
	95-91, S. 826, Department of Energy	Do.
	95-92, H.R. 6884, International Security Assistance	Do.
	95-93, H.R. 6138, Youth Employment and Training	Aug. 5, 1977.
	95-94, H.R. 7932, Legislative Appropriations, 1978	Do.
	95-95, H.R. 6161, Clean Air	Aug. 7, 1977
	95-96, H.R. 7553, Public Works—Energy Research Appropriations, 1978.	Do.
	95-97, H.R. 7558, Agriculture Appropriations, 1978	Aug. 12, 1977.
14	95-98, H.R. 1952, AMVETS	Aug. 15, 1977.
	95-99, H.R. 4991, National Science Foundation Authorization, 1978.	Do.
15	95-100, H.J. Res. 372, Family Week	Do.

PUBLIC LAWS, 95TH CONGRESS (164 OUT OF 633 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 26 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
	95-101, H.R. 7589, Military Construction Appropriations, 1978.	Do.
	95-102, S. 1235, Peace Corps Authorization, 1978	Do.
16	95-103, S. 1377, Indian Claims	Do.
	95-104, S. 2110, River Basins	Do.
	95-105, H.R. 6689, State Department Authorization, 1978.	Aug. 17, 1977.
	95-106, H.R. 6370, International Trade Commission Authorization, 1978.	Do.
	95-107, S. 1935, Drought Emergency Authority	Do.
	95-108, H.R. 6179, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.	Do.
	95-109, H.R. 5294, Debt Collection Practices	Sept. 20, 1977.
	95-110, S. 1153, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy Abolishment.	Do.
	95-111, H.R. 7933, Defense Appropriations, 1978	Sept. 21, 1977.
	95-112, S. 1752, Elementary and Secondary Education.	Sept. 24, 1977.
	95-113, S. 275, Omnibus Farm Bill	Sept. 29, 1977.
	95-114, S. 1731, Medical Personnel Special Pay	Sept. 30, 1977.
	95-115, H.R. 6111, Juvenile Justice	Oct. 30, 1977.
17	95-116, H.R. 6502, World War I Veterans Auto Allowance.	Do.
	95-117, H.R. 1862, Veterans' Disability Compensation and Survivors Benefits.	Do.
	95-118, H.R. 5262, International Financial Institutions.	Do.
	95-119, H.R. 7554, HUD Appropriations, 1978	Oct. 4, 1977.
	95-120, H.R. 9290, Public Debt Limit	Do.
	95-121, H.R. 6951, Council on Wage and Price Stability.	Oct. 6, 1977.
	95-122, S. 1322, D.C. Water and Sewer Payment by Federal Government.	Do.
	95-123, S. 602, Library Services and Construction	Oct. 7, 1977.
	95-124, S. 126, Earthquake Hazards Reduction	Do.
	95-125, S. 213, GAO Audit of IRS and ATF	Do.
	95-126, S. 1307, Vietnam Veterans Discharges and Benefits.	Oct. 8, 1977.
	95-127, S. 1435, Federal Election Commission Authorization, 1978.	Oct. 12, 1977.
	95-128, H.R. 6655, Housing and Community Development.	Do.
18	95-129, S. 1331, Center for the Book	Oct. 13, 1977.
	95-130, H.J. Res. 626, Continuing Appropriations, 1978.	Do.
	95-131, H.R. 6530, D.C. Borrowing Authority	Do.
	95-132, H.R. 5645, Civil Rights Commission Authorization, 1978.	Do.
19	95-133, S. 667, Te-Moak Shoshone Land	Oct. 15, 1977.
	95-134, H.R. 6550, U.S. Territories	Do.
20	95-135, S.J. Res. 89, Technical Corrections to Enrollment of Public Law 95-134.	Do.
	95-136, S. 1522, Marine Mammal Protection	Oct. 18, 1977.
	95-137, H.R. 5742, Drug Enforcement Administration.	Do.
	95-138, H.R. 9354, Former Presidents' Staff Allowance.	Do.
21	95-139, S. 2089, Associate Attorney General	Oct. 19, 1977.
22	95-140, S. 1372, Deputy and Under Secretaries of Defense.	Oct. 21, 1977.
23	95-141, S. 2169, Hubert H. Humphrey Building	Oct. 23, 1977.
	95-142, H.R. 3, Medicare-Medicaid Anti-Fraud	Oct. 25, 1977.
	95-143, H.R. 6415, Export-Import Bank	Oct. 26, 1977.
	95-144, S. 1682, Prisoner Exchange with Canada and Mexico.	Oct. 28, 1977.
	95-145, H.R. 7769, Indochina Refugee Assistance	Do.
24	95-146, H.R. 4836, Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works.	Do.
	95-147, H.R. 5675, Tax and Loan Accounts—IMF—ESF.	Do.
	95-148, H.R. 7797, Foreign Aid Appropriations, 1978.	Oct. 31, 1977.
25	95-149, H.J. Res. 573, General Thaddeus Kosciuszko.	Nov. 1, 1977.
	95-150, S. 393, Montana Wilderness Area Study	Do.
	95-151, H.R. 3744, Minimum Wage Increase	Do.
	95-152, H.R. 2817, Tinicum National Environmental Center.	Nov. 4, 1977.
	95-153, H.R. 4297, Ocean Dumping	Do.
	95-154, H.J. Res. 611, Federal Reserve Banks Purchase of U.S. Obligations.	Nov. 7, 1977.
	95-155, H.R. 5101, EPA Authorization, 1978	Nov. 8, 1977.
	95-156, H.R. 9090, Agricultural Disaster Loan Exemptions.	Do.
	95-157, S. 2149, Northern Marianas District Court	Do.
	95-158, H.J. Res. 621, Alaska Pipeline (AlCan)	Do.
	95-159, H.R. 3259, Duty Suspension on Horses, Canadian Crude Oil and Doxorubicin Hydrochloride.	Do.
	95-160, H.R. 2850, Duty Suspension on Latex Sheets and Synthetic Rutile.	Do.
	95-161, H.R. 2982, Duty Suspension on Synthetic Tantalum, Poppy Straw, Bicycle Parts.	Do.
	95-162, H.R. 3903, Duty Suspension on Copy Lathes, Wool and Istle Fibre.	Do.
	95-163, H.R. 6010, Aircraft Insurance and Other Aviation Amendments.	Nov. 9, 1977.
	95-164, S. 717, Mine Safety and Health	Do.
	95-165, H.J. Res. 643, Continuing Appropriations, 1978.	Do.
	95-166, H.R. 1139, School Lunch and Child Nutrition.	Nov. 10, 1977.

PUBLIC LAWS, 95TH CONGRESS (164 OUT OF 633 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 26 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
26	95-167, S. 2208, Big Brothers-Big Sisters of America.	Nov. 11, 1977.
27	95-168, S. 810, Daughters of the Confederacy Patent Renewal.	Do.
28	95-169, H.R. 2527, Land Conveyance—California	Nov. 12, 1977.
	95-170, H.R. 2849, Duty Suspension on Mattress Blanks and Bobsleds and Luges; Private Foundations Donations.	Do.
	95-171, H.R. 3387, Child Care Program Extension	Do.
	95-172, H.R. 3373, Duty Suspension on Silk Yarns—Communications Excise Tax.	Do.
	95-173, S. 1019, Maritime Authorization, 1978	Do.
29	95-174, S. 2118, Land Conveyance—Alaska	Do.
30	95-175, S. 2052, Capitol Police Jurisdiction	Nov. 14, 1977.
	95-176, H.R. 4458, Excise Tax on Distilled Spirits	Do.
	95-177, H.R. 7278, National Defense Reserve Fleet	Nov. 15, 1977.
	95-178, H.R. 8499, Alaskan Native Claims	Do.
31	95-179, H.R. 8992, Executive Protective Service Name Change.	Do.
	95-180, H.R. 9512, Higher Education in the Trust Territory of the Pacific.	Do.
	95-181, H.R. 9704, Federal Crop Insurance	Do.
32	95-182, H.R. 9836, Fogler Shakesperare Library	Do.
	95-183, S. 1339, ERDA Nuclear Authorization—Military, 1977.-78.	Do.
	95-184, S. 1863, Military Procurement Supplemental Authorization, 1978.	Do.
33	95-185, S. 1062, D.C. Armory Board	Do.
	95-186, H.R. 9019, Third Budget Rescission, 1978	Nov. 16, 1977.
	95-187, H.R. 8346, Commuter Rail Services	Do.
	95-188, H.R. 9710 Regulation Q	Do.
	95-189, S. 2281, River Basins	Do.
	95-190, S. 1528, Safe Drinking Water	Do.
34	95-191, H.R. 6348, Ely Indian Land	Nov. 18, 1977.
	95-192, S. 106, Land and Water Resources Conservation.	Do.
	95-193, H.R. 8777, Appalachian Child Development Programs.	Do.
	95-194, S. 1184, Fisherman's Protection Reimbursement Program.	Do.
	95-195, S. 1560, Siletz Indian Tribe Restoration	Do.
	95-196, H.R. 2770, Courts of Appeals Judicial Accommodations.	Nov. 19, 1977.
35	95-197, S.J. Res. 81, Day of Prayer	Nov. 21, 1977.
	95-198, H.R. 422, Duty Suspension on Aircraft Engines.	Nov. 23, 1977.
	95-199, H.R. 4049, Rail Reorganization	Do.
36	95-200, H.R. 7074, Bull Run Reserve	Do.
	95-201, H.R. 8175, Veterans' Physician and Dentist Comparability Pay.	Do.
	95-202, H.R. 8701, G.I. Education Benefits	Do.
	95-203, S. 1750, Saccharin Study	Do.
	95-204, H.R. 7345, Veterans' and Survivors' Pension Adjustment.	Dec. 2, 1977.
	95-205, H.J. Res. 662, Labor-HEW-D.C. Continuing Appropriations, 1978.	Dec. 9, 1977.
	95-206, H.R. 1904, Duty Suspension on Intravenous Fat Emulsion, Color Couplers and Glasses.	Dec. 12, 1977.
	95-207, H.R. 7, Career Education Incentives	Dec. 19, 1977.
	95-208, H.R. 8159, Safe Container Regulations	Do.
	95-209, S. 1131, Nuclear Regulatory Commission Authorization, 1978.	Do.
	95-210, H.R. 8422, Medicare Coverage for Rural Health Clinics—NOSH.	Do.
	95-211, H.R. 3722, Securities and Exchange Commission Authorization, 1978.	Dec. 19, 1977.
	95-212, S. 1316, Endangered Species	Do.
	95-213, S. 305, Foreign Corporate and Domestic Disclosure.	Do.
	95-214, H.R. 9378, Employees Retirement Benefits Plan Insurance.	Do.
	95-215, H.R. 9418, Medical School Grants	Do.
	95-216, H.R. 9346, Social Security Financing	Dec. 20, 1977.
	95-217, H.R. 3199, Clean Water	Dec. 27, 1977.
	95-218, S. 1063, D.C. Bonds	Dec. 28, 1977.
	95-219, H.R. 9794, Fishery Agreement with Mexico	Do.
	95-220, S. 904, Federal Assistance Programs information.	Do.
37	95-221, H.R. 674, Convening of Second Session of 95th Congress.	Do.
	95-222, H.R. 6666, Legal Services Corporation	Do.
	95-223, H.R. 7738, International Emergency Economic Powers.	Do.

2D SESS. (JAN. 19, 1984–OCT. 15, 1984; 127 OUT OF 410 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 31 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)

	95-224, H.R. 7691, Federal Grants and Cooperative Agreements.	Feb. 3, 1978.
	95-225, S. 1585, Child Pornography	Feb. 6, 1978.
	95-226, H.R. 10532, Drought Emergency Relief	Feb. 7, 1978.
	95-227, H.R. 5322, Black Lung Trust Funds	Feb. 10, 1978.
	95-228, H.R. 5054, Executive Branch Appointments	Do.
1	95-229, H.J. Res. 386, American Revolution Bicentennial Medals.	Feb. 14, 1978.
2	95-230, H.R. 2719, Pueblo Lands Maintenance Charges.	Feb. 15, 1978.
3	95-231, H.R. 5798, Office of Rail Public Counsel	Do.
4	95-232, S. 1509, Pueblo Indian Lands	Feb. 17, 1978.
	95-233, S. 1360, Timber Sales	Feb. 20, 1978.
	95-234, H.R. 7442, Utility Pole Attachments	Feb. 21, 1978.

