

SENATE—Tuesday, April 30, 1985

(Legislative day of Monday, April 15, 1985)

The Senate met at 9 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.

**** I show unto you a more excellent way. Though I speak with the tongues of men and angels and have not love, I am as sounding brass, or a clanging cymbal.—I Corinthians 12:31, 13:1.*

God who is Love, teach us to love. Forgive us when we downgrade love as weak or sentimental or irrelevant. You have said that love fulfills all the law. You have commanded us to love our enemies and those who "despitefully use us." You have told us that love outlasts everything. Teach us to love. Government cannot love, but people in government can and ought. Teach us to love. In times of stress when we grow impatient with one another and emotions flare, help us to love one another and to love those whom we serve. Under pressure, dear Lord, give us cool heads and warm hearts. Teach us to love. In His name Who is Incarnate Love. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

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

A GRAND SLAM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, again our Chaplain strokes a grand slam home run with his prayer this morning on the issue of love, from Corinthians, which is really one of the most extraordinary parts of that remarkable text. I always have gravitated toward it, but it is difficult to think of love when we scrap as we do on issues in this Chamber. Nevertheless, without it we would find ourselves slipping into anarchy and discord and that has never happened in this country because of comity and caring and love of our fellow man. So it is a tough message. We do not hear it sometimes and it would be well for us to heed it as we head into what will be a very spirited few days—and exhausting ones, too. So, again, we thank him for his prayer—one so very timely and very much appreciated.

SCHEDULE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, today we have recognition of the two leaders under the standing order for 10 minutes each, of course, and special orders not to exceed 15 minutes each for Senator SYMMS, Senator COCHRAN, Senator PROXMIER, and Senator BAUCUS, and then, if time permits, routine morning business not to extend beyond 10 a.m. with statements limited therein to 5 minutes each.

Following morning business, the Senate will resume Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the budget resolution. The Senate will stand in recess between 12 noon and 2 p.m. today for the party caucuses. When the Senate does reconvene at 2 p.m., the Senate will resume consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the budget resolution and all that that entails. Rollcall votes can be expected during the session today.

RESERVATION OF LEADERSHIP TIME

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to reserve the remainder of the time for the minority and majority sides of the aisle.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR COCHRAN

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed at this time under the special order that was provided for me by unanimous consent.

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

Under the previous order, the Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

SENATOR COCHRAN REPORTS ON CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION TO NATO COUNTRIES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it was a pleasure to be a member of the

delegation to Europe led by our majority leader. I was glad we had a chance to express our appreciation, in behalf of the U.S. Senate, for the unity and support within the NATO alliance for the arms reduction efforts of the U.S. Government and the defense policies which have led to the negotiations in Geneva.

I am convinced that without solid support in Europe, the negotiations that are now underway would not be taking place, and the chances for reaching an agreement with the Soviet Union would not be nearly as good as they are.

At the center of these policies is the research that has been authorized and is being conducted into the possibilities for defending against nuclear attack. Much interest was expressed during our meetings with European leaders about the work being done in this area. I detected a firm belief among those with whom we talked that the strategic defense initiative was largely responsible for causing the Soviet Union to participate in the negotiations.

It was also apparent to me that the Europeans do not want anyone to be under the illusion that SDI and the research effort it includes will eliminate in the near future the need for the deterrence that only a credible nuclear capability provides. This sentiment was expressed to us in one way or the other, but always with strong conviction, by every government.

Another impression I have from the visit is the hope in Europe for friendly resolution of differences that exist in the trade area. We are very important to each other economically. That is fully realized in Europe.

As a prelude to the economic summit in Bonn which begins today, I think the meetings we had were very useful in focusing attention on American concerns over agricultural trade subsidies and the deteriorating trade balance of the United States. Our friends in Europe go to the summit with a much keener sense of the economically unhealthy situation on many American farms and the pressure that is building to take more aggressive action to gain a bigger share of world markets for agricultural products of the United States.

Europe does not want to engage in a trade war with us. We do not want that, either. Much effort will be needed to bring about a relationship based on fairness and mutual respect

for the economic interests on both sides of the Atlantic.

In connection with the trade problems, Mr. President, the circumstances we face today with the imbalance is very troublesome and I am sure will occupy a place that is high on the agenda of the topics to be discussed among the Western leaders in Bonn. These are the circumstances as they apply to our agricultural trade.

Just a few months ago, it was being projected by the Department of Agriculture that we would sell in overseas markets this year some \$36.5 billion worth of U.S.-produced agricultural commodities. Last month, however, that projection was changed to \$35.5 billion, and now it is being projected by the Department of Agriculture that U.S. trade in agricultural commodities will amount to only \$34.5 billion this year.

It is easy to see that in a very short period of time, our expectations with respect to what we will be able to sell in overseas markets, including the European market, have been reduced dramatically. Some are suggesting that this is a symptom of the total illness that is affecting U.S. trade, because agriculture historically has been the strongest part of U.S. trade capability.

What are we to do about it? I hope Senators will review legislation that I introduced a few weeks ago that would include a provision in the new farm bill that has to be written this year, called a marketing loan.

In essence, this would permit the Government to advance a nonrecourse loan to farmers, similar to the loan that is permitted under current farm policies. But instead of just forfeiting that loan at the end of the harvest season, the farmer, even though it is a nonrecourse loan, could redeem that loan at either the loan rate provided in the law or the market price, whichever is lower.

What this will permit, or, rather, what it will force, is the sale in international markets of U.S.-produced agricultural commodities. No longer will foreign competitors be able to peg their prices just below the U.S. loan rate and expect an automatic advantage in competition with us in international markets. We are losing market share, and this is damaging—some may say even destroying—the ability of U.S. farmers to compete overseas.

Mr. President, I have compiled a list of questions that I have been asked by persons who have looked at this proposal and who are interested in it, with answers to these questions, in the hope that this will help explain what this marketing loan is, what it seeks to do, how it will help improve our competitive position in agricultural trade, how much it could cost the U.S. Government, so that other Senators can be better advised about this proposal.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that a list of questions and answers concerning the market loan proposal be printed in the RECORD.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. What is a "marketing loan"?

It is the name used to describe a new kind of CCC loan which the farmer would be allowed to repay based on the original value or market price, whichever is less. It is different from the current system of loans, which must be either repaid in full or the commodity is forfeited to the government.

2. How would it work?

As with the current system, these loans would be offered to farmers at harvest with the crop as collateral. Interest would accrue on the loan, and the farmer could repay the loan at any time before or at loan maturity (9-11 months).

3. How would it be administered?

There are several options. The simplest might be to have ASCS make non-recourse, marketing loans available to farmers at harvest and then have USDA determine the repayment level based on market prices each week. Price data from the Agricultural Marketing Service and Statistical Reporting Service could be used to determine repayment. During the first month after the loan is taken out, the producer could be required to repay the full face value of the loan in order to encourage orderly marketing. Interest would be charged, but could be reduced as needed to allow repayment and avoid government takeover of commodities.

4. How much would this program cost?

There would be savings to the taxpayer, rather than costs, compared to current programs.

5. Why would it be more cost effective than the current programs?

Current programs lead to government takeover of surplus stocks which are costly to store and difficult to dispose. The cost to the taxpayer of acquiring and storing these stocks is greater than simply discounting the amount of loan repayment. Thus, the marketing loan avoids costly government takeovers.

In fact, by encouraging loan repayment even at a discounted level, USDA receives working capital which can immediately be reinvested or used to reduce the Federal deficit.

Beyond that, the marketing loan offers farmers an additional incentive to participate in acreage reduction programs, which makes the programs more cost-effective.

6. How would the safety net for farmers be maintained under this program?

Farmers would receive the protection of the initial value of the loan, plus whatever target price is in place. If market prices go down, farmers would still have the assurance of the loan value which provides a certain minimum safety net to provide needed cash flow.

7. If this is in addition to target prices, is the marketing loan discount a kind of "double-dip" for farmers?

No, not any more than the current program which provides the farmer both deficiency payments and unlimited forfeitures of CCC loans. In fact, under the marketing loan the government actually receives money back from farmers instead of receiving commodities which are difficult to dispose of and costly to store.

8. Would the payment limitation apply to the discounted loan?

No, unless Congress specifies that it would in the new farm bill. The payment limitation has never been applied to loan proceeds. If it were, that would certainly limit the effectiveness of the loan as a marketing tool.

9. What about farmer-owned reserves, set-asides, and so forth?

These current program elements could be retained and used in various combinations. However, if the U.S. is going to cut production through set-asides or acreage reduction programs, then the marketing loan is especially needed.

10. Why?

Currently when the U.S. cuts production of a crop, other exporting countries tend to expand their acreage of the same crop, knowing that prices for those commodities will stay up because of U.S. price supports. However, with the marketing loan the U.S. farmer is protected but prices are allowed to move downward, which removes the price umbrella from foreign competitors and causes them to assume market risks.

11. What are the choices a farmer has with the marketing loan?

Basically, three. Here are some examples:

(1) *Settle and sell at settlement price*

Under this situation the farmer would get a loan of \$4.00 per unit and settle with USDA at \$3.70. If he immediately sold at \$3.70, he would be guaranteed the \$4.00:

Loan	\$4.00
Pay back	3.70

Gain at settlement	+30
Sale price of the commodity	+3.70

Realized price

4.00
(2) *Settle and hold with price going up to \$3.90*

Under this situation the farmer would get a loan of \$4.00 and settle at \$3.70 per unit. If he holds and the price goes to \$3.90, the following is the realized price:

Loan	\$4.00
Pay back	3.70

Gain at settlement	+30
Sale of the commodity	+3.90

Realized price

4.20
(3) *Settle and hold with price going down to \$3.50*

Under this situation the farmer would get a loan of \$4.00 and settle at \$3.70 per unit. If he holds and the price goes down to \$3.50, the following would be the realized price:

Loan	\$4.00
Pay back	3.70

Gain at settlement	+30
Sale of the commodity	+3.50

Realized price

3.80

These examples illustrate that under the program outlined above a farmer would be assured a support level but the option is still available for him to consider a marketing strategy. In other words, he can make money above the loan with good marketing. Of course, poor marketing could result in a realized price below the loan. As a last resort, however, a farmer can simply forfeit the non-recourse loan. If this option is chosen, the farmer's realized price is the loan rate.

12. Is this an export subsidy that will get us in trouble with GATT?

No, this is no more an export subsidy than the current target price and loan system. Products would be priced at the same level for domestic and export use, unlike those countries which do subsidize exports. However, it will allow us to have competitive prices which should allow us to export.

13. Does the marketing loan idea have support from anyone else?

Yes—and it is picking up support all the time. The idea has been endorsed in various forms by the National Association of Wheat Growers, National Corn Growers Association, some rice interests, the National Farmers Organization, and at least one State Farm Bureau.

14. Some people think the proposal is a potential budget buster. Can budget exposure be limited?

Yes. A limit can be established on the amount the Secretary can discount loans. This would create, however, a new floor for world prices and limit the effectiveness of the effort to make U.S. products competitive in world markets. Another option is to limit participation in the program, and a number of different ways to do this are being considered.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR SYMMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized under the previous order.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FALL OF SAIGON

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, 1985 is a year of great anniversaries. Forty years ago, in May, the United States and our allies destroyed Nazi Germany and rescued the people of Europe from Hitler's savage occupation. Forty years ago, in August, the United States and our allies crushed the military empire of Japan and liberated the people of Asia. These anniversaries are cause for celebration.

But 1985 is also a year of remorse. Ten years ago, today, the United States watched helplessly as Saigon fell and North Vietnam defeated and subjugated the people of Indochina.

Regrettably, the 40th anniversary celebration of V-E Day [victory in Europe] and V-J Day [victory over Japan] is tarnished by the 10th anniversary of D-V [defeat in Vietnam].

It is important for the American people, and vital for us in Congress, to understand the reason for this tragedy.

Ten years ago, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I was one of the last U.S. Congressmen in North Vietnam and Cambodia. I saw the determination of those brave people to

fight for their freedom—and their very lives—right up until the end. I saw also the hopelessness of their task.

The question which plagues America on this 10th anniversary of the fall of Saigon is: "How did we lose; why did we fail?" Some explanations for America's defeat are shamefully wrong.

For example, in discussing the end of the Vietnam war, the narrator of the recently produced PBS series, "Vietnam: A Television History" declares: The Americans "counted nearly 60,000 dead and more than 300,000 wounded. It was America's first defeat." But, like most of the national media, PBS does not reveal the real reason for America's first defeat. We are led to believe that North Vietnam's victory was inevitable; that America's and South Vietnam's cause was doomed.

But, North Vietnam's victory was not preordained. The reason for America's loss in Vietnam is not found in the nobility of the Communist cause or the superiority of the Communist soldier, because, Mr. President, we did not lose on the battlefield.

Col. Harry Summers recalls a conversation with Colonel Tu of the North Vietnamese Army in Hanoi in 1975:

Colonel SUMMERS. You know, you never defeated us on the battlefield.

Colonel Tu [pondering this remark for a minute]. That may be so, but it is also irrelevant.

Colonel Tu, of course, was correct. In finally deciding the outcome of the Vietnam war, America's unbroken string of battlefield victories became irrelevant. The war was not lost on the battlefield; the war was lost here, in Congress.

Colin Gray, then assistant director of the prestigious International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, fixed the real reason for America's loss in Vietnam, explaining:

For good reason, most Americans appear convinced that their country lost the war in Vietnam. That is not quite true. The facts are that the United States and the Republic of Vietnam had effectively won the war by mid or late 1972, and then—in America's case at least—proceeded to discard that victory.

John Colvin, counsel general at the British Mission in Hanoi during the war, agrees with Gray, declaring:

Victory—in American hands, was not so much thrown away as shunned.