PUBLIC LAWS, 95TH CONGRESS (164 OUT OF 633 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 26 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
5	95-235, H.R. 7766, D.C. Union Station—Post Office Bridge.	Do.
	95-236, S. 266, Radiation Exposure	Do.
	95-237, H.R. 3454, Endangered Wilderness	Feb. 24, 1978.
	95-238, S. 1340, ERDA Nuclear/Nonnuclear Authorization—Civilian, 1978.	Feb. 25, 1978.
	95-239, H.R. 4544, Black Lung Benefits	Mar. 1, 1978.
	95-240, H.R. 9375, Supplemental Appropriations, 1978.	Mar. 7, 1978.
	95-241, H.R. 10368, Aircraft Registration	Mar. 8, 1978.
	95-242, H.R. 8638, Nuclear Nonproliferation	Mar. 10, 1978.
6	95-243, S. 838, Sioux Black Hills Claim	Mar. 13, 1978.
7	95-244, S. 2076, Grand Canyon National Park School Aid.	Mar. 14, 1978.
	95-245, H.R. 9851, Air Cargo Service	Do.
	95-246, H.J. Res. 746, Urgent Power Supplemental Appropriations, 1978.	Mar. 15, 1978.
8	95-247, S. 773, Wichita Tribal Land Claim	Mar. 21, 1978.
	95-248, H.R. 8803, Appalachian Trail	Do.
	95-249, S. 1671, Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness	Mar. 27, 1978.
9	95-250, H.R. 3813, Redwood National Park Expansion.	Do.
	95-251, H.R. 6975, Administrative Law Judges	Do.
	95-252, H.R. 11518, Public Debt Limit	Do.
10	95-253, H.J. Res. 715, Sun Day	Do.
	95-254, H.R. 10982, First Budget Rescission, 1978	Apr. 4, 1978.
	95-255, H.J. Res. 796, Urgent Disaster Supplemental Appropriations, 1978.	Do.
	95-256, H.R. 5383, Age Discrimination in Employment.	Apr. 6, 1978.
	95-257, H.R. 9169, Fishing Vessel Loan Guarantees	Apr. 7, 1978.
	95-258, H.R. 11055, Tax Treatment of Crop Payments and Legislator's Residence.	Do.
11	95-259, H.R. 5981, American Folklife Preservation	Apr. 17, 1978.
12	95-260, H.R. 2960, Declaration of Independence Signers.	Do.
13	95-261, H.R. 8358, Depository Libraries	Do.
14	95-262, H.J. Res. 770, Education Day	Do.
15	95-263, S.J. Res. 124, Oceans Week	Do.
16	95-264, H.R. 2540, Umatilla Indian Lands	Apr. 18, 1978.
17	95-265, H.R. 4979, Land Conveyance, Nevada	Apr. 24, 1978.
	95-266, H.R. 6693, Child Adoption and Child Abuse Prevention.	Do.
18	95-267, H.J. Res. 578, Architectural Barrier Awareness Week.	Do.
	95-268, H.R. 9179, OPIC	Do.
	95-269, H.R. 7744, River and Harbor Dredging	Apr. 26, 1978.
19	95-270, S. 2452, Humphrey Institute and Dirksen Research Center.	Apr. 27, 1978.
20	95-271, S. 2597, District Court Relocations	Apr. 28, 1978.
21	95-272, H.J. Res. 649, White House Conference on Arts and Humanities.	May 3, 1978.
	95-273, S. 1617, Ocean Pollution Research	May 8, 1978.
22	95-274, S.J. Res. 106, Smithsonian Board of Regents Appointment.	May 10, 1978.
23	95-275, S.J. Res. 107, Smithsonian Board of Regents Appointment.	Do.
24	95-276, S.J. Res. 108, Smithsonian Board of Regents Appointment.	Do.
25	95-277, S. 2220, Library of Congress Trust Fund Board.	May 12, 1978.
26	95-278, S. 917, Land Conveyance-University of Nevada.	Do.
	95-279, H.R. 6782, Emergency Agricultural Act	May 15, 1978.
27	95-280, S. 482, Zuni Indian Lands	Do.
28	95-281, S. 661, Oklahoma Indian Tribes	Do.
	95-282, H.J. Res. 859, U.S. Railway Association Supplemental Appropriations, 1978.	May 19, 1978.
	95-283, H.R. 8331, Securities Investor Protection	May 21, 1978.
	95-284, H.J. Res. 873, Urgent Disaster and Employment and Training Supplemental Appropriations, 1978.	Do.
29	95-285, S. 1568, Lake Herbert G. West	May 25, 1978.
30	95-286, H.R. 10392, Hubert H. Humphrey Fellowship.	May 26, 1978.
	95-287, S.J. Res. 137, NATO	May 30, 1978.
	95-288, H.R. 9005, D.C. Appropriations, 1978	June 5, 1978.
	95-289, S. 2370, Forest Service Volunteer Programs.	Do.
	95-290, H.R. 11662, Lowell National Historical Park.	Do.
	95-291, H.R. 11370, Social Services Retroactive Claims.	June 12, 1978.
	95-292, H.R. 8423, Renal Disease Program	June 13, 1978.
	95-293, S. 1792, Administrative Conference	Do.
31	95-294, S.J. Res. 140, American University Press Day.	June 14, 1978.
32	95-295, H.R. 11657, Central, Western and South Pacific Fisheries.	June 16, 1978.
	95-296, S. 1640, Mike Monroney Aeronautical Center.	June 19, 1978.
	95-297, H.R. 130, Petroleum Marketing Practices	Do.
	95-298, S. 2553, Maritime Authorization, 1979	June 26, 1978.
	95-299, H.R. 5493, Wildlife Refuges	Do.
	95-300, H.R. 10884, Council on Environmental Quality.	Do.
	95-301, H.J. Res. 944, Urgent Grain Inspection Supplemental Appropriation, 1978.	Do.
	95-302, S. 2380, Marine Pollution	Do.
	95-303, H.R. 5176, Duty Reduction on Levulose	June 29, 1978.
	95-304, H.R. 10823, National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere.	Do.
	95-305, S. 2973, Kennedy Center Authorization, 1979.	Do.
	95-306, H.R. 11779, Renewable Resources	June 30, 1978.
	95-307, H.R. 11778, Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources.	Do.
	95-308, H.R. 11465, Coast Guard Authorization, 1979.	Do.
33	95-309, H.J. Res. 995, Brotherhood Day	Do.
34	95-310, S. 2033, Land Conveyance—Wenatchee Forest, Washington.	Do.
35	95-311, S. 2351, John L. McClellan Veterans' Hospital.	Do.
36	95-312, S.J. Res. 128, Free Enterprise Day	Do.
37	95-313, H.R. 11777, Cooperative Forestry Assistants.	July 1, 1978.
	95-314, H.R. 12571, Fishery Agreement with Canada.	Do.
	95-315, H.R. 11713, Small Business Energy Loans	July 4, 1978.
	95-316, H.R. 10730, Marine Mammal Protection	July 10, 1978.
38	95-317, H.R. 3447, Survivor Annuities	Do.
39	95-318, H.R. 3755, Survivor Annuities	Do.
	95-319, S. 2401, Insulation Safety Standards	July 11, 1978.
	95-320, H.R. 2176, GAO Audits of Federal Banks	July 21, 1978.
	95-321, H.R. 9757, Grazing Fee Moratorium	Do.
	95-322, H.R. 11232, Standard Reference Data and National Bureau of Standards.	Do.
40	95-323, H.R. 3489, Merchant Marine Academy Appointments.	July 29, 1978.
41	95-324, H.R. 4270, Federico Degetau Federal Building.	Do.
42	95-325, H.J. Res. 613, Grandparents Day	Do.
	95-326, H.R. 12637, North Pacific Fisheries	Do.
43	95-327, S. 1291, Cheyenne-Arapaho Indian Lands	Do.
44	95-328, S. 1582, Ak-Chin Indian Water Settlement	Do.
49	95-329, S. 947, Creek Indian Nation Lands	Do.
	95-330, H.J. Res. 1024, Urgent Agriculture Supplemental Appropriations, 1978.	July 31, 1978.
	95-331, H.R. 11877, Peace Corps Authorization, 1979.	Aug. 2, 1978.
	95-332, H.J. Res. 945, Urgent Black Lung Supplemental Appropriations, 1978.	Do.
	95-333, H.R. 13385, Public Debt Limit	Aug. 3, 1978.
	95-334, H.R. 11504, Agricultural Credit	Aug. 4, 1978.
	95-335, H.R. 12933, Transportation Appropriations, 1979.	Do.
	95-336, H.R. 10569, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education.	Do.
46	95-337, S. 785, Fallon Paiute and Shoshone Tribal Land.	Do.
	95-338, H.R. 11832, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.	Aug. 8, 1978.
	95-339, H.R. 12426, New York City Loan	Do.
47	95-340, H.R. 12138, Chet Holifield Building	Aug. 11, 1978.
	95-341, S.J. Res. 102, American Indian Religious Freedom.	Do.
	95-342, S. 920, Lake Murray Recreational Demonstration Area Projects Disposal.	Do.
	95-343, S. 2463, Strip Mining Programs Authorizations.	Do.
	95-344, H.R. 8336, Chattahoochee River Recreation Area.	Aug. 15, 1978.
	95-345, H.R. 7581, Tax Exemption of Telephone Cooperatives; Tax Treatment of Loaned Securities and Tobacco Cooperatives.	Do.
48	95-346, S. 2424, American Legion Membership	Aug. 17, 1978.
49	95-347, H.J. Res. 946, National Guard Day	Aug. 18, 1978.
	95-348, S. 2821, Guam and Other U.S. Territories Public Works.	Do.
50	95-349, H.J. Res. 963, POW-MIA Recognition Day	Do.
51	95-350, H.J. Res. 682, Lupus Week	Do.
	95-351, H.R. 2777, National Consumer Cooperative Bank.	Aug. 20, 1978.
	95-352, H.R. 10787, Bureau of Land Management Authorization, 1979-82.	Do.
52	95-353, H.R. 11579, Olin E. Teague Veterans Center and other VA Hospital Designations.	Aug. 28, 1978.
	95-354, H.R. 10732, Fishery Conservation and Management.	Do.
	95-355, H.R. 13467, Second Supplemental Appropriations, 1978.	Sept. 8, 1978.
	95-356, H.R. 12602, Military Construction Authorization, 1979.	Do.
53	95-357, H.R. 3532, Naval Observatory Publication Name Change.	Do.
	95-358, H.R. 7161, Jr. Reserve Officers' Training Corps.	Do.
54	95-359, H.R. 8471, USS Wyoming Silver Service	Do.
	95-360, S. 2543, Fraudulent Mail Solicitations	Sept. 9, 1978.
55	95-361, H.R. 8397, Papago Indian Land	Sept. 10, 1978.
56	95-362, H.R. 185, Coast Guard Employees Transportation.	Sept. 11, 1978.
	95-363, H.R. 12106, Independent Safety Board	Do.
57	95-364, H.J. Res. 773, Port Week	Sept. 15, 1978.
	95-365, H.R. 8342, Federal Employees Withholding of Local Taxes.	Do.
	95-366, H.R. 8771, Civil Service Retirement Fund Payments.	Do.
	95-367, H.R. 6669, Climate Program	Sept. 17, 1978.
	95-368, H.R. 2931, Federal Employee Health Benefits.	Do.
	95-369, H.R. 10899, International Banking	Do.
	95-370, H.R. 12240, Intelligence Activities Authorization, 1979.	Do.
58	95-371, H.J. Res. 1014, Victims of the Holocaust	Sept. 18, 1978.
	95-372, S. 9, Outer Continental Shelf	Do.
	95-373, H.R. 13468, D.C. Appropriations, 1979	Do.
	95-374, H.R. 12927, Military Construction Appropriations, 1979.	Do.
59	95-375, S. 1633, Pascua Yaqui Indian Tribe	Do.
	95-376, H.R. 10878, Fisherman's Protection Reimbursement Program.	Do.
	95-377, S. 3454, Military Personnel Practices Extension.	Sept. 19, 1978.
60	95-378, H.R. 8112, Federal Records Council Abolishment.	Sept. 22, 1978.
61	95-379, H.R. 12915, National Archives Trust Fund Board.	Do.
	95-380, H.R. Substitute Treasury Checks	Do.
	95-381, S. 2928, Foreign Investment Survey	Do.
	95-382, Civil Service Retirement for Japanese-American Internees of W.W. II.	Do.
	95-383, S. 3107, Referees of Bankruptcy Employees.	Do.
	95-384, S. 3075, International Security Assistance	Sept. 26, 1978.
	95-385, S. 3119, D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency	Do.
	95-386, S. 3120, D.C. Audit	Do.
	95-387, S. 1103, D.C. Reciprocal Tax Collection	Sept. 27, 1978.
62	95-388, S. 2556, D.C. Bail Agency Name Change	Do.
63	95-389, S.J. Res. 133, Good Neighbor Day	Sept. 19, 1978.
	95-390, H.R. 7814, Federal Employees Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules.	Do.
	95-391, H.R. 12935, Legislative Appropriations, 1979.	Sept. 30, 1978.
	95-392, H.R. 12936, HUD Appropriations, 1979	Do.
	95-393, H.R. 7819, Diplomatic Immunity	Do.
64	95-394, H.R. 12772, Land Conveyance—Oregon	Do.
65	95-395, H.R. 12860, Rhode Island Indian Claims Settlement.	Do.
	95-396, S. 1678, F.I.F.R.A	Do.
	95-397, H.R. 3702, Survivors Benefits of Retired Military Personnel.	Do.
66	95-398, S. 3069, Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Indian Land.	Do.
67	95-399, S. 3002, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservaton.	Do.
	95-400, S. 3271, Food Stamp Workfare Pilot Project.	Do.
	95-401, H.R. 11401, NASA Authorization, 1979	Do.
	95-402, S. 3468, Upland Cotton Price Supports	Do.
	95-403, S. 1896, Hazardous Materials Transportation.	Do.
	95-404, S. 2701, Water Resources Planning	Do.
	95-405, S. 2391, Commodity Futures Trading Commission.	Do.
	95-406, S.J. Res. 165, Mortgage Insurance	Do.
	95-407, H.J. Res. 1140, Export-Import Bank	Do.
	95-408, S. 3375, District Court Relocations	Oct. 2, 1978
	95-409, S. 3272, Livestock Sales	Do.
68	95-410, H.R. 8149, Customs Procedural Reform	Oct. 3, 1978
	95-411, S.J. Res. 154, International Petroleum Exposition.	Oct. 5, 1978
	95-412, H.R. 12443, Immigration Ceiling	Do.
	95-413, S. 3342, Standing Bear and Glenn Cunningham Lakes.	Do.
69	95-414, S. 2507, Smithsonian Acquisition of Museum of African Art.	Do.
	95-415, H.J. Res. 1088, New York City Appropriations.	Do.
70	95-416, S. 1265, Documents Transfer	Do.
	95-417, H.R. 12508, Immigration and Naturalization of Adopted Children.	Do.
71	95-418, H.R. 8812, E.C. "Took" Gathings Building	Do.
72	95-419, H.J. Res. 1007, Asian Pacific American Heritage Week.	Do.
	95-420, 13745, Military and Other Public Lands Conservation.	Do.
	95-421, S. 3040, Amtrak Authorization	Do.
	95-422, H.R. 11291, Fire Prevention and Control	Do.
	95-423, H.R. 1920, Excise Tax on the Loss of Alcoholic Beverages.	Oct. 6, 1978
	95-424, H.R. 12222, International Development Assistance—Food for Peace.	Do.
	95-425, H.R. 11567, Securities and Exchange Commission Authorization, 1979-80.	Do.
	95-426, H.R. 12598, State Department Authorization, 1979.	Do.
	95-427, H.R. 12841, Tax Treatment of Fringe Benefits.	Do.
	95-428, H.R. 10822, National Sea Grant Program	Do.
	95-429, H.R. 12930, Treasury-Postal Service Appropriations, 1979.	Oct. 10, 1978
	95-430, H.R. 11005, International Trade Commission Authorization, 1979.	Do.
	95-431, H.R. 12934, State-Justice-Commerce Appropriations, 1979.	Do.
	95-432, H.R. 13349, Expatriation Statutes Repeal	Do.
73	95-433, H.R. 10581, Yakima and Mescelero Indian Judgment Funds.	Do.
	95-434, H.R. 11400, National Science Foundation Authorization, 1979.	Do.
	95-435, H.R. 9214, International Monetary Fund—Bretton Woods.	Do.

PUBLIC LAWS, 95TH CONGRESS (164 OUT OF 633 PUBLIC LAWS, OR 26 PERCENT, WERE NONSUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE)—Continued

	Public Law No., Bill No., and title	Approved
74	95-436, S. 409, Roman L. Hruska Animal Meat Research Center.	Do.
	95-437, H.R. 10126, Federal Employees Part-Time Career Employment.	Do.
75	95-438, S. 425, Lieutenant General Ira C. Eaker Gold Medal.	Do.
	95-439, S. 286, Animal and Plant Quarantine Notices.	Do.
76	95-440, S. 1267, Federal Records Schedules	Do.
	95-441, S. 2946, Agricultural Lands	Do.
77	95-442, S. 2951, Department of Agriculture Gift Acceptance.	Do.
	95-443, S. 3045, Farm Credit Loans for Aquatic Products.	Do.
	95-444, S. 3067, Civil Rights Commission Authorization.	Do.
	95-445, S. 3092, Livestock Slaughtering	Do.
78	95-446, S. 3274, Carl Hayden Bee Research Center.	Do.
79	95-447, S. 3036, Susan B. Anthony Dollar	Do.
	95-448, H.R. 13125, Agriculture Appropriations, 1978.	Oct. 11, 1978
80	95-449, S.J. Res. 29, Family Week	Do.
	95-450, H.R. 12026, Indian Peaks and Oregon Wilderness.	Do.
81	95-451, S. 3467, W.R. "Bob" Poage Pecan Field Station.	Do.
	95-452, H.R. 8588, Offices of Inspector and Auditor General.	Oct. 12, 1978
	95-453, H.R. 9945, Indian Claims Commission	Do.
	95-454, S. 2640, Civil Service Reform	Oct. 13, 1978
82	95-455, H.R. 12603, Great Lakes Pilot Licenses	Do.
	95-456, S. 2249, Rate Discrimination	Do.
	95-457, H.R. 13635, Defense Appropriations, 1979	Do.
	95-458, H.R. 1337, Excise Tax on Trucks—Other Tax Amendments.	Oct. 14, 1978
83	95-459, H.R. 13991, Susanville Indian Rancheria	Do.
	95-460, S. 3384, Agricultural Foreign Investment Information.	Do.
	95-461, S. 2916, Drug Abuse Prevention and Treatment.	Do.
84	95-462, H.R. 13692, Chattahoochee Compact	Do.
85	95-463, H.J. Res. 685, Fire Prevention Week; Jogging Day; Inventors' Day.	Do.
	95-464, S. 415, Anadromous Fish Conservation	Oct. 17, 1978.
	95-465, H.R. 12932, Interior Appropriations, 1979	Do.
86	95-466, S.J. Res. 16, Jefferson F. Davis Citizenship	Do.
	95-467, S. 2704, Water Research and Development—Saline Water Conversion.	Do.
87	95-468, S. 2801, Henry R. Koen Forest Service Building.	Do.
	95-469, H.R. 8394, Wildlife Refuge Revenue Sharing.	Do.
	95-470, S. 2376, Payroll Deductions for Charitable Contributions.	Do.
	95-471, S. 1215, Indian Education	Do.
	95-472, H.R. 8811, Tax Court Judges Retirement—Estate Taxes.	Do.
	95-473, H.R. 10965, Transportation Codification	Do.
	95-474, S. 682, Tanker and Port Safety	Do.
	95-475, H.R. 6503, Intercoastal Shipping	Oct. 18, 1978.
	95-476, H.R. 12028, Veterans' Housing Benefits and Burial Allowances.	Do.
	95-477, H.R. 11302, EPA Authorization, 1979	Do.
	95-478, H.R. 12255, Older Americans	Do.
	95-479, H.R. 11886, Veterans' Disability Compensation and Survivors' Benefits.	Do.
	95-480, H.R. 12929, Labor-HEW Appropriations, 1979.	Do.
	95-481, H.R. 12931, Foreign Aid Appropriations, 1979.	Do.
	95-482, H.J. Res. 1139, Continuing Appropriations, 1979.	Do.
	95-483, H.R. 9998, Ocean Shipping	Do.
88	95-484, H.R. 13797, Fort Scott National Historic Site.	Oct. 19, 1978.
	95-485, S. 3486, Military Procurement Authorization, 1979.	Oct. 20, 1978.
	95-486, H.R. 7483, Omnibus Judgeships	Do.
	95-487, H.R. 14026, Alaskan Natives	Do.
	95-488, H.R. 13167, Black Lung Trust Funds	Do.
89	95-489, H.R. 13803, Columbia Slough, Oregon Navigation Project Termination.	Do.
90	95-490, S. 1318, Hawaiian Revenue Proceeds Disposition.	Do.
	95-491, S. 3259, Federal Information Centers	Do.
91	95-492, S. 3373, Girl Scouts International Transportation.	Do.
92	95-493, H.R. 11035, U.S. Capitol Historical Society	Do.
	95-494, H.R. 12264, Wisconsin Wilderness	Oct. 21, 1978.
	95-495, H.R. 12250, Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness.	Do.
93	95-496, S. 1081, Osage Tribe	Do.
	95-497, H.R. 12051, New York Pension Funds	Do.
94	95-498, S. 2588, Pueblo of Santa Ana Land	Do.
95	95-499, S. 2358, Pueblo of Zia Land	Do.
	95-500, H.R. 8755, Duty Suspension on Ball Bearings, Yankee Drying Cylinders, and Plastic Necklaces.	Do.
	95-501, S. 3447, Agricultural Exports	Do.
	95-502, H.R. 8533, Waterway User Fee—Taxation of Bingo Games.	Do.
96	95-503, S. 2411, U.S. Marshals Transportation Expenses.	Oct. 24, 1978.
	95-504, S. 2493, Airline Deregulation	Do.
97	95-505, H.R. 11658, Great Lakes Vessel Speed	Do.
	95-506, H.R. 13767, Federal Motor Pool Vehicles	Do.
	95-507, H.R. 11318, Small Business Minority Investment Companies.	Do.
	95-508, H.R. 12165, Duty Suspension on Metal Waste and Scrap and Red Peppers.	Do.
	95-509, H.R. 11686, Department of Energy—Military.	Do.
	95-510, H.R. 13418, Small Business Volunteer Counseling Programs.	Do.
	95-511, S. 1566, Foreign Intelligence Surveillance	Oct. 25, 1978.
98	95-512, S. 3412, Annuity Adjustments for Comptroller General.	Do.
	95-513, H.J. Res. 1147, Vietnam Veterans Week	Do.
	95-514, H.R. 10587, Grazing Fees	Do.
	95-515, S. 1185 Horseracing Bets	Do.
	95-516, H.R. 10161, Duty Suspension on Graphite	Do.
99	95-517, H.R. 11945, Nazi War Paintings	Do.
100	95-518, H.R. 12112, Gaithright Dam and Lake Moomaw.	Do.
101	95-519, S. 1626, Librarian of Congress	Do.
	95-520, H.R. 5029, Philippine Veterans' Benefits	Oct. 26, 1978.
	95-521, S. 555, Ethics in Government	Do.
102	95-522, H.R. 13481, Frederick G. Payne Building	Oct. 27, 1978.
	95-523, H.R. 50, Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment.	Do.
	95-524, S. 2570, CETA	Do.
103	95-525, H.R. 7296, Charles A. Lindbergh Federal Building.	Do.
	95-526, H.R. 12116, D.C. Home Rule Amendments	Do.
104	95-527, H.R. 7305, William L. Springer Building	Do.
105	95-528, H.R. 13808, Omar Burleson Federal Building.	Do.
106	95-529, H.R. 13809, George C. Mahon Federal Building.	Do.
	95-530, H.R. 13892, Northern Marianas Attorneys and Marshals.	Do.
107	95-531, H.R. 14223, Leslie C. Arends Building	Do.
108	95-532, H.R. 14295, Paul G. Rogers Federal Building.	Do.
109	95-533, H.J. Res. 747, State of New Mexico Constitutional Amendment.	Do.
	95-534, H.J. Res. 816, Federal Reserve Banks Purchase of U.S. Obligations.	Do.
	95-535, S. 2049, Witness Fees and Expenses	Do.
110	95-536, S. 2403, New Hampshire-Vermont Interstate School Compact.	Do.
	95-537, S. 3336, Drug Dependent Federal Offenders.	Do.
111	95-538, S. 3540, William O. Douglas Federal Building.	Do.
	95-539, S. 1315, Bilingual Court Proceedings	Oct. 28, 1978.
	95-540, H.R. 4727, Rape Victims	Do.
	95-541, H.R. 7749, Antarctic Conservation	Do.
112	95-542, H.R. 11671, C. Bascom Slemp Building	Do.
113	95-543, H.R. 12634, Joe Skubitz Social Security Administration Center.	Do.
114	95-544, H.R. 13187, John J. Flynt, Jr. Federal Building.	Do.
115	95-545, H.R. 13514, Joe Waggoner Federal Building.	Do.
	95-546, H.R. 13972, Montana Wilderness Extension	Do.
	95-547, H.R. 13989, Agricultural Research Formulas for Land Grant Colleges.	Do.
116	95-548, S. 3112, Library of Congress James Madison Building.	Oct. 30, 1978
	95-549, H.R. 12509, Nazi War Criminals—Indochina Refugee Assistance.	Do.
117	95-550, S. 1403, University of New Mexico Land Conveyance.	Do.
	95-551, H.R. 13416, United States Military Academy.	Do.
118	95-552, H.R. 13372, Duck Stamp	Do.
	95-553, S. 3551, North Pacific Fisheries Act of 1954.	Do.
	95-554, S. 3189, Coal Leasing	Do.
	95-555, S. 995, Sex Discrimination on Basis of Pregnancy.	Oct. 31, 1978.
	95-556, H.R. 13702, Congressional Delegate from American Samoa.	Do.
	95-557, S. 3084, Housing and Community Development.	Do.
	95-558, S. 3595, Federal Trade Commission Report	Nov. 1, 1978.
	95-559, S. 2534, Health Maintenance Organizations	Do.
119	95-560, H.R. 8389, Robert F. Kennedy Medal	Do.
	95-561, H.R. 15, Elementary and Secondary Education.	Do.
	95-562, S. 976, Perishable Agricultural Commodities.	Do.
	95-563, H.R. 11002, Government Contracts Disputes.	Do.
	95-564, H.R. 11209, Maritime Satellite Telecommunications.	Do.
	95-565, S. 2788, ConRail Stock	Do.
	95-566, S. 2539, Middle-Income Student Assistance.	Do.
	95-567, H.R. 12605, Corporation for Public Broadcasting.	Nov. 2, 1978.
	95-568, H.R. 7577, Economic Opportunity	Do.
	95-569, S. 1029, Smithsonian Museum Support Facilities.	Do.
	95-570, H.R. 11003, White House Personnel Authorization.	Do.
120	95-571, H.R. 14224, Minnesota Chippewa Indian Land.	Do.
	95-572, S. 2075, Jurors' Fees	Do.
	95-573, H.R. 14145, District Court Relocations	Do.
	95-574, S. 3081, Railroad Safety	Do.
	95-575, S. 1487, Cigarette Racketeering	Do.
	95-576, H.R. 12140, Water Pollution—Hazardous Substances Control.	Do.
121	95-577, H.R. 13597, Solar Collector Installation in Rayburn Building.	Do.
	95-578, S. 2820, Dam Safety and Inspection	Do.
122	95-579, S. 2257, Immigration Nationality Act, Eugenia Cortes.	Do.
	95-580, S. 1835, Rural Transportation Advisory Task Force.	Do.
	95-581, H.R. 10343, Marine Corps Retirement	Do.
	95-582, H.R. 12393, False Claims Act—Illegal Alien Transport.	Do.
	95-583, H.R. 4319, Federal Employee Life Insurance & Health Benefits.	Do.
	95-584, S. 3371, Religious Corporation Land	Do.
	95-585, H.R. 3185, Government Contracts	Do.
123	95-586, H.R. 7971, Land Conveyances	Nov. 3, 1978.
124	95-587, H.R. 7101, Land Claims—California	Do.
	95-588, H.R. 10173, Veterans' Pensions	Nov. 4, 1978.
	95-589, H.R. 13903, Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences Board.	Do.
	95-590, H.R. 12874, Solar Photovoltaic Energy	Do.
	95-591, H.R. 13500, Presidential Papers	Do.
	95-592, S. 1816, Guayule Rubber Production—Maryland Tobacco.	Do.
	95-593, S. 703, Overseas Citizens Voting Rights	Do.
125	95-594, H.J. Res. 1173, House Adjournment Resolution.	Do.
	95-595, H.R. 9701, Federal Pension Plan Reporting	Do.
	95-596, S.J. Res. 160, Pension Building Restoration.	Do.
	95-597, H.R. 5646, ConRail Employee Benefits	Do.
	95-598, H.R. 8200, Bankruptcy Reform	Nov. 6, 1978.
	95-599, H.R. 11733, Highways—Mass Transit	Do.
	95-600, H.R. 13511, Tax Reduction, 1978	Do.
	95-601, S. 2584, Nuclear Regulatory Commission Authorization, 1979.	Do.
	95-602, H.R. 12467, Vocational Rehabilitation	Do.
	95-603, S. 990, Federal Physicians Comparability Allowance.	Do.
	95-604, H.R. 13650, Uranium Mill Tailings	Do.
	95-605, S. 2774, Toiyabe National Park	Nov. 8, 1978.
126	95-606, S. 2727, Amateur sports	Do.
	95-607, S. 2981, Local Rail Services	Do.
	95-608, S. 1214, Indian Child Welfare	Do.
	95-609, S. 3083, Noise Control	Do.
	95-610, S. 274, Military Unionization	Do.
	95-611, H.R. 10898, U.S. Railway Association	Do.
	95-612, S. 2093, Exchange Stabilization Fund	Do.
	95-613, S. 2522, Family Planning and Sudden Infant Death.	Do.
127	95-614, S. 553, Cibola National Forest	Do.
	95-615, H.R. 9251, Tax Treatment of American Abroad.	Do.
	95-616, H.R. 2329, Fish and Wildlife Programs—Sea Level Canal Study.	Do.
	95-617, H.R. 4018, Public Utility Rates	Nov. 9, 1978.
	95-618, H.R. 5263, Energy Taxes	Do.
	95-619, H.R. 5037, Energy Conservation Policy	Do.
	95-620, H.R. 5146, Coal Conversion	Do.
	95-621, H.R. 5289, Natural Gas Pricing	Do.
	95-622, S. 2450, Public Health Services—Biomedical Research.	Do.
	95-623, S. 2466, Health Research	Do.
	95-624, S. 3151, Justice Department Authorization, 1979.	Do.
	95-625, S. 791, Omnibus Parks	Nov. 10, 1978.
	95-626, S. 2474, Public Health Programs	Do.
	95-627, S. 3085, School Lunch and Child Nutrition	Do.
	95-628, H.R. 7320, Miscellaneous Timing Requirements.	Do.
	95-629, S. 1829, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation—San Antonio Missions—Historical Camden.	Do.
	95-630, H.R. 14279, Financial Institutions Regulatory Agencies—Regulation Q—Export-Import Bank.	Do.
	95-631, S. 2796, Consumer Product Safety	Do.
	95-632, S. 2899, Endangered Species	Do.
	95-633, S. 2399, Psychotropic Substances	Do.

PRESIDENTIAL VETOES

97TH AND 98TH CONGRESSES COMPARED WITH 95TH AND 96TH CONGRESSES

Although President Reagan often blames Congress for the record deficits and a

myriad of other problems, a look at history shows that he has vetoed very few bills compared to other Presidents.

Only President Kennedy who served with a Democratic House and Senate vetoed fewer bills. One has to go back to President Harding for a President who used his veto authority even less.

COMPARATIVE PRESIDENTIAL VETO RECORD

President	Years served	Vetoes	Override votes	Overrides
Reagan	4	24	4	4
Carter	4	31	4	2
Ford	2½	66	29	12
Nixon	5½	43	20	5
Johnson	5	30	0	0
Kennedy	3	21	0	0
Eisenhower	8	181	11	2
Truman	8	250	24	12
Roosevelt	12	635	17	9
Hoover	4	37	9	3
Coolidge	5½	50	7	4
Harding	2½	6	1	0
Wilson	8	44	16	6
Taft	4	39	10	1
Roosevelt	7½	82	2	1
McKinley	4½	42	0	0

THE RETIREMENT OF SENATOR JOHN TOWER

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it is a privilege for me to take these moments to express my regards for JOHN TOWER.

The Senate will miss his talents and tenacity in pursuing with great energy the causes close to his heart. The Senate executes no more vital duty than the vigorous and responsible protection of our Nation's basic national security—her military prowess, her alliances with friends, the deterrence of her adversaries. JOHN TOWER has, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee these last 4 years, executed that duty with great diligence.

Of course, Senator TOWER's Senate career spans six times that period of time—24 years. During that time, in addition to his long service on the Armed Services Committee, Senator TOWER has acquitted himself in workman-like fashion on the Banking Committee, the Budget Committee, and as chairman of the Republican Policy Committee.

I may not have agreed always with JOHN's particular point of view on a given subject, but I could never accuse him of failing to make it crystal clear how and why he took a particular position.

I have noted one report wherein one of Senator TOWER's high school classmates, and college roommate, Mr. David Switzer, recounted that, as far as he knew JOHN was the only freshman in Southwestern University in the class of 1942 who read Karl Marx's "Das Kapital" just for pleasure. I think it is safe to say there is nothing I have seen the Senator from Texas do, or say, to indicate that any of Marx rubbed off on him. Quite the contrary, he behaves very much as if he did not believe a word of it.

The range of JOHN TOWER's knowledge on defense matters and the hard-working way he has managed the very complicated legislation which funds our defense programs deserve our thanks.

I am certain that Senator TOWER will bring those same talents and energy into all of his furture enterprises, and I wish him well.

Mr. RANDOLPH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

SENATOR RANDOLPH THANKS HIS COLLEAGUES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in these closing minutes of the current Congress, I wish to express my personal appreciation to each and every Member, the 99 Members on both sides of the center aisle, with whom I have been privileged to serve. I hope that it is not inappropriate for me to say that I mean every word.

I have had a tremendously wonderful experience here in the Senate. Of course, as you do know, I came to this historic Hill and was sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives on March 9, 1933. That was the day when we cast our first rollcall. It was not a rollcall perhaps of importance to discuss now. We selected Henry T. Rainey, of Illinois, to be the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Shortly thereafter, we voted on the Emergency Banking Act. The vote for the passage of that legislation was without a dissent by any Member of the House of Representatives. A little later the Senate voted 73 to 7 for the Emergency Banking Act.

So that was the beginning of the process of voting here on Capitol Hill.

I have just now cast my 10,753d vote. That is quite a number of votes.

Mr. President, I do want to indicate that, as I sat here, I was thinking of the closeness of some of the votes that I have cast. I go back now in memory to the night of August 12, 1941. We were voting in the House of Representatives on the extension of the Selective Service Act. That was the continuance of the draft.