How and why did America discard and shun victory in Vietnam? As a Member of Congress during the last Vietnam years, it is difficult and unpleasant for me to tell the blunt truth: America lost the war in Vietnam on the floor of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Congress of the United States legislated defeat in Vietnam.

To prove this painful thesis, I must remind you of events in Vietnam in

1972, when, Colin Gray believes, America had effectively won the war and before we shunned victory.

On March 31, 1972, North Vietnam's Defense Minister, General Giap, called on "the Vietnam people's armed forces to march forward to complete victory." The Communists hurled 14 combat divisions spearheaded by 600 Soviet tanks across the 17th parallel in the biggest attack of the war.

The Easter offensive was South Vietnam's moment of truth. President Thieu told his countrymen, "this is the final battle to decide the survival of our people."

Unlike the Tet offensive 4 years earlier, U.S. military support was now limited. Only about 60,000 troops were in Vietnam at the time, and none of them participated in ground combat other than in an advisory capacity. The main U.S. support came from the air. President Nixon unleashed tremendous tactical and strategic air strikes to help crush the Communist offensive.

Along with the massive air strikes, President Nixon ordered the mining of North Vietnam's ports—a bold move which was long overdue. Seventy-five percent of North Vietnam's imports from Russia and Eastern Europe entered from the sea, 95 percent at Haiphong. Almost all of North Vietnam's gasoline, diesel fuel, ammunition and weapons reached North Vietnam from the sea.

Predictably, the President's firm action was denounced by a storm of criticism in liberal media and by the hand-wringers in Congress. Senate doves voted to condemn Nixon's decision to mine Haiphong. One Senator exclaimed, "we must act at once to reverse this fateful error. Armageddon may be only hours away."

But, the American people overwhelmingly backed President Nixon. A Sindinger poll showed that 76 percent of the American people supported Nixon's initiatives in Vietnam. A Harris survey found that 64 percent supported the mining of Haiphong, and 74 percent thought it important that South Vietnam did not fall into the hands of the Communists.

The U.S. bombing and mining were vital, but if the Communist drive was to be stopped the ARVN had to stop it on the ground. As General Westmoreland explained.

Here, apparently, was the ultimate test of the long years of American effort to create a viable South Vietnamese armed force. Even as the test developed, the last American battalions began to move, not to help in the fight, but to complete American withdrawal. As the results eventually demonstrated, the ARVN for all of its many errors in plans and execution, no longer required the assistance of American ground troops.

As President Nixon said:

U.S. mining of Haiphong Harbor and the use of our air power against targets in

North Vietnam helped save the day, but the fighting on the ground was done exclusively by South Vietnam forces. The South Vietnamese demonstrated in 1972, that they could effectively stop the invasion on the ground if they were adequately armed and provided with air support.

By September, North Vietnam's forces had retreated. A captured Communist document conceded that "We failed to accomplish our spring-summer plan. Objectives have not been achieved." Four hundred of North Vietnam's tanks had been knocked out; close to 100,000 Communist regulars had been killed.

Finally, after 10 years of fighting, a successful formula had been found to deny South Vietnam to the Communists. Severely tested by the Easter offensive, this formula required several segments for success:

First, American military advisers were still needed to aid the ARVN.

Second, American air support was required to destroy enemy positions and to discourage future invasions.

Third, mining Haiphong was necessary to discourage Communist offensives by preventing a sustained military attack in the South.

Fourth, most importantly, because the ARVN's ground troops proved they could challenge North Vietnam's best units, American combat troops were no longer needed in Vietnam.

Under these promising conditions, Congress proceeded to legislate defeat in Vietnam—first, by preventing any future U.S. military action in Indochina, and later, in 1975, by denying South Vietnam and Cambodia the military aid necessary for their self-defense.

After numerous unsuccessful efforts, congressional liberals finally pushed through the Case-Church amendment on June 29, 1973, preventing U.S. military involvement in Southeast Asia. The terms of Case-Church were categorical:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on or after August 15, 1973, no funds herein or heretofore appropriated may be obligated or expended to finance directly or indirectly combat activities by United States military forces in or over from off the shores of North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia.

President Nixon had vetoed previous bills to cut off American military action in Indochina, and he denounced Case-Church vigorously, but the bill was veto proof. It passed 278 to 124, 69 percent, in the House and 64 to 26, 71 percent, in the Senate.

Not satisfied with preventing any future military support to our allies, Congress proceeded to deny South Vietnam and Cambodia the basic weapons and supplies needed for their defense.

In 1972-73, U.S. military aid to South Vietnam was \$2.1 billion.

In 1973-74, aid to South Vietnam was cut to \$964 million.

In 1974-75, the year of the final communist offensive, U.S. military aid to South Vietnam totaled only \$700 million.

Such drastic cuts in military supplies crippled the ARVN. Helicopter missions dropped from 16,000 a month to 3,000 a month because of a shortage of spare parts and gasoline. In the final battle in 1975, the ARVN desperately lacked all types of weapons and equipment.

I remember very vividly a ride in a Huey helicopter that was in such poor shape that I was certain no American troops would have used it. It was literally a stripped down version of a Huey. I thought to myself at the time that the situation must be very bad, indeed, or these people would not be using equipment that was in this poor condition. There were no spare parts to repair the equipment. There was nothing they could do but make do with what they had.

Tran Van Lam, South Vietnam's Foreign Minister, came to Washington to plead for a \$300 million supplementary appropriation, but he was told by several Congressmen that the ARVN was not fighting effectively. Tran Van Lam replied:

We fought well in 1968 and 1972, and these are the same people. They held An Loc for years. The North Vietnamese have ten times more shells than we have. If our troops have ten bullets and know that they will get ten more when they need them, then they will fight. But inevitably, when soldiers have no bullets, no equipment, no means of transportation, it is only natural that morale will suffer.

At the time that Congress was cutting South Vietnam's military aid, Soviet supplies to North Vietnam quadrupled in 1974-75. Communist supplies were so abundant in the north that vast storehouses were left unhidden. To move men and equipment rapidly to the south, portions of the Ho Chi Minh Trail were paved with limestone and packed dirt. Obviously, the Communists had no reason to fear U.S. air strikes.

In the spring of 1975, Congress also denied military aid to Cambodia, where Pol Pot's Khmer Rouge was locked in fierce combat with government troops. English journalist William Shawcross, a severe critic of U.S. policy in Cambodia, reveals that—

In these final three months, each side fought with extraordinary bravery and each suffered losses that would have been intolerable for most armies.

According to Shawcross:

Ammunition decided the outcome of the war. Within days of the start of the offensive, Hanoi was no longer withholding arms. The Khmer Rouge had far more weapons and ammunition than ever before.

But government troops depended on Congress for aid, and by April 11 no more funds were available to the desperate Cambodian Army.

It was a tragic situation, but I was truly impressed with the discipline of the Cambodian troops and the spirit that they demonstrated in their defense of that very small perimeter around Phnom Penh.

Of course, it saddens me to remember that all the people that I met and dealt with are now dead, victims of the Cambodian genocide in which two out of seven of the citizens of that country were killed by the Khmer Rouge after the fall of Phnom Penh.

In imploring Congress for aid to Cambodia, President Ford warned of "an unbelievable horror story" if the Khmer Rouge won. American Ambassador to Cambodia, Gunther Dean, told Congress that "the Communists would impose a brutal revolution" if they controlled Cambodia.

But Senate doves rejected Cambodia's plea; they knew better. Many Senators dismissed predictions of large scale Communist atrocities as "political rhetoric" and "scare tactics about Indochina." Some agreed with the Senator who believed: "It's up to those people to settle their differences themselves in their own way, and that includes Cambodia." According to the New York Times of March 13, 1975, two leading antiwar Senators "cited statements by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the exiled Cambodian leader, that only the lives of President Lon Nol and his immediate entourage would be in jeopardy when the Communists took over."

On April 17, Cambodia surrendered to Pol Pot, paving the way for one of the most barbaric acts in human history—the genocide of the Cambodian people.

Predictably, the Case-Church amendment and cuts in military aid encouraged North Vietnam to invade South Vietnam in 1975. Graham Martin, U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, revealed that the Soviet Union told North Vietnam to "go for broke" because "support for honoring the American commitment to South Vietnam had been irretrievably eroded in Congress."

Gen. Van Tien Dung, chief of staff of the North Vietnamese Army and commander of the final offensive, in his book "Our Great Spring Victory," written in 1977, describes how the North Vietnamese Politburo "raised and heatedly discussed" America's response "if we launched large scale battles that would lead to the collapse of the puppet troops." According to General Dung, North Vietnam's leaders concluded that:

The United States was meeting difficulties at home and abroad, and its ability to give political or military aid was declining every day. Not only had the United States decreased its aid to Saigon, it also faced increasing opposition to any effort to "jump back" into the South.

General Dung decided that South Vietnam would be forced to fight a poor man's war.

The Case-Church amendment and cuts in military aid assured the Communist victory in 1975. As General Westmoreland explained:

We were paralyzed by the Case-Church amendment which prohibited the use of funds for Southeast Asia combat activities. That action by Congress not only tied the hands of President Ford, but also removed our only deterrent to large scale attack.

Westmoreland added:

It's too bad we couldn't again mine Halphong Harbor and the President did not have the authority to use tactical air and B-52 strikes to hit Communist supply lines.

As the Communist army swept south, President Ford watched helplessly and lamented:

Unfortunately the United States did not carry out its commitment in the supplying of military hardware and economic aid to South Vietnam. If we had carried out the commitments we had made, the tragic sacrifices that were made by so many would not have been in vain.

Thus, after enduring 360,000 casualties and spending more than \$140 billion, the U.S. Congress left the field to the Communists. Senator Hiram Fong of Hawaii dared to tell his Senate colleagues the hard truth:

There is no question but what we have betrayed the Cambodians and we have betrayed the South Vietnamese. In my mind, there is no question that we have reneged on our commitments; we have not lived up to our commitments.

The American people and the Vietnam veterans agree with Senator Fong. In 1980, the polling firm of Lou Harris & Associates conducted a lengthy indepth study of the attitudes of the public and the veterans about the Vietnam war.

Harris asked for a reactions to this statement:

The trouble in Vietnam was that our troops were asked to fight a war which our political leaders in Washington would not let them win.

Seventy-three percent of the American people and 92 percent of the Vietnam veterans agreed with that statement.

The consequences of the Communist victory to the people of Indochina are well known. The area has become an Asian Auschwitz. George McGovern said the genocide in Cambodia "made Germany's operation look tame by comparison."

Alexander Solzhenitzen indicts American doves for their role in the Communist victory in scathing language. Solzhenitzen told the Harvard graduating class in 1978:

Members of the U.S. anti-war movement wound up being involved in a betrayal of Far Eastern nations, in a genocide and in the suffering today of 30 million people there. Do these convinced pacifists hear the moans coming from there? Do they understand their responsibility today? Or do they prefer not to hear?

The dread consequences of America's defeat in Vietnam are not limited to the suffering millions of Indochina. Today the "Vietnam syndrome" influences U.S. policy in Central America. A popular bumper sticker proclaims that "El Salvador is Spanish for Vietnam." Some Senators often compare U.S. policy in Central America to Vietnam, declaring that in Central America we must not fail to "learn the lessons of Vietnam."

Last week we were faced with the decision of providing the Nicaraguan freedom fighters with 14 million dollars' worth of military aid. Both the Senate and the House rejected that proposal. We were the victims of the "Vietnam syndrome." We lacked the wisdom, the resolve and the foresight to take the steps necessary to promote democracy in Central America.

Fortunately, we still have time in Central America, time which we can use to correct last week's mistake.

The institutional memory of this body is short. Consequently we must, from time to time, force ourselves to remember the unpleasant past so that we may avoid an even more unpleasant future.

Congress' action in legislating defeat in Vietnam was reprehensible. It would be tragic if we failed to learn from that mistake.

The explanation I have just given for "American's first defeat" does not conform to the "liberal" thesis that American involvement in Vietnam was immoral from the beginning, that under Ho Chi Minh's enlightened leadership a Communist victory was justified and inevitable, and that South Vietnam was a brutal and corrupt nation undeserving of American aid.

Mr. President, discussion of the "lessons of Vietnam" has recently flooded the national media. These "lessons" are often irresponsibly invoked in these Chambers.

But what are these "lessons?" Some are complex and controversial, but five of the most important "lessons of Vietnam" are clear and basic.

President Nixon in his recent book, "No More Vietnams," explains one important lesson:

In Vietnam we tried and failed in a just cause. 'No More Vietnams' can mean we will not try again. It should mean we will not fail again.

President Reagan expressed another crucial "lesson of Vietnam" when he declared that:

We should never again ask men to fight and die for their country unless we intend to win.

A third clear "lesson of Vietnam" is: Don't get bogged down in a prolonged war. General MacArthur's fundamental truism must always be observed:

War's very object is victory—not prolonged indecision.

A painfully plan, but fundamental "lesson of Vietnam" is: Don't lose.

When the greatest power in the world commits its material and human resources to war and loses, grave consequences are suffered by millions whose very existence depends upon our pledges and support. Defeat erodes the very spirit of our country.

Finally, the most tormenting "lesson" of all: Don't abandon victory.

When history finally sorts out the Vietnam controversy, some time in the next century, I believe it will relate that:

The United States of America pledged its honored word, spent its valuable treasure, and sacrificed the sacred lives of its sons in a noble cause to save millions of innocent people from tyranny.

Finally, after 10 years of agonizing struggle, America achieved—then abandoned—victory and allowed the people of Indochina to fall into "that bottomless pit of human degradation" called communism.

The Vietnam war was, as Gen. Omar Bradley proclaimed in 1967:

A right war, at the right place, at the right time, and with the right enemy.

But, this noble cause was lost by error, indecision and timidity. The courage of Congress did not match the courage of the vast majority of the American people, the courage of the American fighting forces in the field, or the courage of the Cambodian, Laotian, and South Vietnamese people.

We were defeated, as North Vietnam's leaders predicted in 1968 that we would be: "On the political front right in the United States."

Mr. President, we Americans have inherited much: A beautiful country, a proud heritage, and an unprecedented measure of freedom and opportunity. But, we have also inherited the solemn responsibility to lead the free world through these dangerous times.

I have unbounded confidence in America and her people. But if we are to remain a great nation, America's leaders in Congress, to whom is entrusted the Nation's destiny, must accept Winston Churchill's simple axiom: "The price of greatness is responsibility."

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is my understanding I have a 15-minute special order; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

STAR WARS: THE DANGEROUS ESCAPE FROM REALITY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as the Presiding Officer will recall, Dr. Robert Jastrow testified on April 22 before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee that the so-called star wars antimissile defense could be made highly effective for an expenditure of as little as \$60 billion. Dr. Jastrow contended that such a defense would be able to intercept 75 percent and perhaps virtually all incoming ICBM's. Both his estimates of the efficiency of star wars and his cost estimates were far more optimistic than anything the Defense Department has previously claimed. On the other hand, on the same day, Dr. Richard Garwin told the committee that star wars will be unlikely to work at all. He estimated the cost at half a trillion dollars or more. How are members of the Senate to determine which of these two expert witnesses, if either, is right? Is the answer somewhere in between the two estimates of the cost of the program? Will this strategic defense initiative's capacity to intercept incoming missiles even with as little as \$60 billion of expenditure range somewhere between 100 percent success to no success? Many of us when confronted with this kind of sharply conflicting testimony from expert witnesses are inclined to split the difference. Would this give us a roughly right answer on "Star Wars." The answer is "no."

There are two big reasons why Dr. Garwin is likely to be right and Dr. Jastrow is likely to be wrong. First, consider what it will take to support the Jastrow position. The United States will have to secure a system that will work almost perfectly the first time it is challenged by a Soviet attack. This Senator cannot recall any weapon system which worked perfectly or even well the very first time it was put to the challenge. I can recall many that failed and others that failed at first but gradually became effective weapons systems. It takes trial and error to work out the bugs. The more complex the system, the more errors and mistakes. And for a system as brand new, as untried as a comprehensive antimissile system replete with an untried technology, the prospect that it would work perfectly or even very well the first time are about as close to nil as you can get.

Second, and even more importantly, this newly deployed star wars system would not go up against the present technology of offensive missiles. It would not be the present Russian nuclear offensive arsenal that star wars would have to intercept with virtual perfection and defeat. This country would face a far more advanced offensive nuclear arsenal than anything in being today. But even today's technology would enable the Soviets to equip

their giant missiles cheaply with several times more warheads, plus warheads with a hardened skin that would aid penetration, and with thousands of decoys and chaff that could cheaply and easily flood into the defensive zone. Most difficult of all, the star wars system would have to meet and frustrate new developments, not yet on the drawing board—as new as the star wars defensive system itself.

Mr. President, we have great and understandable faith in the capacity of our scientists to achieve miracles, including the miracle of constructing a defense against intercontinental ballistic missiles equipped with nuclear warheads. Many highly competent experts say this cannot be done. Some say it can. And if those who think American scientific ingenuity can build a perfect or near perfect missile defense are right, that achievement could be the beginning of a defense against at least one kind of nuclear attack. Possibly a defense against other kinds of attacks—by cruise missile, by low flying bomber, by submarine, by terrorists—can also be achieved. Perhaps we can mount a marvelous new defense that can win on every front. Would not such a defense be worthwhile? The answer is "No."

Here is why: We can make great scientific advances that might very possibly stop the 1985 offensive nuclear arsenal and stop it cold. But by the time we get such an arsenal researched, produced and deployed, it will not be 1985 or 1986, it will be at least the year 2000. By that time the same kind of scientific ingenuity that developed miraculous defenses against a 1985 technology will face a year 2000 offensive technology.

Mr. President can any sane and reasonable person argue that the scientific ingenuity that works for the antimissile defense will not work at least as well for the nuclear offense? I say "at least as well" because in the history of warfare, the offense has enjoyed a consistent advantage for obvious reasons. The offense can select the time of attack, the mode of attack, the place of attack. It can concentrate its offensive power on the targets it selects. That principle has not changed in thousands of years. The technique of warfare has changed. It has changed with ever-increasing rapidity. We seem to have a virtual revolution now every 10 or 15 years. But the dream that either a defense or offense would somehow develop a permanent advantage, or indeed an advantage that could persist for more than a very few years is an empty, vain and dangerous flight into unreality.

So what do we do? The answer is to stop this star wars gambit. Stop it cold, and then divert some of this marvelous scientific genius into the development of verification systems that will provide credible enforcement of

arms control. We simply must stop the arms race. To do that we need constantly improving verification. Certainly comprehensive, verifiable arms control will never give us the full and perpetual assurance of peace. If we are honest with ourselves, we will admit nothing will do that. But arms control that stops the arms race can give us far and away the best chance of peace and survival.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article on this subject by Walter Clemens of Boston University, and a member of the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

GOOD OFFENSE BEATS A GOOD (STAR WARS) DEFENSE

(By Walter C. Clemens, Jr.)

President Reagan justifies his Strategic Defense Initiative as a kind of gas mask—a precaution to be taken even though certain weapons have been banned. But a long look at history reveals a more basic lesson: It is folly to depend upon moats, walls, forts or interception to keep an attacker at bay. From Jericho to Troy to Corregidor and Dien Bien Phu the record is replete with tales of "impregnable" bastions that fell to the cunning, endurance or concentrated power of determined foes. China's Great Wall was repeatedly breached by "barbarians." Alexander the Great used a mole and barges to take Tyre. Richard the Lion-Hearted, improving on Byzantine forts seen on the Crusades, built Europe's stoutest castle in Normandy. Philip II won it in less than two years.

Medieval fortresses rose ever higher contesting against battering rams, catapults and assault towers. If superior force or stratagem did not overwhelm the defenders, starvation often did the trick. As castles became vulnerable to artillery in the 15th century, moats were deepened and broadened; walls were slanted and rounded to make projectiles ricochet. Still, the defense usually lost out to offensive technology.

Proponents of defense alibi in each case that "something went wrong." Jericho's walls might not have fallen to the shouts and trumpets of Joshua's troops if a prostitute had not hidden two Israelite spies within the town. The Trojans should have heeded Cassandra's warnings not to pull the wooden horse within their walls. The Kaiser's armies could not have raced into France in 1914 if trenches had linked Belgium's mighty forts. Singapore would have repulsed the Japanese had its guns aimed toward land instead of the sea. Czechoslovakia's "little Maginot line" could have stalled the Germans had it not been surrendered to Hitler at Munich. France's Maginot line would have halted the Wehrmacht had French fortifications continued to the North Sea instead of stopping at Belgium.

Why does every defense have an Achilles' heel? Because human ingenuity—especially the attacker's—is so great. Belgium's forts in 1940 were much improved over 1914, but they fell in hours when Nazi troops descended by glider one night and began systematically to destroy each turret. Three hundred German paratroopers jumped down at day-

break and compelled 800 surviving Belgian defenders to surrender before noon. Belgium's collapse permitted German armor to run through the Ardennes Forest (said by French strategists to be "impassable"), outflanking the Maginot pillboxes, railroads and underground cinemas.

France, like Mr. Reagan, hoped that its defense line would inspire confidence in its allies. The opposite occurred. Belgium, Poland and Czechoslovakia looked elsewhere for support as their patron dug in for its own protection.

Not only have defense systems spurred overconfidence at home and discord among allies but they have also triggered the very attack they were meant to inhibit. Like boxers, nations fear that if their adversary combines a powerful defense with a long reach, it may seek a knockout. So it was after Athens and Sparta troops returned home following their victory over Persia and organized rival alliances. Athens, like the U.S. today, was strong at sea; Sparta, like the U.S.S.R., on land. When Athens started to erect two long walls to its port, Sparta and other rivals complained. They saw the Athenian defense as a provocation and asked that it be halted. Athens, in the same way, ordered its tributary states not to build walls that could lessen their vulnerability to Athenian influence. Wall building added to the psychosis that produced the Peloponnesian Wars in which all sides were wasted and Athens defeated.

Worried lest the Soviet anti-ballistic missiles of the early 1960s provide the backup for a Soviet first strike, the Pentagon devised multiple warheads to pierce Russia's defenses. Now each superpower accuses the other of violating the ABM treaty to buttress its long reach. If Moscow believes its deterrent is failing, this could produce a desperate act.

Like France in the 1930s, Mr. Reagan exaggerates the enemy's strength, saying we are outmanned and outgunned. Like War Minister Andre Maginot, the president seeks a technological fix to end our vulnerability. He too turns a deaf ear to warnings that a partial shield is not enough. As Paris renounced the offensive posture it used in the early 1920s to enforce the Versailles Treaty, Mr. Reagan talks of eliminating nuclear weapons and internationalizing defenses, even sharing them with the U.S.S.R.

All this is sheer fantasy. The president would squander the modicum of strategic stability we have acquired in quest of pie in the sky. Defenses can impede but not prevent an attack. If we cannot protect a solitary embassy against a jihad truck driver, how can we defend a continent from assault by ballistic, cruise and other weapons, some as yet undreamed of? How can we assure the Soviets—still laboring under their Avis complex—that we will not exploit our technological superiority to create a defense that disarms them?

Despite their anxieties the Soviets could doubtless invent means to punch through any U.S. defense. It is easier to destroy than protect, cheaper to penetrate than keep out. If a leakproof astrodome cannot be attained, there is no justification for the Strategic Defense Initiative unless our deterrent is at risk. Our triad—or most of it—is quite secure for the foreseeable future. If our land-based missiles become vulnerable, we can build 100 ABM launchers without violating our 1972-74 accords with Moscow. We can make our submarines and bombers more difficult to destroy in a first strike. While maintaining a persuasive deterrent, we must

find ways to ease tensions with the Kremlin, reduce prospects of a surprise attack, and lower for all peoples the burdens and dangers of arms racing. Meanwhile we should avoid any "initiative" that alienates our allies, provokes our foe and leads to self-deception. We must never believe that we are safe when we are not, indeed, when our actions could goad our foe to attack. Best safety, as Laertes said, lies in fear.

A HELPING HAND

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, for more than 50 years, the Selfhelp Community Services Organization has been helping New York area survivors of the Holocaust. This organization was founded by a group of Quakers and immigrant Jews to help victims of Nazi persecution. In the early days of its existence, Selfhelp provided a place for those fleeing the Germans. It was a place to come and seek shelter in a strange, new country. At Selfhelp, these refugees found people with whom they could communicate. The social workers not only spoke German, but also Yiddish, Russian, Hungarian and Polish. The Selfhelp Community Organization provided badly needed services to those fleeing the Holocaust.

The end of the war and the end of the Holocaust did not end the need for the services of Selfhelp. Selfhelp still provides services to those whose emotional scars are still open. Many survivors are still haunted by nightmares and often a persistent feeling of guilt exists within them. They feel guilty because they survived when so many did not. There are many institutions and daily events that bring back memories of Nazi Germany. As one of Selfhelp's social workers put it, "illness triggers feelings of helplessness that they had in Germany. Sickness meant immediate death at the hands of the Nazis." As these survivors grow older, Selfhelp provides them assistance with government documents. Government documents in Germany could have meant deportation or death.

There are people who live with this tragedy of history every day, with the emotional scars that will last the rest of their lives. Because the disease is gone does not mean we are immune to it. Genocide could raise its ugly head at any time. Just as the Selfhelp Community Service Organization continues to respond to the effects of the Holocaust, so must we respond. The need is still there. I urge quick action on the long overdue Genocide Convention.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BAUCUS

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 151—SENSE OF SENATE RESOLUTION REGARDING BONN ECONOMIC SUMMIT

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a resolution for myself, Senator BENTSEN, and Senator MOYNIHAN, calling on the President to initiate discussion of the exchange rates at the Bonn Economic Summit.

This resolution is designed to send a message to the President of the United States. A message I and my colleagues hope he hears as he goes into the Bonn Economic Summit.

It is a message drawn from pain—pain caused by this administration's policies. It is a message about moving to stop the pain from getting worse.

Wednesday night President Reagan spoke to the American people about the costs imposed by skyrocketing budget deficits—deficits contained in his budgets. But he ignored one cost: the cost imposed by his deficits' impact on the dollar.

Perhaps I should not have been surprised. After all, for 4 years—as the dollar has risen ever higher—the President has seen no problem. He has even said we should be proud of the dollar's high value!

Well, we stand here today to say to the President of the United States: "You are living in a dream world—removed from the reality that confronts most Americans."

Take off your rose-colored glasses! Leave the oval office and go among the American farmers—good people, hardworking people and the most productive people in the world. They will tell you an overvalued dollar is a source not of pride but of pain and bankruptcy.

Go to a Caterpillar plant. Talk to the men and women who have spent their lives making the best tractors in the world. Ask them if watching the overvalued dollar drive their jobs overseas, has made them proud.

Ask the American worker who has foregone a rise or taken a payout to protect his job, only to see it disappear offshore. Ask him if he feels pride in an overvalued dollar.

Or ask Eastman Kodak Co. if achieving a 13-percent increase in productivity in 1 year and then watching a rise in the dollar swamp that gain makes them feel proud.

Ask the millions of Americans who have lost jobs to imports if they feel pride in the overvalue of the dollar.

The answer, Mr. President, would be a resounding "No."

The American farmer, the American manufacturer, and the American worker all cry out in pain. The pain of lost sales, lost profits, lost jobs—lost not because of inefficiency or rising costs, but because this President's policies have put a tax on the products they try to ship overseas.