I recall the somewhat bitter debate between certain forces in the House. "We did not need to continue the draft," they said.

I voted with the 203 for continuance rather than with the 202 against. Continuance of that law was responsible in rather substantial degree for the program of manpower which allowed us to prosecute successfully the conflict in which we were to engage over the next 4 years.

Remembering I have now cast my last vote, I will say to both of the leaders—to the majority leader, HOWARD BAKER, and to the minority leader, ROBERT BYRD—that in all of these years—and I think of them how they rise before me now in retrospect—I have never served under two leaders with whom I have felt more comfortable than the two who are now sitting at their desks.

I have enjoyed these cherished associations. I have profited by not only their personal consideration of me, but also I have profited by watching their work, work worthy of the positions to which they have been entrusted.

Senator BYRD of West Virginia made reference to Senator BAKER coming back here again. I believe the minority leader indicated if HOWARD came back he might be in the minority. But I can tell you I will not be back. This closes out my membership in the Senate of the United States.

The experience, to be born on Main Street in a little town, Salem, WV, and then, through all the years to work with others—to be helped by others, stimulated by others, inspired by others—and then to serve for 40 years in the Congress, 14 in the House and 26 in the Senate in this Capitol of the United States, has been something that I shall never forget.

Mr. President, this is the last comment I shall make: To work with friends, to, hopefully, accomplish with friends, this has instilled in me a feeling which will never leave me. This is a land which I love. This is a country in which I believe regardless of the problems that face us; this is a country that will continue to be the leader in bringing peace and understanding to the peoples of the world.

I thank the Chair.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I sat in rapt attention as my friend and colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH] made those moving remarks. I would like to repeat something I have said many times from this place and on the floor of the Senate over many years: I still think of JENNINGS RANDOLPH as my chairman. Even though he is now the ranking minority member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, I recall so clearly his chairmanship when I first came to the Senate.

I freely acknowledge that what little I may know about the Senate and about procedures of this body, and certainly about committee work, I learned first from JENNINGS RANDOLPH. He is a great chairman, a great friend, he has been a great Senator and a great part of the deliberations of this body for a very long time.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH was elected to the Congress of the United States on the same day that my late father-in-law, Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, was elected to the House of Representatives in 1932. He has served during a tumultuous time in the history of the Republic. He has served with great intelligence, forbearance, and effectiveness.

JENNINGS, well done.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, JENNINGS RANDOLPH and I campaigned for the Senate together in 1958. We won together. Throughout these 26 years, we have worked together in the Senate, and we have, I would like to think, represented the majority of the people of West Virginia in a way they can be proud of.

I shall miss JENNINGS RANDOLPH. He has always been very supportive of me as I have tended to serve in the leadership on this side of the aisle. My service on this side of the aisle in one leadership capacity or another now totals 18 years. For 4 years, I was Secretary of the Democratic Conference; for 6 years, majority whip; for 4 years as majority leader, and 4 years minority leader.

I have said many times, and I say once more for the record here, that were all Senators as understanding and cooperative as JENNINGS RANDOLPH has been in his working relationship with me, the burden that goes with the leadership would have been much lighter and, certainly, the office would have been much more enjoyable.

I thank JENNINGS RANDOLPH, my senior colleague, for his many kindnesses. I have always respected him, and I shall continue to think of him as my friend and I want him to feel that I am his.

The Senate has appropriately recognized my senior colleague by its demonstration after demonstration, statement after statement, and word after word of warmth and affection and I know that those expressions by my colleagues have come from the heart.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH is innately a very warm, gracious, thoughtful, considerate, and charitable individual. I do not think I shall again see the likes of JENNINGS RANDOLPH as I have worked with him and, perhaps more than any other Senator, come to know him. I do not think the Senate will see the likes of JENNINGS RANDOLPH again, at least in my time.

I want to speak a final tribute to Senator BAKER. He leaves this body as my friend. He leaves this body knowing that I am his friend. I must say there are few persons whom I have ever called my friend. That should perhaps be explained.

I have thousands of friends in West Virginia. I have a good many friends here. But I have been careful in my use of the word "friend," as those who know me—my staff and my family—well know.

I suppose it is a bit like the man who, on his death-bed, expressed a desire that he be buried at 3 o'clock in the morning. So one cold, wintry night, at 3 o'clock in the morning he was buried on a high mountain.

At the opening of his last will and testament, he said that he wanted his great wealth to be distributed among those who had attended his funeral. Only three persons had attended his funeral. Those were his true friends. The man who departed from this life certainly knew how to leave his wealth to his real friends.

I have often thought that, one day, those of us who get wrapped up in our little worlds so easily should just take pause and think about the final hours that will come to each and, hopefully, we will be in our clear minds when the end is near.

As we more or less look at ourselves from time to time, we should perhaps try to project ourselves into those final sobering, leveling moments when at first the flowers will come and the postcards and the letters and the telegrams and visitors. We will have the needles in our arms and intravenous feeding will constitute our meals. After a couple of weeks, we will become less popular, the number of baskets of flowers will decrease, the letters will diminish, and fewer and fewer people will take the time to come around. The Moon will rise and go down, the Sun will shine and be followed by the night, the seasons will still come and go, the tides will continue to rise and fall, the traffic on the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge and the 14th Street Bridge and all the other bridges will be congested at rush hour, the planes will fly in and fly out of National Airport, and things will go on pretty much as ever. And in those last hours, there will be four walls around us and the ceiling overhead, our families and maybe one or two friends who remember will be there at our bedside. Then it is not long until one is forgotten around here. The Senate will go on, just as it has for 195 years. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be printed every night, as it is now, and there will be the speeches that we make. I wish at times that I could have been one of the astronauts who went to the Moon so that I could have looked back upon this planet Earth and seen how small it is and how infinitely infinitesimal I am. However, although this picture will unfold as I have attempted to draw it, those who serve here will have to make the sacrifice. We all pay to serve in this body. My sacrifice has been that I was not able to be with my two daughters as they were growing up in that most impressionable stage of life. I was in a campaign for this office or another office, and so they sacrificed, my wife sacrificed, I sacrificed. I cannot ever recall the years back. I never had the opportunity to spend time as I should have with my wonderful grandson. I wish I could yet have the chance to live those days over when he was alive and I could be with him more. There was once when he said, "Pa Pa, you are not with us often on the 4th of July anymore." If I could call time back in its flight, I would be with him more, but he has gone on to meet God.

Those are the sacrifices that we all make here, and even though we may reflect, as I have reflected, indeed we do perform a service, and it is that service which brings happiness to widows and orphans, the elderly and the young, and which helps our Nation to become a better Nation for them and for their children. We should perhaps not overly minimize the good that we may do here in public service.

So for my friends HOWARD BAKER and JENNINGS RANDOLPH, I close by attempting to remember a bit of verse at this time of their departure from the Senate we love so much.

If a man does a deed that you really admire, don't leave a kind word unsaid, for fear to do so might make him vain, and cause him to lose his head. So reach out your hand and tell him well done and see how his gratitude swells; it isn't the flowers we strew on the grave, it's the word to the living that tells.

Mr. BAKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. As always, Mr. President, the minority leader is not only eloquent and touching, but he embodies the spirit of this institution.

There is one more official act that I am called upon to perform and that is to wait upon the President of the United States by telephone and to advise him that the Senate is prepared to adjourn sine die and to inquire of him if he has further requests or requirements. At this time in order to do that, in conjunction with my friend and my colleague, the minority leaders, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

EXPRESSIONS OF APPRECIATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I spoke the other day and expressed my own personal gratitude to the staff and officers of the Senate. I have an additional statement concerning the pages that was written by one of our cloakroom aides. I think it is well done.

Mr. President, since the Senate reconvened September 5, after the August recess, we have seen many a difficult hour. The sessions during this time have been very long and laborious; and indeed all those involved must be quite weary from this recent furious legislative pace.

However, Mr. President, I wish to draw the attention of the Senate and its observers to the "center of the ring," so to speak; and that is to the

rostrum where the Senate pages are stationed.

As surely as those strong marble pillars behind the Presiding Officer's desk hold up our national motto "E Pluribus Unum," this youthful group of pages has rendered unsurpassed support for the Members and staff of the Senate.

I have noticed with no small amount of pride the fine example of American youth portrayed by these young men and women who have so diligently served the U.S. Senate.

Numerically, this is a smaller group of pages than usual and they only began their term of service at the beginning of this past September. But despite their relative inexperience and proportionally increased work load, they have demonstrated truly unique dedication, aptitude, and ability. They have been quick to learn and eager to assist, no matter how complex, urgent, or demanding the task.

Therefore, I congratulate the families and sponsors of these fine high school students who have so tirelessly made our work here all that much easier. On behalf of the Senate and the 98th Congress, I express our sincere gratitude for their exemplary contribution and I list here their names in the RECORD:

Gwen Newton, Sally Klemperer, Kim Gross, Victoria Yates, Debora Reck, James McKinzie, and Chris Bailey.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am happy to report that we have completed our conversation with the President of the United States by telephone. Senator BYRD and I advised him that the Senate had completed its work for this Congress and we inquired of the President if he had further requests or requirement, and he indicated he did not.

He asked that we express his gratitude and appreciation to the Members of Congress, to the Senate in particular, for their faithful performance over the past years and to wish them well in their future endeavor.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have a series of resolutions now that I wish to propose.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I first send to the desk a resolution now and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 485) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable George H.W. Bush, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the second session of the Ninety-Eighth Congress.

AUTHORITY TO MAKE CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS AFTER THE SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE PRESENT SESSION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I send another resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 486) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the President of the Senate, the President of the Senate pro tempore, and the Majority Leader of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 487) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the second session of the Ninety-Eighth Congress.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE SECRETARY COMMENDING THE EMPLOYEES IN THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I send another resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 488) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate hereby commends those faithful employees who have labored under the able direction of the Secretary of the Senate, the Honorable William F. Hildenbrand, and thereby expresses it collective vote of gratitude to those employees at the desk and behind the scenes who are available around the clock in order to assure the orderly running of the Senate.

EXPRESSIONS OF THANKS, APPRECIATION, AND CONGRATULATIONS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I will not take but just a moment. Let me take this opportunity to extend my thanks, appreciation, and congratulations to certain people who have made it possible for the Senate to function effectively and efficiently over the past many months and during this session of Congress and those preceding.

First, Mr. President, I extend my appreciation and gratitude to our distinguished Chaplain, Reverend Halverson, Reverend Halverson has been with us diligently. We have listened with great interest to his opening prayers, and I know at some point they will be compiled and published as they should be.

I hope he will forgive me sometimes for the remarks that I made in respect to those prayers but at least it is proof positive that I have listened.

Mr. President, the secretary of the majority, Howard Greene, supervises a staff of considerable proportions, and he does so with skill and dignity. He is one of the most remarkable men I have ever known, and I wish to congratulate him for his career thus far and predict for him great things in the future.

John Tuck is his assistant. John Tuck is a relative newcomer to the Senate and the staff on the Republican side, and he has shown his talents and his ability very promptly. He has come to be an indispensable part of the Republican organization. He has shown us many things about the rules and procedure of the House of Representatives from where he came as a staff person and has been invaluable in his insight and advice.

Elizabeth Baldwin, known to most of us as Liz, is perhaps the busiest person in the Senate. She is the one who sits at the desk in the well on this side and tries diligently and without complaint to make sense out of the overlapping requests, demands, and requirements that we put upon her almost unceasingly in trying to clear the calendar for action on routine matters, to obtain unanimous-consent clearances, and otherwise to make our life at least to give it a semblance of orderliness.

Cindy Oravecz is invaluable on the Republican cloakroom staff. John Doney is invaluable on the Republican cloakroom staff, as are Ann Haldeman and Mary Arnold. They, too, have an extraordinarily difficult job, and they handle it with great skill. They have my special thanks and appreciation of gratitude for the job well done.

Also, the Republican scheduling staff, located in S. 123, comprised of Cindy Oravecz and Lynne Grant are to be commended for their performance. Their assistance in scheduling presiding officers for the chair and attending to the legislative interests of our Republican Senators and their staffs is invaluable.

I know, Mr. President, that there have been formal resolutions in respect to the officers of the Senate, but it would be unseemly of me to complete this day without expressing my personal congratulations to the Sergeant at Arms, Larry Smith, and his

entire staff, to the Secretary of the Senate, Bill Hildenbrand, to his Assistant Secretary, Marilyn Courtot, to Bob Dove, our Parliamentarian, and Alan Frumin, his assistant, and Gail Cowper, the Assistant Parliamentarian as well and Sally Goffinet, an executive assistant. To Bill Farmer, the Legislative Clerk, to Scott Bates, the Assistant Legislative Clerk, Jim Thorndike, the Journal Clerk, and Bill Lackey, the Assistant Journal Clerk, I express my appreciation as well. Also to Vince Del Balzo, the bill clerk, Jennifer Smith, the assistant bill clerk, and the executive clerks, Gerald Hackett and David Tinsley, as well as the enrolling clerks, Fred Sparrow and Brian Hallen, his assistant.

I express my appreciation to the official reporters of debates who record and process our debates and proceedings for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Their efficient operation is headed by G. Russell Walker, editor in chief. I commend him, the assistant editor, Jeanie Bowles, and the official reporters, who are: William Mohr, Charles Reynolds, Frances Garro, Frank Smonskey, Ronald Kavulick, Jerald Linnell, and Raleigh Milton. I also commend their assistants, Mark Lacovara and Scott Sanborn. Jim Timberlake, editor of the Daily Digest, and Thom Pellikaan, the assistant editor of the Digest, are diligent in their duties and deserving of our thanks.

Mr. President, these are the people who make things work. These are the people who wield the pens in the enrollment of unanimous-consent orders, bills, and resolutions. These are the ones who wield the scissors, the paste pots, and the paper clips that produce those documents that finally are codified into statute law and published for the country and the world to see, whether for good or bad. They are the ones who finally try to make sense of the meanderings of the Senate and expressions of our will and in terms of legislative endeavor.

Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to all of them as well as to certain functionaries on the Democratic side who I am sure will be thanked more extensively by the minority leader, but he will not be offended I am sure when I point out that Pat Griffin, who is the secretary for the minority, and Pat Hynes, the assistant secretary for the minority, have been extraordinarily diligent in their work and in working our staff and our corresponding staff in making things come together.

Charles Kinney and Marty Paone are of particular importance certainly to the Democratic side, but their courtesy to the Republican side is noted and appreciated.

Finally, Abby Saffold—some day, Mr. President, I may—I doubt it, but I some day may write a book about my experience in the Senate. When I do, if I do, I have already chosen the title and it is "Waiting for Abby."

Because never a day goes by that some Senator does not come to me and say, "Can we clear so-and-so?" And usually after I talk to Liz, I say, "Well, it is cleared on our side, but we are waiting for Abby." Because Abby is the one who has that responsibility of conveying to us the clearance of many, many routine matters from the Democratic side which finally enables us to deal with the great bulk of legislation that this body does deal with.

It may seem to the casual observer that our extensive debates and heated discussions of major issues are the main work of the Senate. Indeed, that is the central core of our responsibility. But it probably represents less than 10 percent of the total legislative enactments of this body. Those are matters that are agreed upon after they leave committee or matters that are at the desk and agreed to that we may proceed to otherwise. These are matters that both sides agree should be handled routinely, expeditiously, and by unanimous consent. And it is Abby and Liz who make it possible for us to proceed to that 90 percent of our responsibility.

Finally, Mr. President, I would be remiss if I did not say a word about my three fellow class members. And I am talking about those three Senators who join me in graduation today. I am talking about Senator RANDOLPH, about whom I have spoken extensively and often.

SENATOR JOHN TOWER

But I would like to say a word, as well, about Senator TOWER. Senator TOWER is one of the most remarkable men I ever met, one of the greatest Senators I ever met, and, for good or ill, he is probably the reason that I ran for the Senate in the first instance. Because I remember so clearly, when I was a young lawyer—two conditions from which I have now recovered—in Knoxville, TN, and I saw JOHN TOWER on "Meet the Press" shortly after he was elected to the Senate from Texas. And JOHN has heard me say this, so he will not be offended when I repeat it. I thought, you know, if he could get elected from Texas, I bet I could get elected from Tennessee. [Laughter.]

That may be the reason I really decided to run for the U.S. Senate in the first instance. If TOWER were here, he would no doubt remind the Members, as he has reminded me, that I lost that first race. But I was able to run the second time for the Senate and was elected.

JOHN has been an extraordinary student of the military strength of this Nation, as well as a careful trustee of the traditions of this institution. I wish to extend to him my congratulations for a job well done.

SENATOR PAUL TSONGAS

Senator TSONGAS is a young man who has served his State well, who serves the Senate well, and who will leave the Senate with a great reputation and a record of great accomplishment.

It has been my pleasure to serve with PAUL TSONGAS. He is a man of dignity and dedication. He is a man who has made his mark.

Mr. President, I wanted to say these things. I am prepared now to move that the Senate adjourn or to yield to the minority leader if he has further business to transact.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his kind words concerning those of our officers and members of staffs on this side of the aisle. I especially thank him for his gracious words concerning Abby and Elizabeth.

SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, this may be the last time I ever get the last word. But before I move the Senate adjourn, I would like to take this opportunity to tell the Senate how extraordinarily fortunate they are to have ROBERT C. BYRD as an officer of this body, as a colleague, as minority leader and, in the past, the majority leader.

I have said to BOB BYRD on previous occasions, and I will repeat now, there are not many people in life who work so closely together, so intimately over a period of time, that they know each other as well as the minority and majority leaders of the Senate. There are not many situations in life where it is so necessary to understand the needs and requirements each of the other, and the responsibilities that each have to our fellow Members on our sides of the aisle.

The leadership of the Senate is little understood as an institution. The joint leadership of the Senate is almost never understood. But the joint leadership of the Senate, the Republican and Democratic leaders of the Senate, who have an understanding of their responsibility to the entire Senate, is the glue that holds this place together. And ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia, both as minority and majority leader, has provided the perfect example of how that should be conducted in both roles.

On occasion after occasion, when we have confronted each other on issues, in controversy after controversy, where it has been necessary for us to compete for victory or suffer defeat, there has been an unspoken but a clear understanding of our responsibilities, not only to the Senate but to each other, to make sure that this place functions.

31-059 O-87-24 (Pt. 23)

Someone in the press asked me the other day, "What do you think your greatest achievement has been in your leadership?" And my answer came quickly, and I will repeat it now. It is that this place works—and it has worked.

But it would not have worked without ROBERT C. BYRD. I wish to express to him my gratitude, my admiration, and my appreciation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not seek the last word. I want HOWARD BAKER to have the last word, and he should have.

I just want to do something that I do not say often on this floor, and that is, to address another Senator in the second person—thank you, HOWARD.

THE 98TH CONGRESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, impossible as it may seem, we have come to the end of the 98th Congress.

The experience of recent days reminds me, as it may remind my learned and literate colleagues, of the words of William Faulkner on accepting the Nobel Prize for Literature more than 30 years ago.

> It is easy enough to say that man is immortal, simply because he will endure, that when the last ding-dong of doom has clanged and faded in the red and dying evening, even then there will be one more sound: that of his inexhaustible voice still talking.

But, like Faulkner, I refuse to accept this. I believe man is immortal not because he has an inexhaustible voice but because he has "a soul, a spirit capable of passion and sacrifice and endurance."

In the waning days of this Congress, we have endured quite a lot. But we have not only survived; we have prevailed.

We have shown once again that in the clamorous, cumbersome, chaotic way we do business here, we do it in the people's name and with the people's consent and in a manner that reflects with astonishing clarity the passion and conviction and ultimate commonsense of the American people themselves.

It's not always a glamorous job, but somebody's got to do it, and I believe we have an extraordinary assembly of talented and conscientious men and women who do this job very well.

In this session of Congress alone, the Senate has made some enormously useful contributions to the law and life of the American people.

We have reformed the Federal Criminal Code. We have made a $140 billion down payment on the Federal deficit. We have reformed our farm programs and our banking, insurance, and bankruptcy laws. We've stepped up the fight against organized crime with the Labor Management Racketeering Act. And we've added more than 7.5 million acres of national lands and forests to the wilderness system.

These achievements and others, together with those of the first session of the 98th Congress—the extension of the Voting Rights Act, the preservation of the Social Security System, the passage of the Caribbean Basin initiative, and the creation of a national holiday honoring the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., among many other important legislative measures—constitute a record of performance that speaks well of us even if we may speak ill of the tortuous process which leads us to these legislative goals.

Clearly there is room for improvement. Clearly there is no need—and no real excuse—for us to routinely run the risk of shutting down the Government of the United States for lack of appropriated funds.

Surely there may be better ways to organize ourselves and our legislative responsibilities so that the months we pass at leisure in the beginning of a congressional session need not be redeemed in long hours of agony and turmoil at the end.

We say these things near the adjournment of every Congress now. The words are almost as familiar and frequently intoned as the farewells we bid each other. But we never act to remedy these conditions by reforming our procedures, and I fear we are becoming accustomed to this accursed system when that is the last thing we should do.

The subjects of congressional reform and congressional responsibility have weighed heavily on my mind for some time now. I have spoken often and written much on these subjects in the past, and I daresay I will speak and write still more in the future, because I love this Senate and I want to see its special role in the Nation's leadership preserved and enhanced with time.

Perhaps the greatest reform involves not a change of rules but a change of heart in this Chamber. We are in danger of losing the spirit of civility that can sustain us in times of political stress and legislative logjams.

The vigorous competition of ideas is essential to the Senate's success, and we have some of the ablest and keenest competitors today that we've had in my experience.

But the time must ultimately come when we say of an issue, "This matter is decided."

The Senate cannot fight a guerrilla war over every issue all the time. We cannot be sniping at one another and talking issues to death while the essential work of Government goes undone.

That is not what the American people expect of us, and it is not what they will accept from us. If we cannot resurrect the spirit of chivalry that once reigned here, at least we must restore some semblance of civility and commonality of purpose in this time of challenge at home and danger abroad.

My time in the Senate has come now to an end. This has been my home and harbor for 18 years, and this year's farewell will be my last.

It is impossible, at times like these, not to look back on the road one has traveled, to survey the familiar landmarks with an appreciation that is both old and new, to summon up memories of friends and colleagues and experiences and achievements that have made these 18 years the best of my life.

I feel a little as General MacArthur must have felt when, near the end of his life, he told the corps of cadets at West Point, "Today marks my final rollcall with you."

MacArthur spoke of lengthening shadows and vanished days, of faint bugles and far drums and the strange mournful mutter of the battlefield.

These were the images and senses of an old soldier at the twilight, and I can appreciate and share both the pride and the pain of such reflections.

I think of my first days in the Senate when the doorkeepers would not let me in the Chamber, certain I was too young to be a Senator. The doorkeepers now are not so kind.

I think of the great issues in which I've been engaged—fair housing, clean air, clean water, revenue sharing, Watergate, the Panama Canal, budget cuts and tax cuts and dozens of other battles.

I think of the friends I've made here: the 99 friends who are my fellow Senators today; the absent friends who were my colleagues in days gone by; the remarkable staff, known but to God and us, who serve this institution and this country so well.

But grateful as I am for all these treasures, I have resolved not to dwell on them to the exclusion of all else.

I believe, with Jesse Jackson, that "God is not finished with me yet."

I believe there is life after the Senate, and I intend to live that life to the full.

As my colleagues know, I will be resuming the practice of law next January. I will be engaged in a number of private enterprises and public enterprises, as well.

As I have said on occasions beyond counting, I believe it is possible, and preferable, to be a public servant and a private citizen simultaneously, and I intend to show my abidingly skeptical colleagues by my own example how to be a useful "public citizen."

But however the fates may play in the future, I have already had an opportunity for service which has been entirely satisfying.

I shall forever be in the debt of the good people of Tennessee for giving me that opportunity. They are the best people on Earth, and it has been

the highest honor of my life to represent them here.

I am indebted to my Republican colleagues for choosing me as their floor leader these past 8 years, and for their constant healthy and humbling reminders of the Biblical teaching that "the first shall be last."

I am especially grateful to my colleagues in the Republican leadership: TED STEVENS, the assistant leader; JIM MCCLURE, the conference chairman; JAKE GARN, secretary of the conference; JOHN TOWER, the policy chairman; DICK LUGAR, the senatorial committee chairman; and STROM THURMOND, the distinguished president pro tem of the Senate.

These gentlemen perform their important roles with great talent, dedication and skill, and whatever success I have had in this position is due in large measure to the work they have done in theirs.

I am particularly grateful, also, to the chairmen of the standing committees of the Senate, who have proven beyond doubt these last 4 years that a quarter-century in the minority did not diminish the Republican capacity to govern the legislative as well as the executive branch.

These chairmen have done more, both individually and collectively, for this institution and this country than they will ever be properly credited for, and I wish to pay them special tribute today.

I am grateful to my worthy adversary and good friend, BOB BYRD, with whom I have waged near-constant battle these past 8 years and for whom I have the highest professional respect and personal admiration.

I am grateful to each of my collegues on both sides of the aisle for making my experience in the Senate so rich and rewarding.

I believe the quality of the membership of this body has grown steadily over the last 18 years, and I am confident I leave the Senate in eminently good hands.

I wish to salute the Presidents with whom I've been privileged to serve—Presidents Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, and Reagan—for the many contributions that each of them has made to the Nation we serve together.

Since my service as majority leader has been coterminous with President Reagan's service in the White House, I feel a special bond with him, and I should like to state for the record my belief that Ronald Reagan will go down in history as one of the very best Presidents who ever served in that office.

In this moment of magnanimity, I shall even toss a small bouquet in the direction of the press gallery, though I am certain they will bat it down one way or another. I cherish my friends in the fourth estate as I once cherished a dog that nobody liked but me, a dog that had the single bad habit of biting people in the nose.

Finally, I would thank my wife Joy and our family for their long-suffering patience with the rigors of public life.

Our children, who were small when we came here, are grown now with careers and children of their own. I'm very proud of them, and I'm especially proud of my wife, who has been a quiet profile in courage and a source of inspiration and insight for me beyond value.

Senator Norris Cotton of New Hampshire told me early in my service here that once I smelled the marble in these halls I would be hooked for life. As usual, he was right, and the intoxicating scent of history in the making will remain with me to my last days.

Today marks my final rollcall with you. As I take my leave, I pray for the blessing of Him who, as Lincoln said, can go with me and abide with you and be everywhere for good.

In His care, I am confident the Senate and the Nation it serves will not only endure but prevail in the great challenges that define our modern world.

In the spirit of friendship and respect and love, I bid you farewell.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the House has been notified that the Senate is prepared to adjourn. The President has been notified and he has no further requests.

I move, in accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 377, as amended, that the Senate now stand in adjournment.

The motion was agreed to, and, at 3:17 p.m., the Senate adjourned sine die.

DEFERRALS OF CERTAIN BUDGET AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT—PM 179

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of October 11, 1984, the Secretary of the Senate, on October 31, during the sine die adjournment, received the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report, which, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1984, was referred jointly to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report eight new deferrals of budget authority for 1985 totaling $107,881,834. The deferrals affect the Departments of Energy, Justice, and State, the Board for International Broadcasting, and the United States Information Agency.

The details of these deferrals are contained in the attached report.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 31, 1984.*

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS

A message from the President of the United States reported that he had approved and signed the following bills and joint resolutions:

On September 24, 1984:

S. 1538. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Comestic Act to revise the procedures for new drug applications, to amend title 35, United States Code, to authorize the extension of the patents for certain regulated products, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 333. Joint resolution to designate September 21, 1984, as "World War I Aces and Aviators Day."

S.J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to designate the week of September 23, 1984, as "National Historically Black Colleges Week."

On September 25, 1984:

S. 806. An act to provide for a plan to reimburse the Okefenoke Rural Electric Membership Corporation for the costs incurred in installing electrical service to the Cumberland Island National Seashore.

S. 1546. An act to amend the Deepwater Port Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 25. Joint resolution redesignating the Saint Croix Island National Monument in the State of Maine as the Saint Croix Island International Historic Site."

S.J. Res. 275. Joint resolution to designate the month of October 1984 as "National Spina Bifida Month."

S.J. Res. 334. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of November 1984, as "National Hospice Month."

S.J. Res. 335. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning on May 19, 1985, as "National Tourism Week."

On September 28, 1984:

S. 38. An act entitled the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act Amendments of 1984."

S. 277. An act for the relief of Marion Dolon Opelt.

S. 301. An act for the relief of Kim Hae Ok Heimberger.

S. 435. An act for the relief of Joseph Antonio Francis.

S. 514. An act for the relief of Seela Jeremiah Piula.

S. 598. An act to authorize a land conveyance from the Department of Agriculture to Payson, Arizona.

S. 692. An act for the relief of Charles Gaudencio Beeman, Paul Amado Beeman, Elizabeth Beeman, and Joshua Valente Beeman.

S. 798. An act for the relief of Grietje Rhea Pietens Beumber, Johan Christian Beumer, Cindy Larissa Beumer, and Cedric Grant Beumer.

S. 1060. An act for the relief of Samuel Joseph Edgar.

S. 1140. An act for the relief of Patrick P. W. Tso, Ph.D.

S. 1735. An act entitled the "Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe—Dexter-by-the-Sea Claim Settlement Act".

S. 2155. An act to designate certain national forest system lands in the State of Utah for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System to release other forest lands for multiple use management, and for other purposes.

S. 2418. An act to authorize and direct the Librarian of Congress, subject to the supervision and authority of a Federal civilian, or military agency, to proceed with the construction of the Library of Congress Mass Book Deacidification Facility, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 227. Joint resolution designating the week beginning November 11, 1984, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week".

S.J. Res. 254. Joint resolution to designate the month of October 1984 as "National Down's Syndrome Month".

S.J. Res. 304. Joint resolution to designate the month of October 1984 as "National Quality Month".

S.J. Res. 336. Joint resolution to proclaim October 23, 1984, as "A Time of Remembrance" for all victims of terrorism throughout the world.

On October 3, 1984:

S. 1989. An act for the relief of Vladimir Victorovich Yakimetz.

S. 2040. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 with respect to the treatment of mortgage backed securities, to increase the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, and for other purposes.

On October 4, 1984:

S. 32. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code with respect to rental, lease, or lending of sound recordings.

S. 1770. An act to extend the lease terms of Federal oil and gas lease numbered U-39711.

S. 2000. An act to allow variable interest rates for Indian funds held in trust by the United States.

S. 2614. An act to reauthorize and amend the Indian Financing Act.

S. 2732. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to permit the control of the lamprey eel in the Pere Marquette River and to designate a portion of the Au Sable River, Michigan, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

On October 9, 1984:

S. 2603. An act to extend the authorization of appropriations for, and to revise the Older Americans Act of 1965.

S.J. Res. 332. Joint resolution designating the week beginning on October 7, 1984, as "Mental Illness Awareness Week".

On October 11, 1984:

S. 197. An act to direct the Secretary of the Department of Transportation to conduct an independent study to determine the adequacy of certain industry practices and Federal Aviation Administration rules and regulations, and for other purposes.

S. 1841. An act to promote research and development, encourage innovation, stimulate trade, and make necessary and appropriate modifications in the operation of the antitrust laws.

S. 2688. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1985 to carry out the National Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 and the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 201. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week of November 25 through December 1, 1984, as National Epidermolysis Bullosa Awareness Week".

S.J. Res. 237. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 25, 1984, through December 1, 1984 as "National Home Care Week".

S.J. Res. 260. Joint resolution designating the week beginning on November 11, 1984, as National Blood Pressure Awareness Week".

S.J. Res. 273. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 7, 1984, through October 13, 1984, as "Smokey Bear Week".