Yes, a tax. President Reagan talks a great deal about cutting taxes. But his policies have imposed an insidious, a hidden, and unfair tax—a disguised tax. The overvalued dollar is a tax on exports just as surely as any direct levy.

We say to the President: You shall not crucify the American worker on the cross of an overvalued dollar.

Mr. President, this administration's attitude toward the dollar has imposed costs beyond our borders as well.

This administration spends time and energy arguing for military aid to encourage democracy in Latin America. It should spend some time worrying about the destabilizing effect of a 4-year rise in the dollar. As the dollar's value rises, so does the cost of oil, the size of their debt, and the interest burden of the LDC's. We want democracy to flourish, but we impose dreadful economic costs which in turn cause political tensions. This makes no sense.

Mr. President, this is not the time for a smile or a wink; it is not the time to pretend the problem will take care of itself.

Just 2 weeks ago, Secretary of State Shultz discussed the disadvantages of the high dollar—both to us and to our trading partners. He attributed half the deterioration of our trade position to the overvalued dollar. He did not think the problem would go away by itself.

Last week, the Senate Finance Committee held hearings on the exchange rate question. We heard economists, labor leaders, and business leaders talk about the problems caused by exchange rate volatility and currency misalignment. We heard from a great many people, but none of them believed the problem would just go away by itself.

This is a time to face reality. Reducing the budget deficit is a necessary and crucial step—but it is not the only step. It is time to recognize we live in a global economy. It is time to recognize that massive capital flows swamp and in fact may drive trade flows. It is time to cooperate with our allies.

That is why my colleagues and I offer this resolution. We call on the President to attend the Bonn summit committed to beginning a discussion about reducing currency misalignments and exchange rate volatility.

To use a favorite quote of the President's: "If not now, when. If not us, who."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. Res. 151

Whereas the President's Council of Economic Advisers has reported that the real rate of exchange of the dollar increased by almost 60 percent between 1980 and 1984;

Whereas the Congressional Budget Office and the President's Council of Economic Advisers have stated that the large budget deficit has been a major cause of the high interest rates which they report have been a major cause of this increase in the real rate of exchange of the dollar;

Whereas this overvaluation of the dollar acts as a tax on American exports and a subsidy for foreign imports;

Whereas this overvaluation has resulted in the loss of an estimated two million American jobs since 1980—approximately 1.5 million of them in the manufacturing sector;

Whereas America's traditional strength in agricultural exports has been seriously eroded by the overvaluation of the dollar, with the result that the President's Council of Economic Advisers estimates that American agricultural exports have declined by about \$8.5 billion from the levels of three years ago;

Whereas currency misalignments, including the overvaluation of the dollar, have led to major competitive dislocations in the United States and world economies and have increased trade tensions between the United States and its trading partners; and

Whereas those critical currency issues have been largely ignored in the Administration's approach to international discussions of economic and trade policy: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that a decrease in the Federal deficit is a necessary but not a sufficient condition to bring down the value of the dollar and that the President should at the Bonn Summit initiate a preliminary discussion on the problem of currency misalignments, exchange rate volatility, and possible cooperative approaches to these problems.

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

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each, not to extend beyond 10 a.m.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I understand at 10 o'clock we are back on Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 and the pending amendment. There are 2 hours on that pending amendment. If no one yields time, time will run on the amendment, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOLE. Then, from 12 o'clock until 2 o'clock will be the Republicans and Democrats having their Tuesday policy luncheons.

At approximately 2 o'clock we will lay down the final amendment. There is 1 hour on that amendment, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOLE. As I understand, on that amendment it makes no difference who would yield time. I would not be in a position of having less time than

the minority side. That would not be relevant at that point. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it would be my hope that sometime in the late afternoon we could have a vote. But, obviously, if someone wants to use time on the resolution, we would not vote today or tomorrow. As I have indicated, in those circumstances we are using time so at least that is getting us to the goal of using up the 50 hours. I had hoped that we might vote today.

I have been asked by a number of my colleagues about the schedule for the remainder of the week. I think it will probably be fairly hectic, probably coming in early in the morning—8:30 or 9 o'clock—and staying late at night, speaking of Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. I am not certain about Saturday. It depends upon whether we are nearing the end or not.

I have not discussed this with either Senator DOMENICI or Senator CHILES, but I do not think there is any likelihood to finish by Friday. We could if we stayed all night a couple of nights, but I am not certain that would be productive. In any event, it is the hope of the majority leader that we could have a vote and that will be followed, I assume, by 60-some amendments with one or two votes in the next 2 days followed by maybe 30 or 40 votes.

I would also thank my colleagues for their willingness to let us take care of the Ortega resolution last evening, condemning the visit to Moscow. We have seen some reference to it in the newspapers and on television.

We think it is of great concern, which is the important thing. The resolution was sponsored by myself, the distinguished minority leader, and others. It passed with a voice vote without dissent, so far as I am aware. In my view, it is an important resolution. It indicates that the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, are concerned about Ortega's visits, are concerned about additional bailouts by Moscow, are concerned about the activities in Central America. Whether or not it is reported, downplayed, or ignored by most of the media is probably insignificant.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, was the order recognizing the minority leader for 10 minutes under the standing order reserved for me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was. Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

HERB LITTLE STATEHOUSE DEAN

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the dean of the West Virginia statehouse press corps, Herb Little, will be retiring next

month after covering the West Virginia Legislature for almost 35 years.

Herb Little began covering the West Virginia Legislature in 1951, the year that I began serving in the West Virginia Senate. After 35 years of reporting on the legislature, Herb is the senior mind of statehouse journalists, and a natural resource for reporters looking for guidance on parliamentary procedure or legislative history.

We will miss Herb's statehouse reports, but we wish him well in his retirement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Charleston Gazette on Herb Little's career be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

STATEHOUSE "DEAN" LEAVING MARBLE HALLS
(By Bill Case)

Herb Little says he's a "low blood pressure type guy." Apparently, that's the only kind of person who could survive 35 years at the West Virginia Capitol and live to laugh about it.

Little, head of The Associated Press bureau at the Capitol, strolled into the marble halls of the state Supreme Court for the first time in 1950 on assignment from the wire service. "I had never been in any kind of court before, not even a J.P. (justice of the peace) court," he recalls. "I didn't have the foggiest idea what was going on."

The dean of the Statehouse press corps will retire May 4, leaving behind a trail of cigar smoke and a score or so of younger media types who now do the jobs he and three others held down in the 1950s.

Only a few longtime staff people who were there for Little's first days remain on the job. "I'm covering the sons of the senators and delegates who were here, and the sons of the lawyers at the Supreme Court," he said. "But when the third generation started showing up, I decided it was time to hang it up."

Little got a job with his hometown newspaper, the Parkersburg Sentinel, after he was discharged from the Army in 1946. Later that year, AP hired him to staff a one-man bureau in Bluefield.

He was transferred to Charleston in 1950, and has attended every legislative session since 1951 as an AP writer.

It wasn't easy to write about what the Legislature was doing in the 1950s, because almost every important decision was made behind closed doors. Little says,

"All the committee hearings were closed, and you couldn't get minutes or a roll call. The only way to find out what was going on was to find someone who would leak it to you, and hope they would tell you the truth. It wasn't an ideal way to cover a legislature."

Little says it was easy to find people to claim credit for legislation which was reported out of committees. But when a bill was killed in secret, "It was pretty hard to pin down who did it."

The legislators, in general, are better informed about what they are doing than in the past, in part due to better staff support, he says. But the last-minute crunch is still the same. "People pass legislation on the basis of sketchy oral information provided by a member of the conference committee.

It's not uncommon to find mistakes a week or two weeks later."

Despite this year's budget fiasco, Little says, "It's a lot less harried than usual around here."

While some find the sessions interminable, Little says he enjoys the Legislature. "I'll miss it. I've generally had a pretty good relationship with the legislators, although it's been a basically adversarial one. A lot of them seem to me to be hypersensitive to what's being written about them."

Several times, he adds, new members of the House or Senate have sought him out for background information about issues. But unlike some who would jump at the chance to tell a legislator how they saw things, the encounters apparently made Little uneasy. "I always would lean over backward to avoid taking positions," he says.

The Statehouse press corps in Little's early days consisted of one reporter each from AP, United Press, and the two Charleston papers. Today, each of those organizations sends two or more people to the Capitol, joined by representatives of several other newspapers and a number of radio and television stations.

The competition between the two wire services has been unabated over his 35 years, Little says. "The only advantage I might have over younger reporters is what I have in my head," he says. "I might not be able to get a story they couldn't get, but I could get it faster because I'd know where to look."

But he says the competition, and the hectic pace which often develops at the Capitol, doesn't get to him. "It's a matter of temperament. I'm kind of a low-blood-pressure type guy. Stress doesn't bother me," he says. "It would be really unfortunate if we shook down in just one wire service. The competition is part of the job."

Little plans to spend the summer reading, traveling, and "spending more time than anybody should watching baseball on television."

"But I'm not going to spend my retirement on the porch in a rocking chair," he adds. "Next fall I'm going to look for some part-time work. I don't think I'd enjoy staying fully retired."

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV'S FUTURE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, even before Mr. Chernenko's demise, some members of the Western media corps were fulsome in their praise and admiration of the Soviet heir-apparent, Mikhail Gorbachev. Reporters and newsmen were not alone in their twitteration. One Tory member of the British House of Commons went so far as to compare Gorbachev and his wife to President and Mrs. John Kennedy.

Now that Mr. Gorbachev has been officially elevated to the apex of the Soviet state apparatus, global conjecture about the directions he will take in domestic and foreign affairs continues. As in his preselection period, most of those conjectures are based on Mr. Gorbachev's perceived charm, much of which is, in turn, based on his talents in manipulating his hosts and joking with reporters. Rare as those qualities have been in recent Soviet leaders,

they do not, in fact, justify some of the more sanguine assessments of future Soviet-American relations that have been offered in some quarters. So far, Mr. Gorbachev has proved primarily again that style can temporarily obscure substance.

America's dealings with the new Soviet leader should be founded on reality, however, not on fantasy, wishful thinking, or public relations. Mr. Hoyt Purvis contributes significantly to that reality in a recent article of his that appeared in the Springdale News of Springdale, AR. His article is entitled "Gorbachev: Soviet Change More Style Than Substance." The director of the Fulbright Institute of International Relations at the University of Arkansas, Hoyt Purvis has had long prior service as a Senate staff member—as a matter of fact, having been on the Democratic Policy Committee staff for quite a long time—and as an adviser and participant in defining and shaping foreign policy issues.

I recommend Mr. Purvis' article on Mikhail Gorbachev for its comprehensive, lucid, and analytic thought, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

GORBACHEV: SOVIET CHANGE MORE STYLE
THAN SUBSTANCE
(Hoyt Purvis)

No sooner had Mikhail Gorbachev emerged as the new general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party than he was being described in the Western media and by some analysts as a "moderate."

Such a description seems to be based partially on wishful thinking, partially on Gorbachev's comparatively youthful appearance and style, and much less on the basis of any hard data about Gorbachev's views or the likely direction of his policies.

It is possible that Gorbachev may prove to be a moderate, at least in relation to his predecessors. He does represent a new generation of Soviet leadership and there are reasons to believe that this generation may try to do some things differently. But these instantaneous assessments of Gorbachev are more indicative of how style is often given as much or more weight than substance, how much depends on personal and public relations in international affairs as well as in domestic politics.

In many ways international politics and the arms race have become a public relations contest. That doesn't make these matters any less critical, it doesn't reduce the potential destructiveness of nuclear weapons—it simply means that packaging sometimes counts for as much as the product. It also means that the Soviets may be doing better for a while in the international public relations competition. Gorbachev is off to a good start in this regard, but at this stage it is relatively easy for him to look good, primarily because he is being contrasted to those who have gone before him in recent years—that tired, tottering parade of Soviet senior citizens.

Gorbachev received rave notices when he made his Western debut in London in December. Accustomed to bland Soviet leaders,

British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and others were much impressed with Gorbachev, and almost equally, it seemed, by his svelte spouse, Raisa, who was so different from the stereotype of the Russian woman. Last week, one British politician, a conservative member of Parliament, went so far as to compare the Gorbachevs to John and Jackie Kennedy, in what must rank as one of the least profound analyses of the season.

Gorbachev's trip to London before becoming the top man is likely to be only the first of several major visits to the West. He has reportedly accepted invitations to both France and West Germany, and can be expected to intensify the Soviet effort to win points with America's allies and to pull them toward a somewhat more neutral position between the two superpowers, or at least a position less obviously anti-Soviet. There might well be a renewal of the Soviet peace offensive of the early 1980s—depending upon what is happening at the Geneva arms talks—but perhaps the public relations offensive will be handled more adroitly this time. The Soviets badly overplayed their hand in the previous effort to drive a wedge between the United States and Western Europe. Ultimately, of course, there is likely to be a summit meeting between Gorbachev and Reagan when both sides believe there are clear benefits to be gained.

The atmospherics, the political and public relations environment, have to be right, and there are indications that such an environment is gradually developing. When President Reagan says, "The Soviet Union is in a different frame of mind than it was in the past," he might also be indicating that he is in a different frame of mind that he was in the past.

But Gorbachev has many problems to worry about besides summit meetings, and unless he is able to deal effectively with some of those and to consolidate his hold within the country, he won't be in much of a position to engage in high-stakes diplomacy. He will have his hands full dealing with domestic problems and with neighboring countries.

It is not at all clear how much flexibility and autonomy Gorbachev will have. Andrei Gromyko seems certain to remain a major foreign policy influence for awhile. Other Politburo members will obviously be closely scrutinizing the new leader's moves.

His first speech as top man was generic, but is probably an accurate indicator of where his emphasis must be. He stressed economic development and "law and order," and he must deal with the stagnation and corruption that have plagued the nation. For all the progress that the Soviets have made in developing their strategic capability, and the advances in certain scientific and technological areas, the Soviet economy is badly lagging. Perhaps Gorbachev is the man who can at least provide the leadership to grab hold of the aging Soviet infrastructure and shake it into a more modern state.

Certainly it will be interesting to contrast what Gorbachev and company attempt and accomplish in the Soviet Union in comparison to the remarkable changes being attempted under Deng Xiaoping and his team in China. Another question is how long the Soviets can keep the lid on in Eastern Europe, where in several spots the desire for more economic freedom simmers, and how this will affect the U.S.S.R. And there is the Afghanistan quagmire.

Gorbachev may bring some new crispness to the way Soviet government runs, and it

will be especially interesting to see the extent to which other "younger" figures will move into the Politburo and into other key positions.

It is clear that, for awhile at least, Gorbachev will put a new gloss on Soviet pronouncements and public relations, but dramatic changes, particularly in foreign policy, seem unlikely. The Soviet policy on arms control, for example, is rather clearly established, and Gorbachev has already fired a few salvos against President Reagan's proposed "Star Wars" system.

Gorbachev is, after all, a product of the Soviet system and he did not earn his stripes by being unorthodox. But perceptions, personal style and atmospherics can be important in international affairs, and because they are, Gorbachev is potentially well positioned to bring about internal and external change.

THE INSPIRATION OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, 120 years ago this month, on April 15, 1865, President Abraham Lincoln died from an assassin's bullet. It is just and honorable that we take a few minutes today to remember the man and the President, and what he meant to America.

We remember President Lincoln for his compassion: "With malice toward none, with charity for all," he declared.

We remember the awesome burden that fell upon this gentle man during the darkest days in the history of our Nation: "We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last best hope of Earth," he lamented.

We remember the torturous dilemmas that President Lincoln encountered as he sought to preserve this "last, best hope." "Don't it seem strange," he remarked, "that I, who could never so much as cut off the head of a chicken, should be elected * * * into the midst of all this blood." During the last year of the Civil War, while the North and South were still locked in mortal combat, Lincoln pondered the irrationality of such a conflict: "Both (sides in the conflict) read the same Bible and pray to the same God, and each invokes His aid against the other."

We remember Lincoln for the complex man that he was. The poet and Lincoln biographer Carl Sandburg commemorated Lincoln as "a man * * * both steel and velvet * * * hard as rock and soft as drifting fog."

"Honest Abe," we call him now—the "Great Emancipator" who preserved the union and freed the slaves, and whose example still inspires and directs us.

But we also should remember that the "Great Emancipator" was not always regarded in such glowing, appreciative terms. For example, like most politicians, the 16th President had his troubles with the press. "Most of America's leading newspapers," wrote historian David Donald, "were

anti-Lincoln in 1860, and they remained anti-Lincoln till April 15, 1865. They berated Lincoln in a way that makes even the anti-Roosevelt campaigns of our own day seem mild."

I point out that Lincoln was not universally admired in his day in order to remind my colleagues that Lincoln was indeed a mortal. He was a human being who had his faults and problems. Still, he is remembered as the great man who rose out of poverty to accomplish so many noble deeds, including recognizing the establishment of my own State of West Virginia.

Today, Lincoln is all around us, not only in spirit, but in physical testimonies to his greatness. At the other end of the mall stands the Lincoln Memorial. A few blocks away is Lincoln Park. Statues and busts and portraits of Lincoln saturate this city, the seat of the most powerful Government on Earth, and this building, the Capitol of the United States.

The life and work of this man have inspired more writings than any other American.

Fortunately, thanks in considerable measure to the efforts of President Lincoln, the Union is still intact. But we face problems today that are just as challenging and significant, and in some cases deadly. And we, like Lincoln, are only human. As we confront them, we will not do wrong by following his example, and heeding his warning to Congress: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We will be remembered in spite of ourselves."

We, too, in our own time and in our own way, will "nobly save, or meanly lose, this last, best hope." In the manner in which we approach this grave but wonderful challenge, to paraphrase the words of Phillip Brooks: "May God make us worthy of the memory of Abraham Lincoln."

STATEMENTS BY AFGHAN LEADERS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the April 1985 issue of the Journal of Defense and Diplomacy includes an interview with three Afghan resistance leaders. I call my colleagues' attention to this article because it offers a good deal of insight into the motives and strategy of the brave Afghan resistance fighters. As one officer says:

We do not ask the British, French, Americans, or anybody else to take rifles and fight. . . . We are asking for material, moral, and political aid.

The commitment of the Afghan people is evident from the words of their leaders. They rely on our help in pressuring the Soviet Union to the bargaining table. We can do no less than to pay attention to their plea for help. I encourage my colleagues to read this interview. It is an inspiration and a solemn reminder of the price of

freedom. I ask unanimous consent that the interview be printed in the RECORD.

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

AFGHAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS

Hassan Gallani is the chief military commander of the freedom fighters of the National Islamic Front of Afghanistan. Gallani has been credited with launching the first anti-Communist armed resistance in Afghanistan. Brig. Rahmatullah Safi and Wali Khan are his right-hand men.

Brig. Rahmatullah Safi is the military adviser to the National Islamic Front of Afghanistan under the leadership of Pier Sayad Gallani, Hassan Gallani's uncle. The staff officer in charge of military plans and training, Brig. Safi was a leader of the 1983 to 1984 offensive in the border provinces of Paktia and Paktika, southwest of Kabul. Part of his military training was received with U.S. Army Special Forces at Fort Bragg and with Britain's Special Air Services. He has also had commando training in the Soviet Union.

Prior to the 1979 Soviet invasion, Brig. Safi was Chief of Special Forces of the Royal Afghan Army. After the Communist coup, he was imprisoned for two years and was tortured two to three times a week. Upon his release, he joined the Afghan resistance movement.

Under Brig. Safi's direction, the combat readiness of the Afghan freedom fighters has been substantially increased. Specializing in small unit hit-and-run tactics, his men have succeeded in severely punishing the Soviet and Afghan armies.

Wali Khan is a general commander of the Mohaz freedom fighters in Kabul. After graduating from the University of Kabul, he became an administrator for the U.N. Refugee Program in Afghanistan. Khan and his brother, Hassan Khorohkel, were both instrumental in Operation Blackout, the largest sabotage operation by the freedom fighters against the Soviets since the war began. Operation Blackout left two-thirds of the city of Kabul without power.

JODD. What is the current state of affairs in Afghanistan?

BRIG. SAFI. Things in Afghanistan are generally miserable, though we have had some success militarily. From the military point of view, our freedom fighters gain more experience; with time, they reduce their losses. We have been able to give good economic and psychological damage to the Soviets, and the Soviets are still not able to control the heart of the Afghan people. The government takes everybody—the old, the young—into the army, but once they are in, they run away and join the mujahideen. That is the mark of our success.

As the Soviets have not been able to find the strongholds of the freedom fighters, they have changed their tactics. Now they attack all over the country—they kill civilians, burn crops—which makes life impossible for the people. I believe that is because the biggest ally of the freedom fighter is always the local people. Food from the local people, intelligence from them, accommodation from them, so many things. Always the local people. Because of this the Soviets want to make life difficult for the freedom fighters. As the Soviets kill children, women, the elderly, destroy villages and force the survivors to be refugees, there is no more support. As time goes by, the result becomes clear.

JODD. As the Soviets continue this policy of "scorched earth," how can your movement combat this? How can you survive against this kind of tactic?

BRIG. SAFI. This is the main reason we have come to the United States. We are not here to enjoy Washington. Our minds are still in Afghanistan. We are here to see if we have allies, to see if there is a free world ready to defend democracy and freedom. We believe we are not only fighting Afghanistan but for you, too. If you also believe this, then this is the time. We don't ask the British, French, Americans or anybody else to take rifles and fight. That is our job.

We are not being suicidal. We are happy to be alive. But now is the time for Washington to make decisions. If Afghanistan is to be a political gift to the Soviets, then the killing is for nothing, the genocide for nothing. If not, let them take it seriously—militarily and politically. People [in the West] say they give military aid. We do not see the aid. Is the West afraid of the Soviets? We are asking for material, moral and political aid. Now is the time to tell the Soviets, "You are savages. Stop." If somebody wants to stop the Soviets, it is in Afghanistan that it can be done.

JODD. How will the West's supplying of arms halt the Soviets' scorched earth atrocities from driving out the population?

BRIG. SAFI. Let the Soviets continue to come. We will continue to fight them. We have never said that if you give us the weapons we will throw the Soviets out. But we will surely give you the chance to force them to the negotiating table. If they continue to lose men, to lose equipment as we continue to fight, they can be forced to talk. In London in 1979 I was there, and all the British experts thought we would collapse in a fortnight. We are still fighting.

JODD. You are saying, then, that the longer you can prolong the fight, the more political and moral support you can muster to force them to the table?

BRIG. SAFI. First, the Soviets have been told more than 15 times by the majority of western nations that they must pull out. This happens because we fight, because there is still a national will in Afghanistan. That is the proof. If we don't fight, how can we win support? Secondly, yesterday, all over the world everyone was saying that the U.S. was imperialist and that the Soviets were the great peace-lovers. Today, after Afghanistan, after we fight and people see what the Soviets really are, it's the other way around.

KHAN. We are not able to push out the Soviets by the use of direct force due to the geographical position of the two countries and other factors. Nor can we claim that if we receive sufficient weapons and food we can stop them from destroying villages and so forth. But if we can get sufficient support, those Soviet activities will get very expensive. We could limit their invulnerabilities—get into a better position to put pressure on them and bring them to the table. If they know they would lose one fighter for every house they take, they will not do it. If they are sure that if they destroy a particular village they would lose 50 tanks and 10 or even five fighters, then they won't do it. They are counting and worrying about losses, too.

JODD. How many Cubans are there in Afghanistan?

KHAN. Cubans were seen in the north and southwest of Afghanistan back in 1982. Currently they are mainly advisers to Kabul commando units, as well as to some other

special forces units—not so much to the regular army. There is also one division of Bulgarians. There are groups from several of the Soviet ethnic nations within the Soviet empire.

JODD. After the cutting of power to Kabul by your forces during Operation Blackout, what is the current state of availability of electrical power to Kabul?

KHAN. Kabul had 220,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power from three plants. The lines from these three plants were cut as a result of Operation Blackout. According to our sources, the government has only temporarily repaired one line in the past six months. As they were finishing repairs, one of our groups attacked again. It will be some time before Kabul has all its electrical power.

JODD. How effective is the Afghan army?

BRIG. SAFI. It is not trusted by the Soviets.

KHAN. The army of the Karmal regime is only for show. Government soldiers are seen by day in Kabul as sentries and watchmen, but the army is not used for much else. Even in combat situations they are usually only used because they are familiar with the terrain, as just a buffer to the front line. They are not even really trusted in Kabul city. Even on patrol in the streets they must have the Soviets behind them. The soldiers in the Afghan army have been taken from villages and the streets and put into the army by force. They are always seeking an opportunity to escape—to join the freedom fighters or just get away.

JODD. What is your level of recruitment? How many men do you have coming in?

BRIG. SAFI. We don't need to recruit. This is not a war of ideology where we have to make people come to fight with us to convince them that we are the right side. It is a war of national resistance. There is always a shortage of weapons. This is the real problem, not manpower. We can always get the men, but we must give them weapons with which to fight.

JODD. What kinds of weapons do you need? And how many?

BRIG. SAFI. It is very difficult to say how many. That depends on how quickly you want the Soviets to take us seriously. But we terribly need effective anti-aircraft weapons, useful weapons. Not merely machine guns and assault rifles. They are not very effective against jets and attack helicopters.

JODD. You appeared before a committee of the U.S. Congress. What do you want from the U.S. Congress particularly?

BRIG. SAFI. First, if they believe in freedom, they should seriously call on the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops from our country. Then, we want food, medicine and weapons to continue the fight to stop the bombardment, to stop the genocide. What we are asking for are American anti-aircraft missiles. We are asking for American medicine. We are asking for American guns. We are asking for American doctors and medical equipment. We are asking for American food.

JODD. There are concerns in the United States that some of the equipment meant for your forces doesn't get through. If the United States makes a commitment but the pipeline remains unchanged, that will be a serious problem.

BRIG. SAFI. Our job is to better organize, hurt the enemy and train our freedom fighters. But we are not in a position to know how much aid is coming in the first place. Is the aid really here, or is it KGB propaganda? We receive much "help," but we have nothing—just the sandals on our

feet. It is psychological warfare against our organization. You should not start from our end—you must start at the suppliers' end and follow from there.

JODD. Are you satisfied with the aid and level of support from other Muslim nations, considering that you have declared your struggle to be a jihad? There does not seem to be an enormous degree of help from any of them. Does this concern you?

Brig. SAFI. I have heard that some aid is coming from the fundamentalists to some mujahideen fundamentalist groups because of the ideological ties. They want to export their ideology. Our ideology is based on the ideology of the people of Afghanistan, on nationalism. If you ask refugees in the camps, "What do you want?" they reply the same as we commanders do: we want our country back, we want to go home. We are adding one more goal besides getting rid of the Soviet Union: the future of the state of Afghanistan must be in the hands of the people of Afghanistan. We don't want to import and impose on them any foreign ideology.

JODD. So, the fundamentalists in the Muslim world are not giving aid to the whole resistance movement?

Brig. SAFI. No, unfortunately for us.

GAILANI. They don't consider all of us to be true Muslims.

JODD. Has the coordination between the various freedom fighter groups improved?

GAILANI. You could say that in Afghanistan all the freedom fighters are cooperating with each other. There were some problems among some groups, but they have decreased a lot. It is not that much of a problem. They are united and fighting the same enemy.

JODD. Are there combined operations, or do the groups each work in their own general area?

GAILANI. Mostly, if they have a plan, they do it themselves. If we have a plan, we do it ourselves. But when the enemy attacks somewhere we are not aware of, then everybody stands together against it.