S.J. Res. 295. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week of October 14 through October 20, 1984, as "Myasthenia Gravis Awareness Week".

S.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution designating the month of November 1984 as "National Christmas Seal Month".

On October 15, 1984:

S.J. Res. 332, Joint Resolution to proclaim October 16, 1984, as "World Food Day".

On October 17, 1984:

S. 2819. An act to make technical and conforming amendments in certain laws relating to housing and community development.

On October 19, 1984:

S. 416. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating a segment of the Illinois River in Oregon and the Owyhee River in Oregon as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

S. 566. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States a reversionary interest in certin tracts of land conveyed to the South Caroling State Commission of Forestry, and to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain mineral interests of the United States in such land to such Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 648. An act to facilitate the exchange of certain lands in South Carolina.

S. 905. An act to establish the National Archives and Records Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 1102. An act to provide authorization of appropriations for title III of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, and for other purposes.

S. 1146. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the revocation of the airman certificates and for additional penalties for the transportation by aircraft of controlled substances, and for other purposes.

S. 1151. An act to compensate heirs of deceased Indians for improper payments from trust estates to States or policital subdivisions thereof as reimbursements for old age assistance received by decedents during their lifetime.

S. 1330. An act to establish a National Council on Public Works Improvement to prepare three annual reports on the state of the Nation's infrastructure to amend the provisions of title 31, United States Code, relating to the President's budget to require it to separately identify and summarize the capital investment expenditures of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1510. An act to establish uniform audit requirements for State and local governments receiving Federal financial assistance.

S. 1688. An act to amend the act of October 18, 1972, to authorize additional authorization of appropriations for Sitka National Historical Park, Alaska.

S. 1711. An act providing for a fifteen-year extension of patent numbered 3,376,198.

S. 1790. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with the Art Barn Association to assist in the preservation and interpretation of the Art Barn in Rock Creek Park in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 1868. An act to add $2,000,000 to the budget ceiling for new acquisitions at Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

S. 1889. An act to amend the Act authorizing the establishment of the Congress Swamp National Momument to provide that at such time as the principal visitor center is established, such center shall be designated as the "Harry R. E. Hampton Visitor Center", and for other purposes.

S. 2048. An act to provide for the establishment of the Task Force on Organ Transplantation and the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network, to authorize financial assistance for organ procurement organizations, and for other purposes.

S. 2125. An act to designate certain national forest system lands in the State of Arkansas for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes.

S. 2303. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the authorities of that Act for assistance for alcohol and drug abuse and mental health services.

S. 2483. An act to rename Dulles International Airport in Virginia as the "Washington Dulles International Airport".

S. 2496. An act to extend the authorization of appropriations for certain education programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2616. An act to revise and extend the programs of assistance under titles X and XX of the Public Health Service Act.

S. 2663. An act pertaining to the inheritance of trust of restricted land on the Lake Traverse Indian Reservation, North Dakota and South Dakota, and for other purposes.

S. 2773. An act to designate certain National Forest System lands in the State of Georgia as wilderness, and for other purposes.

S. 2808. An act to designate certain National Forest System lands in the State of Mississippi as wilderness, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to grant posthumously full rights of citizenship to William Penn and to Hannah Callowhill Penn.

S.J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 12, 1984, through November 18, 1984, as "National Reye's Syndrome Week".

S.J. Res. 299. Joint resolution to designate November 1984, as National Diabetes Month.

S.J. Res. 309. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to designate January 1985 as "National Cerebal Palsy Month."

On October 24, 1984:

S. 864. An act to amend the Volunteers in the Parks Act of 1969, and for other purposes.

On October 25, 1984:

S. 2583. An act to authorize United States participation in the Office International de la Vigne et du Vin (the International Office of the Vine and Wine); and

S. 2947. An act to designate the lock and dam on the Warrior River in Hale County, AL, as the "Armistead I. Selden Lock and Dam".

On October 30, 1984:

S. 66. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide a national policy regarding cable television;

S. 149. An act for the relief of Adel Shervin;

S. 543. An act to designate certain national forest system lands in the State of Wyoming for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, to release other forest lands for multiple use management, to withdraw designated wilderness areas in Wyoming from minerals activity, and for other purposes;

S. 771. An act to revise and extend provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to health promotion and disease prevention, to provide for the establishment of centers for research and demonstrations concerning health promotion and disease prevention, and for other purposes;

S. 1160. An act to authorize Douglas County of the State of Nevada to transfer certain land to a private owner;

S. 1291. An act to authorize appropriations of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and section 305 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974;

S. 2217. An act to provide for exemptions, based on safety concerns, from certain length and width limitations for commercial motor vehicles, and for other purposes;

S. 2301. An act to revise and extend programs for the provision of health services and preventive health services, and for other purposes;

S. 2449. An act for the relief of the Sisters of Mercy of the Union, Province of St. Louis, MO;

S. 2499. An act to authorize the appropriations of funds for certain maritime programs for fiscal year 1985;

S. 2526. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, and for other purposes;

S. 2565. An act to extend programs under the Head Start Act, and for other purposes;

S. 2706. An act to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, and for other purposes;

S. 3021. An act to name the Federal Building in Elkins, WV, the "Jennings Randolph Federal Center";

S. 3034. An act to grant a Federal charter to the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists; and

S.J. Res. 236. Joint resolution relating to cooperative East-West ventures in space.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of October 11, 1984, the Secretary of the Senate, on October 12, 1984, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, received a message from the House of Representatives, announced that the House has agreed to the following resolution:

H.J. Res. 620. A resolution appointing the Honorable Thomas S. Foley, of Washington, as Speaker pro tempore during any absence of the Speaker until October 15, 1984.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FOLEY] has signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 654. Joint resolution increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of October 11, 1984, the enrolled joint resolution was signed by the Vice President on October 12, 1984.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of October 11, 1984, the Secretary of the Senate, on October 15, 1984, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, received a message from the House of Representatives, announcing that the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FOLEY] had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 2583. An act to authorize United States participation in the Office International de la Vigne et du Vin (the International Office of the Vine and Wine);

S. 2947. An act to designate the lock and dam on the Warrior River in Hale County, Alabama, as the Armistead I. Seldon Lock and Dam";

H.R. 440. An act for the relief of Francisco Akers;

H.R. 1095. An act to grant a Federal charter to the 369th Veterans Association;

H.R. 1438. An act to provide for the restoration of the fish and wildlife in the Trinity River Basin, California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1870. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to coin and sell a national medal in honor of the members and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in the Vietnam conflict;

H.R. 1961. An act to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe regulations regarding the determination of service connection of certain disabilities of veterans who were exposed to dioxin in the Republic of Vietnam while performing active military, naval, or air service or to radiation from nuclear detonations while performing such service, to provide interim benefits for certain disabilities and deaths, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2087. An act for the relief of Hans Robert Beisch;

H.R. 2645. An act to amend the act of August 15, 1978, regarding the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia;

H.R. 2671. An act for the relief of Edgar Gildardo Herrera;

H.R. 2823. An act to amend title I of the Reclamation Project Authorization Act of 1972 in order to provide for the establishment of the Russell Lakes Waterfowl Management Area as a replacement for the authorized Mishak National Wildlife Refuge, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3331. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands between the Bureau of Land Management and the city of Los Angeles for purposes of the Santa Monica National Recreation Area;

H.R. 3788. An act to designate various areas as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System in the national forests in the State of Texas;

H.R. 3942. An act to facilitate commercial space launches, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3971. An act to provide that any Osage headright or restricted real estate or funds which is part of the estate of a deceased Osage Indian who did possess a certificate of competency at the time of death shall be exempt from any estate or inheritance tax imposed by the State of Oklahoma;

H.R. 4263. An act to designate certain lands in the Cherokee National Forest, Tennessee, as wilderness areas, and to allow management of certain lands for uses other than wilderness;

H.R. 4401. An act for the relief of Shu-Ahtsai Wei, her husband Yen Wei, and their sons, Teh-fu Wei and Teh-huei Wei;

H.R. 4473. An act to designate the Federal Archives and Records Center in San Bruno, CA, as the "Leo J. Ryan Memorial Federal Archives and Records Center";

H.R. 4717. An act to designate the Federal Building and United States Courthouse in Las Vegas, Nevada, as the "Foley Federal Building and United States Courthouse";

H.R. 4966. An act to recognize the organization known as the Women's Army Corps Veterans' Association;

H.R. 5076. An act to designate certain areas in the Allegheny National Forest as wilderness as recreation areas;

H.R. 5172. An act to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5252. An act to redesignate the Veterans' Administration Medical Center located in Poplar Bluff, Missouri, as the "John J. Pershing Veterans' Administration Medical Center";

H.R. 5271. An act to extend the Wetlands Loan Act;

H.R. 5323. An act to designate the United States Courthouse Building in Hato Rey, Puerto Rico, as the "Clemente Ruiz Nazario United States Courthouse";

H.R. 5358. An act to enable honey producers and handlers to finance a nationally coordinated research, promotion, and consumer information program designed to expand their markets for honey;

H.R. 5402. An act to designate the United States Post Office and Courthouse in Utica, New York, as the "Alexander Pirnie Federal Building";

H.R. 5716. An act providing for the conveyance of public lands, Seneca County, Ohio;

H.R. 5728. An act to permit aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence who are employed by the American University of Beirut to return to the United States as special immigrants after completion of such employment;

H.R. 6000. An act to designate the Table Rock Lake Visitors Center building in the vicinity of Brandson, Missouri, as the "Dewey J. Short Table Rock Visitors Center";

H.R. 6101. An act to amend the Panama Canal Act of 1979 to authorize quarters allowances for certain employees of the Department of Defense serving in the area formerly known as the Canal Zone;

H.R. 6221. An act to provide for the use and distribution of certain funds awarded by the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma and to restore certain mineral rights to the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation;

H.R. 6257. An act to amend the Motor Vehicle and Information Cost Savings to impede those motor vehicle thefts which occur for purposes of dismantling the vehicles and major replacement parts to have identifying numbers or symbols, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6296. An act entitled "The San Juan Basin Wilderness Protection Act of 1984";

H.J. Res. 332. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning May 20, 1985, as "National Medical Transcriptionist Week"; and

H.J. Res. 594. Joint resolution designating the week beginning February 17, 1985, as a time to recognize volunteers who give their

time to become Big Brothers and Big Sisters to youths in need of adult companionship.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of October 11, 1984, the enrolled bills and joint resolutions were subsequently signed by the President por tempore [Mr. THURMOND] on October 15, 1984.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of October 11, 1984, the Secrertary of the Senate on October 18, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 66. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide a national policy regarding cable television.

S. 149. An act for the relief of Adel Shervin.

S. 540. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the authorities under that act relating to the National Institutes of Health and National Research Institutes, and for other purposes.

S. 543. An act to designate certain national forest system lands in the State of Wyoming for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, to release other forest lands for multiple use management, to withdraw designated wilderness areas in Wyoming from minerals activity, and for other purposes.

S. 771. An act to revise and extend provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to health promotion and disease prevention, to provide for the establishment of centers for research and demonstrations concerning health promotion and disease prevention, and for other purposes.

S. 1160. An act to authorize Douglas County of the State of Nevada to transfer certain land to a private owner.

S. 1291. An act to authorize appropriations to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and section 305 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974.

S. 2217. An act to provide for exemptions, based on safety concerns, from certain length and width limitations for commerical motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 2301. An act to revise and extend programs for the provision of health services and preventive health services, and for other purposes.

S. 2449. An act for the relief of the Sisters of Mercy of the Union, Province of Saint Louis, MO.

S. 2499. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for certain maritime programs for fiscal year 1985.

S. 2526. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, and for other purposes.

S. 2565. An act to extend programs under the Head Start Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2574. An act to amend provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to health professions training assistance, nurse education, the National Health Service Corps, health maintenance organizations, and primary health care services, and for other purposes.

S. 2706. An act to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, and for other purposes.

S. 3021. An act to name the Federal Building in Elkins, WV, the "Jennings Randolph Federal Center."

S. 3034. An act to grant a Federal charter to the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists.

H.R. 89. An act to permit the transportation of passengers between Puerto Rico and other U.S. ports on foreign-flag vessels when U.S.-flag service for such transportation is not available.

H.R. 452. An act for the relief of Jerome J. Hartmann and Rita J. Hartmann.

H.R. 597. An act to amend sections 2733, 2734, and 2736 of title 10, United States Code and section 715 of title 32, United States Code, to increase the maximum amount of a claim against the United States that may be paid administratively under those sections and to allow increased delegation of authority to settle and pay certain of those claims, and for other purposes.

H.R. 723. An act for the relief of Marsha D. Christopher.

H.R. 999. An act to provide for the conservation, rehabilitation, and improvement of natural and cultural resources located on public or Indian lands, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1880. An act to establish an interagency committee and a technical study group on cigarette safety.

H.R. 2790. An act to amend the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act to authorize certain additional measures to assure accomplishment of the objectives of title II of such Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3150. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey, for certain specified consideration, to the Sabine River Authority approximately thirty-one thousand acres of land within the Sabine National Forest to be used for the purposes of the Toledo Bend project, Louisiana and Texas; and for other purposes.

H.R. 4209. An act to amend the Small Business Act, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act to enhance competition in Government procurement, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4354. An act to designate the Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse in Ocala, FL, as the "Golden-Collum Memorial Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

H.R. 4585. An act to authorize appropriations for the Office of Environmental Quality and the Council on Environmental Quality for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4700. An act to designate the Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse at 1961 Stout Street, Denver, CO, as the "Byron G. Rogers Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

H.R. 5121. An act to designate certain national forest system lands in the State of Virginia as wilderness, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5189. An act to amend section 3056 of title 18, United States Code, to update the authorities of the U.S. Secret Service, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5688. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of disability compensation for disabled veterans and of dependency and indemnity compensation for surviving spouses and children of veterans, to increase the rates of subsistence and educational assistance allowances for veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation programs under chapter 31 of such title and for veterans and eligible persons pursuing programs of education or training under chapter 34, 35 or 36 of such title, to increase the opportunities for vocational rehabilitation of certain veterans receiving disability compensation, and to provide vocational training opportunities for certain veterans receiving pension; and for other purposes.

H.R. 5747. An act to designate the Federal building in Oak Ridge, TN, as the "Joe L. Evins Federal Building."

H.R. 5760. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Cocopah Indian Tribe of Arizona, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5832. An act to authorize two additional Assistant Secretaries for the Department of the Treasury.

H.R. 6007. An act to establish certain procedures regarding the judicial service of retired judges of District of Columbia courts, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6027. An act to clarify the application of the Clayton Act to the official conduct of local governments, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6100. An act to clarify the intent of Congress with respect to the families eligible for a commemorative medal authorized for the families of Americans missing or otherwise unaccounted for in Southeast Asia.

H.R. 6112. An act to amend the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 with respect to the effect of the 1985 increase in the Federal unemployment tax rate on certain small business provisions contained in State unemployment compensation laws.

H.R. 6299. An act to ensure the payment in 1985 of cost of living increases under the OASDI program in title II of the Social Security Act, and to provide for a study of certain changes which might be made in the provisions authorization cost of living adjustments under that program.

H.R. 6303. An act to make certain technical corrections in various acts relating to the Osage Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma.

H.R. 6430. An act to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1946.

H.R. 6438. An act for the relief of Joseph Karel Hasek.

H.R. 6441. An act to eliminate restrictions with respect to the imposition and collection of tolls on the Richmond-Petersburg Turnpike upon repayment by the Commonwealth of Virginia of certain Federal-aid highway funds used on such turnpike.

S.J. Res. 236. Joint resolution relating to cooperative East-West ventures in space.

H.J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to make technical corrections in the act of January 12, 1983 (Public Law 97-459).