JODD. But there is no actual coordination.

GAILANI. At the present time, that is true.

JODD. What about sharing of supplies?

KHAN. There are some instances of sharing. If one group runs out of ammunition, we supply what we can. As far as the overall politics are concerned, the groups fighting in Afghanistan will be united whenever the source of aid is united. The aid is scattered now.

JODD. If a supplier makes a condition that all aid be distributed equally to all the groups, would that be feasible and workable?

KHAN. If there is to be a unification of all the groups, then it will happen overnight. In the past, some donors have stated that if some of the major resistance groups join together, they would cut off the assistance. So the groups were forced to reject that assistance. We complain that the aid is sometimes used to keep us divided. If this is relaxed, we could get together very easily.

Brig. SAFI. We are brothers. We are Afghans. We have one enemy.

JODD. Is this a struggle you can win?

Brig. SAFI. We must win. We have no alternative. This is our land—it belongs to us. We have no choice.

NATIONAL SEWER GRANTS REDUCED FOR GREAT LAKES STATES

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, yesterday I was shocked to learn of a propos-

al to drastically reduce the Federal funds that will be made available to Great Lakes States for the construction of sewage treatment facilities.

I have been informed that the average Great Lakes State will receive 18 percent less from our National Sewer Grants Program. This comes at a time when many municipalities are in the middle of major construction programs.

For my home State, Wisconsin, the Environment and Public Works Committee proposal would reduce sewer grant funds by 20 percent.

This proposal is totally unacceptable. It is yet another case of where the Federal Government is treating the Great Lakes like an ugly stepchild.

I hope that during the Environment and Public Works Committee markup of the Clean Water Act tomorrow that this proposal is not adopted, and that a more equitable allocation of these essential dollars prevails.

Unfortunately, this failure of the Federal Government to give adequate attention to the Nation's most important freshwater resource is not unique. The United States has failed to live up to its obligations under the water quality agreement with Canada, and failed to provide essential management on several other fronts.

In 1982 the General Accounting Office issued a strong document calling for the Environmental Protection Agency and Congress to take major steps to improve U.S. efforts to clean up the Great Lakes and live up to our obligations under the water quality agreement.

The report cited three key failures of our efforts to manage the Great Lakes. Those three shortcomings are: First, the lack of an effective overall strategy for dealing with Great Lakes water quality problems, second, the lack of knowledge about the extent of pollution problems and the impact of control programs, and third, the need for improved management of Great Lakes pollution cleanup activities.

One of the major reasons for our not meeting the obligations under the Water Quality Agreement is the slow progress on the completion of municipal sewage treatment facilities. While virtually all of the Canadian municipalities have adequate sewage treatment facilities, progress on completing U.S. municipal sewer programs has been totally inadequate.

The amendment the Environment and Public Works Committee will consider tomorrow is a giant step backward. At a time when we are facing tremendous challenges in protecting the Nation's most important freshwater resource we should not be reducing the funds for sewer programs, but should be moving ahead to take a comprehensive approach to the management of the Great Lakes.

I hope the committee will reject this new formula at tomorrow's meeting.

Mr. President, I would like to have printed at this point in the RECORD the section from the GAO report entitled "A More Comprehensive Approach Is Needed to Clean Up the Great Lakes," describing the shortcomings of our progress in completing work on municipal sewers around the lakes.

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

U.S. GREAT LAKES WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES ARE NOT BEING FULLY MET

Although in 1978 the United States committed itself to a comprehensive program to control Great Lakes pollution, the lakes continue to experience eutrophication (aging) and toxic pollution problems because:

Controlling municipal pollution sources continues to lag behind schedule;

Phosphorous, a major factor in controlling lake eutrophication, is not being completely controlled and control efforts may not be properly focused;

Little attention has been directed to non-point sources of lake pollution;

The extent and sources of toxic pollution remain undefined, and an overall toxic control strategy has not been developed; and

Comprehensive, effective surveillance and monitoring activities needed to determine water quality conditions and trends and assess pollution control efforts have not been developed and implemented.

Although progress is being made in cleaning up the Great Lakes, the United States has experienced many difficulties in attempting to meet its water quality agreement commitments. The lack of information about the nature, source, and extent of lake pollution from some substances, funding constraints, and other factors have all hindered U.S. efforts. If the United States is to meet its commitments to protect the Great Lakes, however, greater and more comprehensive efforts will be needed.

CONTROLLING MUNICIPAL POLLUTION SOURCES CONTINUES TO LAG BEHIND SCHEDULE

From 1972 to February 1981, the United States spent about \$4.9 billion in Federal, State, and local funds to construct and upgrade municipal sewage facilities to treat wastewater discharges to the lakes, but more remains to be done. The Nation will not meet the December 31, 1982, agreement goal for adequate treatment of all municipal sewage discharges to the lakes. In addition, discharges from combined sewers (sewers that carry municipal wastewater along with storm runoff) continue to be a major source of lake pollution, but little funding or effort has been directed to controlling these discharges. Ambitious agreement timetables, difficulties in obtaining funding, and treatment plant operational problems, among other factors, have all contributed to the difficulties in controlling municipal pollution sources.

SEWAGE TREATMENT GOALS WILL NOT BE MET

The Water Quality Agreements require the United States to (1) construct and operate waste treatment facilities to provide adequate treatment for the sewered population in the U.S. portion of the Great Lakes Basin, (2) provide financial resources to ensure prompt construction of needed facilities, and (3) establish pretreatment requirements for industrial plants discharging waste into municipal systems. We reported in March 1975 that the United States had

made substantial progress with its municipal point source control program, but that much remained to be done. That continues to be the case today.

A goal of the 1972 agreement was that the municipal point source control programs in both Canada and the United States would be either completed or in process by December 31, 1975. We reported in 1975 that the United States would not realize this goal. We further reported that, at that time, only about 60 percent of the U.S. sewer population had adequate treatment compared with about 98 percent for Canada.

When the Governments negotiated the 1978 agreement, they established December 31, 1982, as the new goal for completion of municipal point source control programs, including the requirement for providing adequate treatment. In the United States, the Clean Water Act, as amended, requires publicly owned treatment works to provide a minimum of secondary treatment with more stringent treatment to be provided if secondary treatment would be insufficient to protect water quality. Meeting the requirement for secondary treatment satisfies the 1978 agreement requirement for adequate municipal treatment.

In its Seventh Annual Report on Great Lakes Water Quality, issued October 1980, IJC reported that only 64 percent (compared with 60 percent in 1975) of the sewer population in the U.S. portion of the basin has adequate sewage treatment, compared to 99 percent for Canada. In that report, EPA estimated that completion of treatment facilities under construction should provide 99 percent of the U.S. sewer population with adequate treatment by 1983. We found, however, that a significant number of municipal plants on the Great Lakes will not be completed in time to meet the agreement goal of December 31, 1982. EPA's own estimates (see app. III) show that 31 percent of all major municipal treatment facilities on the lower Great Lakes will not be completed until 1983 or later. At the same time, however, EPA points out that the unfinished facilities represent only about 15 percent of the total municipal sewage flow from major facilities into the lower lakes.

In addition, the completion of municipal treatment plants does not in itself guarantee that adequate treatment will be provided. For example, in a 1980 report¹ on wastewater treatment plants, we found that municipal facilities nationwide were experiencing severe problems limiting their ability to treat waste. These problems included plant design and equipment deficiencies, defective sewer systems allowing infiltration of ground water that overloads existing facilities, industry waste that is not compatible with the plant's treatment system process, and operation and maintenance deficiencies. We reported that inadequate operation and maintenance of the 242 municipal plants sampled nationwide resulted in such repeated violations of discharge permits²

that the violations constituted the norm rather than the exception. Using the sampling data in that report, we determined that 22 (85 percent) of the 26 sampled municipal dischargers in the Great Lakes Basin violated their discharge permits at least 1 month during the 12-month study period. Further analysis showed that 35 percent of the 26 sampled plants were, in our opinion, in serious violation of the permit discharge limits for biochemical oxygen demand, total suspended solids, or total phosphorus.

According to the GLNPO director and staff, several reasons exist for the delays in completing adequate treatment facilities in the United States. They stated that (1) unrealistic timetables were set to pressure the Governments to take action, (2) larger, more complex facilities are needed in the United States than in Canada because of greater population and industrialization, thereby necessitating a longer time frame, and (3) lack of expertise among State and local recipients in handling construction grant funds impeded efforts to assess treatment needs and design the types of facilities needed to correct pollution problems. An official with the Ohio EPA cited several reasons for the program slippage in Ohio, including the time required to obtain Federal construction grants, construction problems, and the lack of support by municipal officials for the construction of treatment facilities at a time when other pollution sources are not being controlled.

While many factors have limited the pace of construction for waste treatment facilities, EPA believes that funding limits have also slowed construction. For example, when a large Federal grants program made funds available to local communities to use in completing construction of waste treatment facilities, the communities were no longer willing to construct facilities using only local funds. In addition, faced with limited funds, States were not funding low-priority projects—typically the large number of small plants that will fail to meet the December 31, 1982, deadline.

From 1972 through February 1981, almost \$4.9 billion in Federal, State, and local funds was provided for municipal sewerage construction in the Great Lakes Basin. (App. IV shows municipal wastewater treatment plant construction funding by State.) Actions being taken to reduce the Federal budget, however, could affect the already extended dates for completing municipal projects in the Great Lakes Basin. For fiscal year 1980, actual funding for the construction grants program nationwide was \$3.4 billion, \$1.6 billion less than the \$5 billion authorized. Furthermore, as part of his economic recovery program, the President proposed, and the Congress agreed, to rescind \$1.7 billion in previously appropriated but unobligated construction grant funds. Also, on December 29, 1981, the President signed Public Law 97-117, the Municipal Wastewater Treatment Construction Grant Amendments of 1981. This act amended the construction grant provisions of the Clean Water Act to, among other things, authorize appropriations of \$2.4 billion for fiscal years 1982-85 for the grants program. EPA's fiscal year 1982 appropriation does not include funding for the program, but the administration requested \$2.4 billion for fiscal year 1982. How much of this money, if appropriated, will go for Great Lakes projects is not known.

The 1978 agreement also requires the United States to establish pretreatment requirements for industrial wastes being dis-

charged into municipal treatment systems where such wastes are not amenable to adequate treatment or removal using conventional wastewater treatment processes. In a 1982 report⁴ on EPA's industrial pretreatment program, we reported that although the program was authorized in 1972, it has yet to be fully implemented. We found that the overall scope and impact of the program remains undefined; the program may result in costly, inequitable, and/or redundant treatment which may not address critical pollution problems; and the program will be a further drain on scarce Federal, State, and local pollution control resources. In addition, we found that the program is undergoing a regulatory review analysis and EPA has proposed that the effective date for program implementation be postponed indefinitely.

LIMITED PROGRESS IN CONTROLLING COMBINED SEWER DISCHARGES

To avoid overloading treatment facilities, combined sewer systems divert part of the storm flows directly into waterways. Combined sewers have caused pollution resulting in beach closures; health hazards; fish kills; and unsightly conditions in rivers, harbors, and bays. Although both the 1972 and 1978 water quality agreements addressed the need to control this problem, limited progress has been made, primarily because the structural solutions proposed are very expensive and EPA has not emphasized alternatives control techniques. In addition, according to EPA, any funds available for controlling combined sewer discharges have instead been spent on waste treatment facilities for treatment of the more concentrated portion of wastewaters.

In 1976 IJC reported that overflows from combined sewers were reaching serious proportions and that accelerated control efforts were needed. In November 1980 IJC's Great Lakes Water Quality Board reported that, of 51 specific problem areas (hot spots) on the Great Lakes, 20 had serious combined sewer overflows. Our analysis of these 20 areas showed that the overflows were most severe on Lakes Erie and Ontario.

One reason for the limited progress made in controlling combined sewer problems is that structural solutions to the problems, such as catchment basins, are costly. EPA estimates that the Great Lakes Basin States will need \$8 billion to control combined sewer overflows—\$2 billion just in the Chicago area. In the past, little funding was directed to correcting overflow problems largely because States gave combined sewers low priority compared to other municipal treatment needs.

The adequacy of future funding to control combined sewer overflows is highly questionable. Beginning in fiscal year 1983, \$200 million a year is authorized for combined sewer projects nationwide, but the Great Lakes are ineligible for this funding as it only applies to projects which address water quality problems of marine bays and estuaries. Funding to address combined sewer problems in the Great Lakes will not be available until October 1, 1984, at which time the EPA Administrator is authorized to use construction grant funds for combined sewer overflow projects but only when such projects are major State priorities and the State Governor specifically requests the funding. Although a funding level of \$2.4

¹ The agreement also requires phosphorus effluent limitations for municipal wastewater treatment plants. Phosphorus control efforts are discussed on pp. 15-26.

² "Costly Wastewater Treatment Plants Fail To Perform as Expected" (CED-81-9, Nov. 1980).

³ All dischargers are required to have a permit issued by EPA or an EPA-approved State which specifies the pollutants that may be discharged and the limits on such discharges. The discharge permit is the principal enforcement mechanism for the water pollution program.

⁴ "A New Approach Is Needed for the Federal Industrial Wastewater Pretreatment Program" (CED-82-37, Feb. 19, 1982).

billion annually is expected for the construction grants program, it is important to note that this money will be competed for on a national basis. Consequently, the amount of money that will become available for combined sewer problems in the Great Lakes is uncertain.

In controlling pollution from combined sewers, the 1978 agreement emphasizes the adoption of practical solutions, but, as noted previously, the solutions usually proposed are costly, large-scale structural projects. In a 1979 report we noted that a number of innovative or alternative control techniques which promise in helping control overflows are available. These techniques include storing rainwater on rooftops, parking lots, and elsewhere; disconnecting downspouts; cleaning streets; and using devices to increase sewage flow and to regulate and treat sewage at overflow points. While no technique alone provides the same degree of improvement offered by structural changes, a number of techniques together could minimize overflows and reduce the size of the construction projects. In our report we recommended that EPA emphasize the use of inexpensive techniques and require communities to make maximum use of lower cost alternatives.

Until additional emphasis is placed on abating pollution from combined sewer overflows, the United States will not meet a major provision of the 1978 agreement. Furthermore, uncontrolled overflows from combined sewers will diminish the effectiveness of existing municipal sewage treatment programs in those metropolitan areas in the Great Lakes Basin experiencing overflow problems.

Mr. KASTEN. Finally, Mr. President, I would like to add three new cosponsors to S. 765, "The Great Lakes Management Act of 1985." This is legislation that provides for comprehensive environmental management of the Great Lakes. It corrects the piecemeal approach to efforts to manage the Nation's most important water resource by establishing an agency with the responsibility for assuring comprehensive management of the resource and defining specific responsibilities of the Federal agencies that participate in lakes management. I would like to add as cosponsors to S. 765 Senators STEVENS, MATHIAS, and DURENBERGER.

GREAT LAKES MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1985

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, today I am pleased to add my name as a cosponsor to S. 765, Senator KASTEN's bill, the Great Lakes Management Act of 1985.

This bill is vital to the integrity and future of the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes—Erie, Huron, Michigan, Ontario, and Superior—and the connecting channels from the Earth's largest fresh water lake system.

The lakes contain about 20 percent of the world's fresh surface water and over 95 percent of the U.S. fresh surface water supply for the contiguous 48 States.

The Great Lakes basin includes all of Michigan, parts of Illinois, Indiana,

Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and the Province of Ontario. It contains 20 percent of the total U.S. population and supports economic activity that accounts for 25 percent of the annual national income for the United States.

Twenty percent of all U.S. manufacturing occurs in the eight State region, including 70 percent of total U.S. steel production. In 1983 23.7 billion kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power was generated from Great Lakes water and 70 powerplants depend on the Great Lakes as their energy supply. International shipping provides \$3 billion of economic activity to the region.

The Great Lakes provide 36 percent of the municipal water supply for the eight Great Lake States; 26 million people depend on the Great Lakes for their drinking water. \$8 to \$12 billion are generated through recreation and tourism in the Great Lakes States, plus \$1.5 billion is generated through sports fishing. Approximately 8 million people visit one of the 12 national parks, either in the United States or Canada. Plus 55 million visit one of the 98 State parks established on the shores of one of the Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes have been viewed as a virtually inexhaustible supply of high-quality water. A water supply that is key to the economic development, stability and growth in the Great Lakes States. But like all great natural resources, the basin has a vulnerable and fragile ecosystem.

The lakes are an environmental "sink." Inflowing rivers and streams gather and deliver pollutants from the entire basin to the finite bodies of water. Toxic chemicals—released from long-buried and rusting containers, from fertilizers, and from improperly processed industrial and human waste—all find their way to one of the Great Lakes. Further, the very flow of the system, from Lake Superior to Michigan and Huron, and thence to Erie and Ontario, has gathered and concentrated the debris of society. Scientists are able to measure the changes as the waters flow from the nearly pristine Superior to heavily burdened Ontario.

During the last 200 years the lakes have been used for food, fresh water, for homes, farms, and industry, transportation, power generation, recreation and waste disposal. The region has felt the impacts of intensive agriculture, heavy industry and tourism.

The heavy demands have taken their toll. The water quality of the lakes has declined sharply over the years, and in some instances the damage is beyond repair. The natural ecological unity of the lake system is overlaid by local, State, and national boundaries which has made it difficult, at best, to implement an environmental protection and recovery pro-

gram to restore and enhance Great Lakes water quality.

In 1972 and again in 1978, the United States and Canada signed a Great Lakes water quality agreement. This agreement has gone a long way to heighten the awareness that a coordinated management approach is needed to protect and preserve the natural resources of the Great Lakes basin. Through this agreement, the Governments of Canada and the United States have held each other accountable for actions which affect the water quality of the Great Lakes as well as requiring that specific steps be taken to improve the water quality.

The Clean Water Act is the key vehicle to meet national and international water quality goals for the Great Lakes basin. The construction grant formula proposed by the Committee on Environment and Public Works is unduly biased against the Great Lakes region, and poses a serious threat to efforts to restore and enhance Great Lakes water quality.

This is just one example of the difficulties we face in providing for the management of the natural resources of the Great Lakes basin and with more than a dozen U.S. Federal agencies and eight States sharing management responsibilities, clearly, there is room for improvement. What is needed is a coordinated approach to Great Lakes management instead of the existing bureaucratic maze.

And Senator KASTEN's bill does that by establishing the Environmental Protection Agency as the lead agency with the responsibility for the environmental health of the Great Lakes. It also establishes a basin-wide approach to surveillance and monitoring of the water quality as well as mandating interagency cooperation in efforts to manage the resources of the Great Lakes basin.

This legislation represents a major initiative to provide for the comprehensive management of the Great Lakes. I commend Senator KASTEN for his foresight and efforts in developing this legislation. It is an idea whose time has come.

HIGH MARKS FOR STANFORD UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT DONALD KENNEDY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today's Boston Globe contains an excellent and informative article about an outstanding public servant and educator, President Donald Kennedy of Stanford University.

Many of us in the Senate worked closely with Don Kennedy and admired his talented leadership as Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration in the 1970's. Mr. Kennedy was one of the best and most effective Commissioners the FDA has ever

had, and all of us will be pleased to see that Don today is bringing the same extraordinary combination of intellectual ability and personal commitment to his challenging duties at Stanford University.

I commend Don Kennedy for his brilliant and many-sided record of achievement. Today's article in the *Boston Globe* will be of interest to all of us who know and respect Don Kennedy, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the *Boston Globe*, Apr. 30, 1985]

STANFORD UNIVERSITY'S PRESIDENT GETS HIGH MARKS FOR LEADERSHIP

(By Jeff Biddulph)

STANFORD, CA.—When San Francisco columnist Herb Caen recently wrote that Donald Kennedy is being talked about in Democratic circles as a candidate for the U.S. Senate in California in 1986, Stanford University students weren't surprised.

The Stanford University president, a former commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration in the Carter Administration, is always asked about the issue when he gives interviews. And when the *Stanford Daily*, the student newspaper, printed in its traditional April Fool's issue three years ago that Kennedy had declared his candidacy for the U.S. Senate, readers thought the story was genuine.

To all the speculation, Kennedy has the same answer: He is enjoying himself as Stanford's president and will remain in that position at least until after Stanford's centennial in 1991.

Besides Kennedy's involvement with the Carter Administration, there are other reasons for wondering about his political future. While he has been president, the university has dealt with an unusual number of volatile issues, and Kennedy is generally regarded to have made astute decisions, defusing crises and remaining popular among students and many faculty members. At the same time, Stanford's reputation as a university has, according to many accounts, risen tremendously in the almost five years that Kennedy has been president.

COMPARED TO REAGAN

Kennedy's political skills have caused some professors and students here to compare him to President Ronald Reagan. They say Kennedy, like Reagan, has a "Teflon coating" that allows him to make unpopular decisions and remain personally popular.

"I think he has been good at maintaining an image of somebody who, like Reagan, is always in the right," said Ronald Rebholz, an English professor.

"With some people, who don't know what goes on behind the scenes, there's the impression that he's such a nice guy and there must be some Teflon to him," said Mark Wilson, a senior and a political cartoonist for the *Stanford Daily*. Kennedy offers to go running at 6:30 a.m. twice a week with any student or faculty member who is interested, and Wilson is a regular on those runs.

"He's incredibly charismatic. I don't know anybody who's ever met him who wasn't immediately charmed," said Wilson.

SOME NOT CHARMED BY HIS DECISIONS

But Rebholz and many other faculty members are not charmed by some of Kennedy's decisions and many of his tactics.

Rebholz and political science Professor John Manley have led a campaign to investigate the ties between the university and the Hoover Institution, a conservative think tank on campus that boasts among its members some prominent advisers to the Reagan Administration. Edward Teller, a leading proponent of the Strategic Defense Initiative and a senior research fellow at Hoover, has advised Reagan on some scientific issues, and Martin Anderson, a senior fellow at Hoover, has advised the President on the economy. Hooper himself is an honorary fellow at Hoover.

"As long as the university maintains its present relationship with the Hoover Institution, the perception will grow that Stanford is associated with the right wing of the Republican Party," Rebholz said. "Here we have a major unit of the university that is engaged in partisan political activity—there is a distinction between individuals in the university and an entire unit of the university."

Kennedy counters that the charges of Hoover's political bias are exaggerated.

"I think the institution has been identified with a particular ideology, and quite strongly and quite voluntarily, but if you actually look at its composition, I think it's more diverse now than it was 15 years ago, and I think it will continue to evolve in that direction," he said in a recent interview.

Kennedy was forced to steer between many members of the faculty and members of the Hoover Institution in the controversy over the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library. Reagan indicated he wanted a library containing his presidential memorabilia, a museum and a public affairs center run by the Hoover Institution on the Stanford campus. Stanford faculty members were lukewarm on the idea, and many said Stanford should delay a decision until Reagan's 1984 presidential campaign was over.

Kennedy's position, articulated after intensive discussions with faculty members and the White House, was that the university would welcome a library in a small attached museum, but a public affairs center would have to be subject to academic governance by the university. The Stanford trustees accepted this position in the spring of 1984, and the White House eventually agreed to the compromise. Construction of the library is set to begin in 1987.

Many students, including members of the Black Student Union, have also criticized Kennedy's opposition to blanket divestiture of Stanford holdings in US companies active in South Africa. The trustees decided in February to divest the university's 124,000 shares of Motorola stock but only if it could be proved that the company continued to sell equipment to the South African police or military after 1983. The Stanford Coalition Against Apartheid estimates that Stanford has investments worth \$215 million in companies that are involved in South Africa.

INVOLVED WITH SCHOOL, STUDENTS

Still, many Stanford students see Kennedy as a youthful, active and accessible president who is involved with Stanford and its students. A rabid football fan, he is known to get apoplectic when people mention the 1982 football game with rival University of California at Berkeley, which Stanford lost when Berkeley made a highly disputed kick

return with only a few seconds left in the game.

Kennedy lectures on biology many times a year, advises five freshmen every other year and visits just about every dormitory on campus.

He says simply: "I love Stanford students . . . I want them to have the sense that if there is something they want to unload, there's a fair chance that at some time during the year they'll get me in a position where I can hear."

Kennedy also has taken a number of stances that are popular with students. He has criticized government controls on the publication of unclassified research, called for the Soviet government to release dissident citizen Andrei Sakharov and strongly opposed government cuts in student financial aid.

Stanford's academic reputation has certainly grown during the 1980s. Many polls have rated Stanford as the best or near the best in many departments, especially in the sciences and engineering. The holdings of the university's libraries have increased manifold, as has fundraising and the number of undergraduate applicants.

Still, Kennedy seems to think the university's achievements aren't good enough. He frequently talks about areas for improvement—restructuring the residential education system, which he compares unfavorably to Harvard's and Yale's, and garnering more cultural resources, such as special collections and museums—and laments what he perceives to be an eastern bias against Stanford.

"From the more gothic and somber eastern institutions with which we are often compared, the view is that Stanford is a little happy-go-lucky—academically intense enough, but intellectually lazy, as though somewhat addled by the sun," Kennedy told this year's freshman class in September.

He said the reputation has been accepted, instead of fought by Stanford students, and he urged them to become more serious about intellectual pursuit both in and out of the classroom.

"If seriousness becomes a casualty of student discourse on this campus, then surely controversy will also: and that will impoverish us all," he said.

POPE JOHN PAUL II SPEAKS OUT ABOUT DRUGS

Mrs. HAWKINS. Mr. President, the most influential human being on Earth recently addressed the seriousness of the worldwide problem of drug abuse.

In a recent address before a gathering of Catholic bishops in Thailand, Pope John Paul II discussed the problem posed for youth, and others, by drugs. This saintly man, seen and heard by more of the world community than anyone, and paid attention to by more of the world community than anyone, remarked in this address that "the whole human community must be mobilized to confront this issue. But here the church has a specific task of educating to human dignity, to the respect of self, to the values of the spirit."

The Pontiff displayed his usual courage by delivering these remarks to

Catholic prelates in a drug-producing nation, and thus their effect was strongly felt. In these widely published remarks, he also stressed the benefits of educating youth to the dangers of drug use. The Pope stated that Catholic schools, in particular, are "in a position to make an excellent contribution to the solid education needed by the young to overcome the temptation of drugs."

Mr. President, as he does in every one of his pilgrimages, Pope John Paul II went to Thailand to spread the message of the power of the love of God. This holy man, in every nation he visits, celebrates the love of God, and the presence of Christ in every people on Earth. In thus serving the world community, he recognizes the terrible destructive force of drugs, and the emotional and physical devastation they cause. In speaking to the people of Thailand about the problems of illicit narcotics, the Pope also brought a message of hope and love by accentuating the positive: that the treasure of faith is ever present in every man, and for the joy this brings to be fully realized, the intrusion of drugs is unnecessary. As the Pope said so beautifully in his address " * * * The search (is) for that true joy which abides in the heart and not in the passing exhilaration of the senses."