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of October 11, 1984, the enrolled bills and joint resolutions were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND] on October 18, 1984, during the sine die adjournment.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of October 11, 1984, the Secretary of the Senate on October 19, 1984, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1314. An act to extend and revise the authority of the President under chapter 9 of title 5, United States Code, to transmit to the Congress plans for the reorganization of

the agencies of the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2300. An act to provide retirement equity for former spouses of civil service retirees, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2568. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend for 2 years the exclusion from gross income with respect to educational assistance programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2867. An act to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1985 through 1988, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3398. An act to amend the trade laws, authorize the negotiation of trade agreements, extend trade preferences, change the tariff treatment with respect to certain articles and for other purposes.

H.R. 5361. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend for one year the exclusion from gross income with respect to group legal services plans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5386. An act to amend part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the payment rates for routine home care and other services included in hospice care.

H.R. 5399. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1985 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Intelligence Community Staff, and for Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5479. An act to amend section 504 of title 5, United States Code, and section 2412 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to awards of expenses of certain agency and court proceedings, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5492. An act to provide for the conservation and management of Atlantic striped bass, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5846. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve collection and administration of criminal fines, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6028. An act to making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6163. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the places where court shall be held in certain judicial districts, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6224. An act to provide for the assumption of selected functions, programs, and resources of Saint Elizabeths Hospital by the District of Columbia, to provide for the establishment of a comprehensive mental health care system in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6286. An act to amend title 35, United States Code, to increase the effectiveness of the Patent laws, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6342. An act to approve governing international fishery agreements with Iceland and the EEC; to establish national standards for artificial reefs; to implement the Convention on Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of October 11, 1984, the enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND] on October 28, 1984, during the sine die adjournment.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of October 11, 1984, the Secretary of the Senate, on October 19, 1984, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill (which had previously been signed by the President pro tempore of the Senate):

H.R. 5833. An act to improve certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation and the Department of Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on October 16, 1984, he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2583. An act to authorize U.S. participation in the Office International de la Vigne et du Vin (the International Office of the Vine and Wine); and

S. 2947. An act to designate the lock and dam on the Warrior River in Hale County, AL, as the "Armistead I. Seldon Lock and Dam".

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on October 19, 1984, he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 66. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide a national policy regarding cable television;

S. 149. An act for the relief of Adel Shervin;

S. 540. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the authorities under that act relating to the National Institutes of Health and National Research Institutes, and for other purposes;

S. 543. An act to designate certain national forest system lands in the State of Wyoming for inclusion in the national wilderness preservation system, to release other forest lands for multiple use management, to withdraw designated wilderness areas in Wyoming from minerals activity, and for other purposes;

S. 771. An act to revise and extend provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to health promotion and disease prevention, to provide for the establishment of centers for research and demonstrations concerning health promotion and disease prevention, and for other purposes;

S. 1160. An act to authorize Douglas County of the State of Nevada to transfer certain land to a private owner;

S. 1291. An act to authorize appropriations to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and section 305 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974;

S. 2217. An act to provide for exemptions, based on safety concerns, from certain length and width limitations for commercial motor vehicles, and for other purposes;

S. 2301. An act to revise and extend programs for the provision of health services and preventive health services, and for other purposes;

S. 2449. An act for the relief of the Sisters of Mercy of the Union, Province of Saint Louis, MO;

S. 2499. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for certain maritime programs for fiscal year 1985;

S. 2526. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, and for other purposes;

S. 2565. An act to extend programs under the Head Start Act, and for other purposes;

S. 2574. An act to amend provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to health professions training assistance, nurse education, the National Health Service Corps, health maintenance organizations, and primary health care services, and for other purposes;

S. 2706. An act to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, and for other purposes;

S. 3021. An act to name the Federal Building in Elkins, WV, the "Jennings Randolph Federal Center";

S. 3034. An act to grant a Federal charter to the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists; and

S.J. Res. 236. Joint resolution relating to cooperative East-West ventures in space.

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-3864. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of negotiations of consultation and cooperation with the State of Washington under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3865. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed prospectus for alterations at the Chet Holifield Federal Building, Laguna Niguel, CA; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3866. A communication from the U.S. Trade Representative, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the operation of the International Coffee Agreement for coffee year 1983-84; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3867. A communication from the Chairwoman of the U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 39th quarterly report on trade between the United States and the nonmarket economy countries for April-June 1984; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3868. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on alterations to a Privacy Act system of records; to the committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3869. A communication from the Chief Immigration Judge, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending the deportation of certain aliens pursuant to sections 244(a)(1) and 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3870. A communication from the Director of the Office of Legislative Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on program allocations for fiscal year 1984; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3871. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the transfer of certain Department of Defense funds made under general transfer authority; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3872. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of certain format changes to be made in preparing the annual report on base structure and its relationship to the force structure; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3873. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh report on ocean pollution, monitoring, and research, covering October 1978 through September 1980; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3874. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on ocean pollution, monitoring, and research for fiscal year 1983; to the Committee on Evironment and Public Works.

EC-3875. A communication from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Commodity Credit Corporation payments to U.S. creditors on credits guaranteed by the CCC for which payment had not been received from the Polish People's Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3876. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Administration), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a new Privacy Act system of records; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3877. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior (Indian Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the use and distribution of certain Indian judgement funds; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-3878. A communication from the chief judge of the U.S. Claims Court, transmitting, pursuant to law, the opinion of the court in Sea Gate, Inc. and Charles M. Reeves, Jr. against United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3879. A communication from the President of the National Safety Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the audit of the financial transactions of the Council for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1984; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3880. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Community Services Block Grant: New State Role Brings Program and Administrative Changes"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3881. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1983 report on the administration of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3882. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Agriculture (International Affairs and Commodity Programs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the initial commodity and country allocation table showing current programing plans for food assistance; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3883. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the National Program for Soil and Water Conservation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1983; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3884. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Administration), transmitting, pursuant to law, notice that the Department of the Navy intends to exercise the provision for exclusion concerning the examination of records by the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3885. A communication from the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on loan, guarantee, and insurance transactions supported by Eximbank to communist countries during August 1984; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3886. A communication from the chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 5-177 adopted by the council on September 12, 1984; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3887. A communication from the chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 5-178 adopted by the council on September 12, 1984; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3888. A communication from the chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 5-179 adopted by the council on September 12, 1984; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3889. A communication from the chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 5-180 adopted by the council on September 12, 1984; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3890. A communication from the chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 5-181 adopted by the council on September 12, 1984; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3891. A communication from the chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 5-182 adopted by the council on September 12, 1984; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3892. A communication from the Employee Benefits Administrator of the Farm Credit Banks of Wichita, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the retirement plan for employees of the associations and banks of the Ninth Farm Credit District for the plan year ended February 28, 1984; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3893. A communication from the D.C. auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Biannual Audits of the Advisory Neighborhood Commissions for the Period January 1, 1982 Through December 31, 1983"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3894. A communication from the D.C. auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report on Depository Activities, Fiscal Year 1983"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3895. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on waivers for certain institutions under title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3896. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of meetings related to the International Energy Program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3897. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Federal Agencies' Block Grant Civil Rights Enforcement Efforts: A Status Report"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3898. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense submitting, pursuant to law, a listing of contract award dates for the period November 1, 1984 to December 31, 1984; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3899. A communication from the Deputy Director of the Defense Security Assistance Agency submitting, pursuant to law, information concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed letter of offer to Singapore for defense articles estimated to cost in excess of $50 million; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3900. A communication from the Secretary to the Railroad Retirement Board submitting a report on a violation of law involving an overobligation of an approved appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3901. A communication from the Comptroller General submitting, pursuant to law, a report on progress in improving program and budget information for congressional use; pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, referred to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3902. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget transmitting, pursuant to law, a cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals dated October 1, 1984; pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, referred jointly to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3903. A communication from the Secretary of Defense transmitting, pursuant to law, submitting three reports on violations of law involving overobligations of approved appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3904. A communication from the Clerk of the U.S. Claims Court transmitting, pursuant to law, a certified copy of the court's judgment order in the case of White Mountain Apache Tribe of Arizona against United States—No. 22-H; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3905. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense transmitting, pursuant to law, the intention of the Department of the Air Force to exercise a provision for exclusion of examination of records by the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3906. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force transmitting, pursuant to law, plans to study the conversions from in-house operation to commercial contract of certain activities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3907. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the conversion of the Laundry, Dry Cleaning Services at the Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, NC, to performance by contract; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3908. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Panama Canal Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on two vessel accident claims arising

out of a collision between the M/V *Chimborazo* and the M/V *Luigi Casale* at the Atlantic entrance to the canal on April 27, 1982; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3909. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Panama Canal Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a claim from the owners of the M/V *Fuhwo Venture* arising from the grounding of the vessel in Cristobal Harbor on November 20, 1979; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3910. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on transfers of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3911. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the conversion of the Administrative Support Service function at the Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, PA, to performance by contract; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3912. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development transmitting, pursuant to law, the "Fifth Annual Report to Congress on the Congregate Housing Services Program"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3913. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Housing Counseling Program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3914. A communication from the Secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission's determination to extend the time period for acting upon the appeal before the Commission in finance in Southern Pacific Transportation Co. discontinuance of passenger train service in Ventura and Los Angeles Counties, CA; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3915. A communication from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report to Congress on the effectiveness of the Civil Aviation Security Program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3916. A communication from the President of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on progress achieved and work in progress with respect to the completion of the Northeast corridor improvement project; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3917. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1983; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3918. A communication from the Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 1986 budget request; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3919. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting, pursuant to law, the biennial report of the Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3920. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Fish and Wildlife Service, on the administration of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3921. A communication from the Secretary of Energy transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on the Automotive Technology Development Program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3922. A communication from the Acting Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on construction modifications to Newton Dam, Newton project, Utah; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3923. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to Congress on the Ogallala aquifer water problem; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3924. A communication from the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on nuclear waste management and the use of the sea; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3925. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on State compliance with medicaid utilization control requirements as of August 31, 1984; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3926. A communication from the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for calendar year 1983; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3927. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an unclassified version of a report entitled "A Quarter Century of Soviet Compliance Practices Under Arms Control Commitments: 1958-83"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3928. A communication from the Acting Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States in the 60-day period prior to October 10, 1984; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3929. A communication from the Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on international agreements, other than treaties entered into by the United States in the 60-day period prior to October 3, 1984; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3930. A communication from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the programs of independent living services and assistance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-3931. A communication from the Director of Human Services, Farm Credit Banks of Springfield, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Farm Credit Banks of Springfield retirement plan for April 1, 1983 to March 31, 1984; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3932. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the valuation of the U.S. Coast Guard military retirement system; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3933. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Administration), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on an alteration to a Privacy Act system of records; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3934. A communication from the DC auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Review of the District's Lease for the Georgetown Market"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3935. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Examination of the Rural Telephone Bank's Financial Statements for the Year Ended September 30, 1983"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3936. A communication from the DC auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Refunds Due the DC Energy Office Under the LIHEAP Program"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3937. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services (Health), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on an alteration to a Privacy Act system of records; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3938. A communication from the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an analysis and evaluation of Federal juvenile delinquency programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3939. A communication from the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered on behalf of certain aliens under section 13(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3940. A communication from the Executive Director of the National Council on Educational Research, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh annual of the Council covering fiscal years 1981 and 1982; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3941. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, final regulations for the Secretary's Discretionary Program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3942. A communication from the Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on program activities under the Rehabilitation Act for fiscal year 1983; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3943. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Legislative Changes and Administrative Improvements Should Be Considered for FDA To Better Protect the Public From Adulterated Food Products"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3944. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the funding obligations of the fishermen's guaranty fund; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3945. A communication from the Executive Associate Director for Budget, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating that the

appropriation to the Department of Education for the Guaranteed Student Loans Program for fiscal year 1985 has been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3946. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, the selected acquisition reports and selected acquisition report summary tables for the quarter ended September 30, 1984; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3947. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Shipbuilding and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the conversion of the laundry and dry cleaning services at the Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, California, to performance by contract; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3948. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Administration), transmitting, pursuant to law, notice that the Department of the Navy intends to exercise the provision for exclusion of examination of records by the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3949. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the relative cost of shipbuilding in the various coastal districts of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3950. A communication from the Director of Congressional Relations, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a recent amendment to the standard for the flammibility of mattresses and mattress pads; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3951. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior (Water and Science), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report that the Bureau of Reclamation has approved the deferral of certain repayments for the Webster Irrigation District No. 4, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, Missouri; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3952. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Water and Science transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the deferment of construction repayment installments due the United States from Almena Irrigation District No. 5, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, Kansas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3953. A communication from the Acting Secretary for Water and Science transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of approval by the Bureau of Reclamation of deferment on construction repayment installment due the United States from Cedar Bluff Irrigation District No. 6, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, Kansas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3954. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Water and Science transmitting, pursuant to law, a report that the Bureau of Reclamation has approved a deferment of construction repayment installments due the United States from Kirwin Irrigation District No. 1, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, Kansas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3955. A communication from the Federal inspector, Alaska natural gas transportation system, transmitting, pursuant to law, a quarterly report on the status of the Alaska natural gas transportation system; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3956. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report evaluating the methodology the Secretary of the Interior used in allowing offshore oil and gas wells to be suspended from production or to turn off natural gas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3957. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management, Minerals Management Service, of the Department of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of the intent to make refunds of offshore lease revenues on certain cases where it is appropriate; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3958. A communication from the Deputy U.S. Trade Representative transmitting, pursuant to law, the biennial report of the operation and effect of the International Sugar Agreement; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3959. A communication from the President of the United States reporting, pursuant to law, on developments concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran declared in Executive Order No. 12170 of November 14, 1979; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3960. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, the Treasury report entitled "Foreign Direct Investment and Commercial Capital Flows: The Role of the Multilateral Development Banks"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3961. A communication from an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, a report analyzing the impact on the provision of basic human needs of economic adjustment programs supported in 1983 by financing from the International Monetary Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3962. A communication from the Secretary of the Health and Human Services transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on alcohol abuse, alcoholism, drug abuse, and mental health problems; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3963. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the President's 14th special message for fiscal year 1984 and first special message for fiscal year 1985; pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, referred jointly to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Environment and Public Works, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, the Committee on Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3964. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report that the Iran emergency is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 1984; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3965. A communication from the President and Chairman of Eximbank transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement with respect to a transaction involving United States exports to Brazil; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3966. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1984 Third Quarter Report on the Olympic Commemorative Coin Program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3967. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of net worth certificates purchased under title II of the Garn-St Germain Depository Institutions Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3968. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Net Worth Certificate Assistance Programs; Their Design, Major Differences, and Early Implementation"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3969. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Oil and Gas Leasing Program for non-North Slope Federal lands in Alaska for fiscal year 1984; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3970. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second biennial report on implementation of the Alaska Federal-Civilian Energy Efficiency Swap Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3971. A communication from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final monthly Treasury statement of receipts and outlays of the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1984; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3972. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of the reports issued by the General Accounting Office for September 1984; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3973. A communication from the DC auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Purchase of VCR's for July Grand Prize Drawing"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3974. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior (Indian Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed plan for use and distribution of certain Indian judgment funds; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-3975. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior (Indian Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed plan for the use and distribution of certain Indian Judgment funds; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-3976. A communication from the Executive Secretary, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for October 1983 through July 1984; to the Committee on Small Business.

EC-3977. A communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the activities of the Library of Congress, including the Copyright Office, for fiscal year 1983; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

FOREIGN CURRENCY REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following report(s) of standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees

of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Richard Pierce:									
Belgium	Dollar		650.00						650.00
Richard Spees:									
United Kingdom	Dinar	39	104.00					39	104.00
Lebanon	Dinar	35.625	95.00					35.625	95.00
Bahrain	Dinar	155.25	414.00					155.25	414.00
United Arab Emirates	Rupee	4,753.20	340.00					4,753.20	340.00
Oman	Riyal	110.4	320.00	51.59	149.55			161.99	469.55
Pakistan	Rupee	2,684.16	192.00					2,684.16	192.00
India	Rupee	1,993.48	172.00					1,993.48	172.00
Thailand	Baht	5,702	249.00					5,702	249.00
Singapore	Dollar	511.56	240.00					511.56	240.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	765.90	98.00					765.90	98.00
	Dollar				5,113.00				5,113.00
James D. Bond:									
	Dollar				4,944.00				4,944.00
Upper Volta	Dollar		225.00						225.00
Ivory Coast	Dollar		228.00						228.00
Zimbabwe	Dollar		240.00						240.00
Mozambique	Dollar		225.00						225.00
Jane S. McGhee:									
	Dollar				4,944.00				4,944.00
Upper Volta	Dollar		225.00						225.00
Ivory Coast	Dollar		228.00						228.00
Zimbabwe	Dollar		240.00						240.00
Mozambique	Dollar		225.00						225.00
Total			4,710.00		15,150.55				19,860.55

MARK O. HATFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Oct. 1, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Katherine Cudlipp:									
France	Franc	3,312.56	376.00					3,312.56	376.00
Sweden	Krona	3,421.50	411.00					3,421.50	411.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	378.84	132.00					378.84	132.00
United States	Dollar				2,514.00				2,514.00
Curtis A. Moore:									
France	Franc	3,312.56	376.00					3,312.56	376.00
Sweden	Krona	3,421.50	411.00					3,421.50	411.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	378.84	132.00					378.84	132.00
United States	Dollar				2,514.00				2,514.00
Charlene Sturbitts:									
France	Franc	3,312.56	376.00					3,312.56	376.00
Sweden	Krona	3,421.50	411.00					3,421.50	411.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	378.84	132.00					378.84	132.00
United States	Dollar				2,701.00				2,701.00
Total			2,757.00		7,729.00				10,486.00

ROBERT T. STAFFORD,
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works,
Sept. 30, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Paula Hawkins:									
Mexico	Peso	37,500	187.50					37,500	187.50
Colombia	Peso	4,769	47.69					4,769	47.69
Peru	Sole	500,775	150.00					500,775	150.00
Bolivia	Peso	150,000	75.00					150,000	75.00
Argentina	Peso	17,850	255.00					17,850	255.00
Uruguay	Nupeso	2,034.40	37.50					2,034.40	37.50
Brazil	Cruzeiro	286,740	150.00					286,740	150.00
Senator Charles Mathias:									
United States	Dollar				1,078.00				1,078.00
Great Britain	Pound	220.49	297.00			192.30	259.02	412.79	556.02
Germany	Mark	511.52	184.00			346.00	124.46	857.52	308.46
France	Franc	2,779	322.39			328.90	38.15	3,107.90	360.54

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1984—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
George Ashworth:									
France	Franc	770	90.00					770	90.00
Saudi Arabia	Riyal	1,419.85	408.00					1,419.85	408.00
Kuwait	Dinar	46,750	157.00					46,750	157.00
Oman	Riyal	122	377.97					122	377.97
United States	Dollar				1,471.00				1,471.00
Graeme Bannerman:									
Tunisia	Dinar	175.97	234.00					175.97	234.00
Morocco	Dirham	1,978.61	225.00					1,978.61	225.00
Egypt	Dollar		87.00						87.00
Iraq	Dinar	116,870	377.00					116,870	377.00
Kuwait	Dinar	93,460	314.00					93,460	314.00
Abu Dhabi	Dirham	1,100	299.48					1,100	299.48
Oman	Riyal	165,600	480.00					165,600	480.00
Jidda Saudi Arabia	Riyal	1,002.04	288.00					1,002.24	288.00
Dhahran Saudi Arabia	Riyal	473.30	136.00					473.30	136.00
United States	Dollar				3,269.70				3,269.70
Johannes Binnendijk:									
France	Franc	770	90.00					770	90.00
Saudia Arabia	Riyal	1,419.85	408.00					1,419.85	408.00
Kuwait	Dinar	46,750	157.00					46,750	157.00
Oman	Riyal	146,800	426.00					146,800	426.00
United States	Dollar				1,471.00				1,471.00
Fredrick Brown:									
Philippines	Peso	13,507.50	750.00	4,769.55	264.84		52.99		1,067.83
United States	Dollar				2,103.00				2,103.00
Carl Ford:									
Philippines	Peso	13,507.50	750.00	4,769.55	264.84		52.99		1,067.83
United States	Dollar				2,103.00				2,103.00
Peter Galbraith:									
Israel	Dollar		300.00						300.00
Jordan	Dinar	34,110	90.00					34,110	90.00
Syria	Pound		101.00	400.00	102.56				203.56
Iraq	Dinar	160,890	519.00					160,890	519.00
Kuwait	Dinar	93,460	314.00					93,460	314.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham	970	264.08					970	264.08
Oman	Riyal	161,600	468.41					161,600	468.41
United States	Dollar				2,960.00				2,960.00
John Mica:									
Mexico	Peso	75,000	375.00					75,000	375.00
Colombia	Peso	9,538	95.38					9,538	95.38
Peru	Sole	500,775	150.00					500,775	150.00
Bolivia	Peso	300,000	150.00					300,000	150.00
Argentina	Peso	17,850	255.00					17,850	255.00
Uruguay	Nupeso	4,068.40	75.00					4,068.40	75.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	286,740	150.00					286,740	150.00
John Ritch:									
Germany	Mark	1,023.04	368.00					1,023.04	368.00
Casimir Yost:									
Turkey	Lira	27,607.50	75.00					27,607.50	75.00
Iraq	Dinar	160,890	519.00					160,890	519.00
Kuwait	Dinar	93,460	314.00					93,460	314.00
Abu Dhabi	Dirham	1,100	299.48					1,100	299.48
Oman	Riyal	165,600	480.00					165,600	480.00
Jiddah Saudi Arabia	Riyal	1,002.24	288.00					1,002.24	288.00
Dhahran Saudi Arabia	Riyal	473.30	136.00					473.30	136.00
United States	Dollar				2,939.00				2,939.00
Amendment to 1st quarter 1984:									
Kenneth Myers:									
United States	Dollar				1,701.00				1,701.00
Switzerland	Franc	395.65	182.00					395.65	182.00
Germany	Dollar		92.00						92.00
Amendments to 2d quarter 1984:									
Senator Charles Mathias:									
United States	Dollar				1,726.00				1,726.00
Sweden	Krona	1,029.95	126.99					1,029.95	126.99
England	Pound	71.74	99.00					71.74	99.00
Senator Frank Murkowski:									
Korea	Won	230,442	291.00					230,442	291.00
Taiwan	Dollar	14,617	368.28					14,617	368.28
United States	Dollar				1,945.80				1,945.80
Kevin Coyner:									
Japan	Yen			4,000	17.02			4,000	17.02
Korea	Won	230,443	291.00			5,325	6.72	235,768	297.72
Taiwan	Dollar	14,617	368.28			2,886	72.71	17,503	440.99
United States	Dollar				1,836.00				1,836.00
Erland Heginbotham:									
Japan	Yen	175,717	754.15	38,739.8	163.56	6,983	29.97	221,439.80	947.68
United States	Dollar				1,995.00				1,995.00
Mary Locke:									
Japan	Yen			15,000	63.02			15,000	63.02
Kenneth Myers:									
West Germany	Mark	1,098.20	403.75					1,098.20	403.75
Total			16,523.33		27,474.34		637.01		44,634.68

CHARLES PERCY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Oct. 2, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, FOR TRAVEL FROM JUNE 29 TO SEPT. 30, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jerry Tinker:									
Hong Kong	Dollar	2,290.25	294.00					2,290.25	294.00
Philippines	Peso	2,701.50	150.00					2,701.50	150.00
Thailand	Dollar		656.00		136.00				792.00
India	Rupe	2,948.94	258.00						258.00
United States	Dollar				5,695.00				5,695.00
Switzerland	Franc	593.35	246.00	560.00	227.69			1,153.35	473.69
Total			1,604.00		6,058.69				7,662.69

STROM THURMOND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Oct. 5, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John Dudinsky, Jr.:									
Mexico	Peso	75,000	375.00					75,000	375.00
Colombia	Peso	9,538	95.38					9,538	95.38
Peru	Sole	500,775	150.00					500,775	150.00
Bolivia	Peso	300,000	150.00					300,000	150.00
Argentina	Peso	17,850	255.00					17,850	255.00
Uruguay	Nupeso	4,068.70	75.00					4,068.70	75.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	286,740	150.00					286,740	150.00
Total			1,250.38						1,250.38

ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Human Resources,
Oct. 2, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael P. Pillsbury:									
Panama	Dollar		320.00						320.00
United States	Dollar				559.92				559.92
Panama	Dollar		80.00						80.00
United States	Dollar				944.00				944.00
Nicaragua	Dollar		82.00						82.00
Honduras	Lempira	384	192.00					384	192.00
El Salvador	Colon	296.25	75.00					296.25	75.00
Guatemala	Quetzal	75	75.00					75	75.00
Total			824.00		1,503.92				2,327.92

ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Human Resources,
Sept. 17, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, FOR TRAVEL FROM MAR. 21 TO JUNE 30, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Richard Kaufman:									
United States	Dollar				2,261.00				2,261.00
Greece	Drachma	23,011	225.00					23,011	225.00
Robert Premus:									
United States	Dollar				1,046.50				1,046.50
Japan	Yen	229,086	979.00	441,990	1,904.74			671,076	2,883.74
Japan	Yen			45,300	195.26			45,300	195.26
Japan	Yen			19,390	83.58			19,390	83.58
Robert Davis:									
United States	Dollar		107.79						107.79
David Smith:									
United States	Dollar				1,832.00				1,832.00
United Kingdom	Pound	212.53	297.00					212.53	297.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, FOR TRAVEL FROM MAR. 21 TO JUNE 30, 1984—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James Gabraith:									
Italy	Lira	506,700	300.00					506,700	300.00
United Kingdom	Pound	282.98	396.00					282.98	396.00
George Tyler:									
Japan	Yen	83,853	363.00			57,000	236.51	140,853	599.51
Total			2,667.79		7,323.08		236.51		10,227.38

ROGER W. JEPSEN,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee, Sept. 24, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MAJORITY LEADER, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Marilyn Courtot:									
United Kingdom	Pound	179	240.00					179	240.00
United States	Dollar				417.00				417.00
Gail Martin:									
Mexico	Peso	75,000	375.00					75,000	375.00
Colombia	Peso	9,538	95.38					9,538	95.38
Peru	Sole	500,775	150.00					500,775	150.00
Bolivia	Peso	300,000	150.00					300,000	150.00
Argentina	Peso	17,850	255.00					17,850	255.00
Uruguay	Nupeso	4,068.70	75.00					4,068.70	75.00
Brazil	Cruzceiro	286,740	150.00					286,740	150.00
Total			1,490.38		417.00				1,907.38

HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.,
Majority Leader, Oct. 1, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MAJORITY LEADER, FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 4 TO JAN. 18, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John C. Danforth:									
Senegal	Franc	116,085	272.50					116,085	272.50
Sudan	Dollar		140.00						140.00
Somalia	Shilling	3,584.60	206.25					3,584.60	206.25
Kenya	Shilling	1,041.90	75.00					1,041.90	75.00
Mozambique	Dollar		100.00						100.00
South Africa	Rand	108.36	86.00						86.00
United States	Dollar				3,919.13				3,919.13
Alexander V. Netchvolodoff:									
Senegal	Franc	116,085	272.50					116,085	272.50
Sudan	Dollar		140.00						140.00
Somalia	Shilling	3,584.60	206.25					3,584.60	206.25
Kenya	Shilling	1,041.90	75.00					1,041.90	75.00
Mozambique	Dollar		100.00						100.00
South Africa	Rand	108.36	86.00					108.36	86.00
United States	Dollar				3,919.13				3,919.13
Delegation expenses:									
Senegal							2,231.07		2,231.07
Sudan							1,704.00		1,704.00
Somalia							4,233.48		4,233.48
Kenya							765.07		765.07
South Africa							458.25		458.25
Spain							68.87		68.87
Total			1,759.50		7,838.26		9,460.74		19,058.50

Note.—1 employee each from the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, and from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations accompanied Codel Danforth and are reflected in the delegation expenses. Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to State Department and Defense Department under authority of sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384.

HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.,
Majority Leader, Oct. 1, 1984.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), CODEL LUGAR, FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MAJORITY LEADER, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 5 TO JULY 14, 1984

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Richard G. Lugar:									
England	Pound	143.20	192.00					143.20	192.00
Denmark	Krone	1,929.60	186.00					1,929.60	186.00
Sweden	Krona	2,266	274.00					2,266	274.00
Finland	Finmark	613.10	102.00					613.10	102.00
Norway	Krone	1,863	230.00					1,863	230.00
Senator William V. Roth:									
England	Pound	143.20	192.00					143.20	192.00
Denmark	Krone	1,929.60	186.00					1,929.60	186.00
Sweden	Krona	2,266	274.00					2,266	274.00
Finland	Finmark	613.10	102.00					613.10	102.00
Norway	Krone	1,863	230.00					1,863	230.00
Senator John H. Chafee:									
England	Pound	214.80	288.00	500	670.00			714.80	958.00
Denmark	Krone	1,929.60	186.00					1,929.60	186.00
Sweden	Krona	2,266	274.00					2,266	274.00
Finland	Finmark	613.10	102.00					613.10	102.00
William F. Hildenbrand:									
England	Pound	143.20	192.00					143.20	192.00
Denmark	Krone	1,929.60	186.00					1,929.60	186.00
Sweden	Krona	2,266	274.00					2,266	274.00
Finland	Finmark	613.10	102.00					613.10	102.00
Norway	Krone	1,863	230.00					1,863	230.00
Jeffrey T. Bergner:									
England	Pound	143.20	192.00					143.20	192.00
Denmark	Krone	1,929.60	186.00					1,929.60	186.00
Sweden	Krona	2,266	274.00					2,266	274.00
Finland	Finmark	613.10	102.00					613.10	102.00
Norway	Krone	1,863	230.00					1,863	230.00
Kenneth Myers:									
England	Pound	143.20	192.00					143.20	192.00
Denmark	Krone	1,929.60	186.00					1,929.60	186.00
Sweden	Krona	2,266	274.00					2,266	274.00
Finland	Finmark	613.10	102.00					613.10	102.00
Norway	Krone	1,863	230.00					1,863	230.00
Jan Novins:									
England	Pound	143.20	192.00					143.20	192.00
Denmark	Krone	1,929.60	186.00					1,929.60	186.00
Sweden	Krona	2,266	274.00					2,266	274.00
Finland	Finmark	613.10	102.00					613.10	102.00
Norway	Krone	1,863	230.00					1,863	230.00
Mark Helmke:									
England	Pound	143.20	192.00					143.20	192.00
Denmark	Krone	1,929.60	186.00					1,929.60	186.00
Sweden	Krona	2,266	274.00					2,266	274.00
Finland	Finmark	613.10	102.00					613.10	102.00
Norway	Krone	1,863	230.00					1,863	230.00
Charles N. Andreae:									
England	Pound	143.20	192.00					143.20	192.00
Denmark	Krone	1,929.60	186.00					1,929.60	186.00
Sweden	Krona	2,266	274.00					2,266	274.00
Finland	Finmark	613.10	102.00					613.10	102.00
Norway	Krone	1,863	230.00					1,863	230.00
Ruth Ann Neely:									
England	Pound	143.20	192.00					143.20	192.00
Denmark	Krone	1,929.60	186.00					1,929.60	186.00
Sweden	Krona	2,266	274.00					2,266	274.00
Finland	Finmark	613.10	102.00					613.10	102.00
Norway	Krone	1,863	230.00					1,863	230.00
Delegation expenses:									
England							3,626.38		3,626.38
Denmark							1,597.76		1,597.76
Sweden							2,033.60		2,033.60
Finland							1,056.03		1,056.03
Norway							2,407.41		2,407.41
Iceland							306.13		306.13
Total			9,706.00		670.00		11,027.31		21,403.31

Note.—Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and to the Department of Defense under authority of sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179, agreed to May 25, 1977.

RICHARD G. LUGAR,
Chairman of Delegation, Oct. 1, 1984.