Mr. President, I am excited that this great and good man has joined us in our war against drug abuse. He is an ally of power beyond measure as we fight to control this most serious of world problems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Pope John Paul II's speech before Catholic bishops in Thailand, entitled "The Formidable Problem of Drugs," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE FORMIDABLE PROBLEM OF DRUGS

(The problem posed for youth and others by drugs was discussed May 11 by Pope John Paul II when he addressed the bishops of Thailand in Bangkok. "The whole human community must be mobilized to confront this issue. But here the church has a specific task of educating to human dignity, to the respect of self, to the values of the spirit," the pope stated. Catholic schools are "in a position to make an excellent contribution to the solid education needed by the young to overcome the temptation of drugs," he added. It is young people who are assailed most by the problems of the modern world, the pope told the Thai bishops. Young people "need the pastoral support of their bishops, together with their priests, in order to develop and persevere in their Christian vocation." The pope's address, given in English, follows:)

1. My heart is filled with gratitude in this hour of collegial unity. I am grateful to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has given me the opportunity to make this pastoral visit to Thailand and to proclaim the paschal mystery in your midst. And I am grateful to you, venerable and

dear brothers, for having desired my presence among you and for having welcomed me with such warmth and fraternal love.

Through the power of Christ's death and resurrection we are experiencing in a special way the unity of the church, and in this ecclesial unity we are living the life of Christ. Yes, Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the redeemer of mankind, is with us and in us. As we celebrate our unity in him, the mystery of his risen life unfolds in us. Jesus Christ is alive in his church, and his church is alive in him. As pastors of the flock, we are gathered to celebrate this mystery of Christ's living presence in his church.

Indeed, I have come to Thailand to pay homage to the Christ who lives in your people, to the Christ who in your people has himself become Thai.

2. The Christian communities that we are called to serve, dear brother bishops, are the communities that live the life of Christ in all its dimensions. In your people Christ continues his life of prayer. Through the members of his body, the church, he adores his Father, thanks him and offers expiation and supplication for the world.

The mystery of Christ's redemptive suffering is renewed in the community to which you minister day after day. Through suffering humanity, Christ brings to completion the measure of suffering that belongs to him (cf. Col. 1:24).

In the community of the faithful the risen Christ works incessantly for the salvation of the world. In his zeal he offers himself to his Father for the conversion of sinners. He exercises his power to forgive sins, he touches consciences, he heals hearts. He stands in the midst of the community as the suffering servant of the Lord and of humanity, inviting everyone to take on his dispositions of humility and meekness.

In the church Christ continues to proclaim the Gospel of God's kingdom. He himself catechizes. He himself reveals his Father and the Holy Spirit. Moreover, the very life of the most Holy Trinity is accomplished in the Church. Through his members, indeed acting in his members, Jesus loves his Father to the point of saying in all truth: I love the Father (Jn. 14:3). And the Father, in loving the church, fulfills Christ's own words: "The Father loves me" (Jn. 10:17).

Dear brothers: the mystery of the church is the mystery of the life of Christ, the mystery of the living Christ. And this is the mystery which we are living together with our people. All our pastoral efforts are aimed at assisting the faithful to share more intimately in the life of Christ.

3. A heightened awareness of the profound mystery of Christ's life in us sustains us in our apostolic activities. This awareness, nurtured in faith, generates in us pastoral strength. When we realize that the living Christ is in us, we understand more deeply that "God did not give us a spirit of timidity but a spirit of power and love and self-control" (2 Tm. 1:7).

Being rooted in this conviction, you radiate new hope as you announce the Gospel of peace and minister to your flocks, however small they may be. Your ministry takes on an added sureness as you realize how relevant Christ's promise is: "I am with you always, to the close of the age" (Mt. 28:20). Fresh joy is manifested in the witness that you give; you communicate a serene confidence to your local churches.

With renewed zeal you then proclaim the life which was proclaimed to you, "which was from the beginning . . . the eternal life

which was with the Father" (1 Jn. 1:1-2). The life of Christ, and in Christ the life of the most Holy Trinity, is the great treasure that you share with all those who freely choose to listen to you and to accept your witness, your teaching, your proclamation of the faith.

4. This great treasure must be presented in an especially dynamic way to the young people of the church. It is they who are assailed most by the problems of the modern world; it is they who need a particular grace from Christ to endure the Christian combat with temptation and sin. In Christ the young people can find the answers to the deep questions that are at the basis of all Christian choices. How greatly they need the pastoral support of their bishops, together with their priests, in order to develop and persevere in their Christian vocation.

In speaking of the young people and their needs we cannot ignore the formidable problem of narcotics in the world today, as well as the causes of this phenomenon and the means needed to face this crisis of humanity. The whole human community must be mobilized to confront this issue. But here the church has a specific task of educating to human dignity, to the respect of self, to the values of the spirit, to the search for that true joy which abides in the heart and not in the passing exhilaration of the senses.

In this regard the Catholic schools in particular are in a position to make an excellent contribution to the solid education needed by the young to overcome the temptation of drugs. The Catholic schools provide a proper context to impart the information that will assist young people to resist the pressures placed upon them and the opportunity for them to discuss with their teachers the safeguards that experience can offer. Above all, the power of Christ's word, presented through the ministry of the bishops, offers to all the young the deep solution to all the many problems that touch their consciences as they strive to live the life of Christ.

In this area of narcotics and in so many others the pastors of the flock must stand vigilant in the midst of the faithful, proclaiming the great motivation of the Christian vocation, which is to live the life of Jesus Christ.

5. As bishops you are called upon to help your people face many issues that affect their lives as individuals and as members of a family and of society. If your people are constantly reminded of their Christian dignity, of their life in Christ, they will have an ever fresh motivation to face the challenges made to them by the Gospel of Christ, which has much to say about public and private morality, about the need to worship God and to serve one's neighbor. As bishops, never hesitate to emphasize to your communities how their Christian vocation gives them an important mission of Christian witness. Christ himself put it this way: "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father who is in heaven" (Mt. 5:16).

Dear brother bishops: I am close to you as you strive to help your young people and the Christian families from which they come, as well as the whole Christian community, to live to the full the life of Christ. As you endeavor to promote vocations to the priesthood and religious life and as each of you strives to be a brother, father and friend to the priests who collaborate with you in building up the church in faith and

love, know that you in turn are supported and loved by the pope, by the whole college of bishops and by the entire church. This is indeed the mystery of the church: to live Christ's life and to live it together.

Everything we do as bishops must be marked by the attitude of the Good Shepherd, who through us wants to continue to love his flock because he came "that they may have life, and have it abundantly" (Jn. 10:10).

Venerable and dear brothers: This is the meaning of our lives and of our sacred ministry: to live in Christ Jesus and to serve that life in others.

Praised be Jesus Christ! Praised be Jesus Christ in Thailand!

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on amendment No. 43 to the motion to recommit, which the clerk will report:

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988 and revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1985.

The Senate resumed consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Pending:

(1) Dole-Domenici Amendment No. 37, in the nature of a substitute.

(2) Dole-Domenici Amendment No. 38 (to Amendment No. 37), of a perfecting nature.

(3) Dole-Domenici Amendment No. 39 (to Amendment No. 38), in the nature of a substitute.

(4) Dole-Domenici Amendment No. 41 (to the resolution), of a perfecting nature.

(5) Dole-Domenici Amendment No. 42 (to Amendment No. 41), in the nature of a substitute.

(6) Dole motion to recommit the resolution with instructions to report forthwith.

(7) Dole-Domenici Amendment No. 43 (to the aforementioned motion), to strike the instructions and insert language in lieu of the language in the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? If neither side yields time, time runs equally.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina 15 minutes off the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida, our ranking member on the Budget Committee.

Mr. President, one of our colleagues asked me just a moment ago, about this big tax bill that I may offer.

Let me address that particular comment because, Mr. President, I'm only suggesting what the President of the United States said in his 1984 budget message:

Fourth, because we must ensure reduction and eventual elimination of deficits over the next several years, I will propose a standby tax limited to 1 percent of the gross national product to start in the fiscal year 1986.

This is the President of the United States, Ronald Reagan speaking.

He said that he would propose a tax if we did not get the deficit down.

Now, at that particular time, I say to the distinguished majority leader, President Reagan projected a 1986 deficit of \$147 billion. Instead of \$147 billion, we now have a \$220 billion deficit and it continues to grow and grow.

What I am submitting is bipartisan, and I do not want to talk in any partisan terms. But I must correct the record and the impression that has been made throughout the country, in the media, in the editorials, that somehow because Fritz Mondale and Ronald Reagan got in a silly campaign last year, we are not going to think rationally with respect to this deficit.

The President of the United States said he would impose a standby tax of 1 percent of the gross national product. In 1986, this would generate \$43 billion in revenues.

Now, under our bipartisan plan, I say to the distinguished majority leader, there is a call for only \$25 billion in revenues. You see, I am on the conservative side. Ronald Reagan is a high-tax man; I am the low-tax man.

But I want to congratulate the majority leader on the progress that he has made. And I am genuine in this. I could not be more sincere.

Right after the election, the Secretary of the Treasury, then Don Regan, came out with the charts. He was one of these fiscal Iacoccas. He said 75 percent would not pay taxes, 25 percent, 40 percent would. He broke my TV; no one could understand him.

And I asked the distinguished majority leader, "For Heaven's sake, tackle him and let's get on with the deficit." Tax simplification is important but reducing the deficit is our No. 1 priority.

In December, you could not mention defense, now in April you can, due to the distinguished majority leader. I remember his going to the White House right before Christmas and the President said, "Now Bob, I want \$35 billion more in defense. I'm going to have to spend \$27 billion more in interest costs. That is \$52 billion. I want \$12 billion more in health costs. So that is \$64 billion. I can't touch Social Security, so that is \$7 billion more. I have got an increase in foreign aid and space and science, that's another \$4 billion."

That is \$75 billion in increases the President asked for. And then he said, "And, by the way, Bob, I want you to cut spending \$50 billion. And, oh, by the way, Bob, don't touch revenues."

So you came back and publicly stated, before the President gave his State of the Union Address that, "Most respectfully, I am going to have to go to work on the Hill, because I have been given mission impossible."

If you take the President's particular budget and cut \$50 billion from it

then add his increases in spending, which he must have, you still have increases of \$25 billion, and you have done absolutely nothing to reduce the deficits. So, to your credit, where you could not discuss defense in December, we can discuss defense now in April. Where you could not discuss Social Security in January, you can discuss Social Security in April. And in the April issue of U.S. News & World Report, the distinguished majority leader, when asked what about the alternative of raising taxes, answered: "It is just not going to happen." And talking along, just to save a little time, I quote Senator DOLE:

Yet, I assume that if we found some egregious loophole in the Tax Code that should be closed we might be able to address it. In my view that would not be a tax increase.

Bless you, I really love you for that. [Laughter.] Because, I do not want to increase taxes and go back to South Carolina and hear that "Hollings is a tax increaser." I am just closing egregious loopholes. If we can talk sense, we can get a plan. The great objection I have to the Chiles plan and to the so-called White House Senate Republican compromise, is that they do not do the job. Under the Congressional Budget Office figures, most respectfully, to both Senators who have worked so hard on this, you have given me a half a hair cut.

You have deficits in excess of \$100 billion. You have \$107 billion according to assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office. Senator CHILES has \$106 billion according to assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office. So if I support your compromise I would be supporting deficits in excess of \$100 billion in 1990. So that when I run next year—

Mr. CHILES. 1988 or 1990?

Mr. HOLLINGS. 1990.

The Senator has \$145 billion in 1988 and still a very large \$107 billion by 1990. I want to help, I want to compromise, and I want to go along with a true compromise. But when I run next year—whoever my opponent is stands up and says, "This Hollings is a big windbag on budgets, we have heard all about his budget, he was chairman, and all of that. But what did he vote for? He voted to have at least \$100 billion deficits from now as far as the eye can see including over \$107 billion in 1990." That is my political dilemma. The fiscal dilemma is the markets read it the same way the politicians do. You still have over \$100 billion. You have put the bullet in your mouth but you will not bite it. And I say if you are going this far, Senator CHILES—and I appreciate your courage in acknowledging that revenues must be part of deficit reduction—let us go ahead, bite that bullet, and come on down, and do the job.

We can agree on defense. We can agree on Social Security. We can agree on social programs. We can agree on maintaining the Small Business Administration. I find the Chamber of Commerce and the Federation of Independent Businesses downtown saying I want you to go along with the compromise but we are going to save SBA. You have a lot of doublespeak here. That's what I want to address now that I have held the distinguished majority leader. I do not want to hold the Senator. The Senator has more important business.

Mr. DOLE. Will the Senator yield for 1 second on the resolution?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOLE. I hope when all of this preliminary maneuvering is completed that there will be a majority on both sides to sit down and work out a package. I have to believe the single biggest job in America is this big ticking time bomb called the Federal deficit. Some have been slow to realize it. Some have been waiting for growth to take over. We are all for growth. It is painless. You do not have to do anything, and we want growth. It is a very important factor. But I am encouraged by the Senator's comments. He has been out front on freezing some of this long before anybody else in the Senate.

I think the one problem we have in the so-called bipartisan package is the rather large tax numbers. We will have to examine each one closely. But I hope there is a difference in whether you close loopholes for rate reduction or close loopholes so you do not have to cut spending. My view is if there is going to be any loopholes closed at all, it ought to be for rate reduction—not more spending.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I agree with you thoroughly. And, if you can fashion the Dole-Domenici-Chiles compromise which would be a true compromise, then I will go along. What happens is with the doublespeak that we have in this town is the leadership and the White House got together. That is like me going into executive session with myself in a telephone booth. You did not have Senator KASSEBAUM, Senator ANDREWS, Senator MATHIAS and those who really had taken a different view—and Senator GRASSLEY who voted differently in your Budget Committee. That is a matter of record. He voted for this freeze.

We have bipartisan support. We had 12 Republican's over the objection of the leadership last year, in May, vote for this particular bipartisan freeze approach not because they liked it, but because they found—as you indicate now in your comments—it is absolutely necessary we get something done. If we can get that kind of movement going, that would be a true compromise, and you would get this Senator to hush.

I am just trying to go along, but I am trying to get the job done. I do not want to go halfway, and not get this job done.

That is our dilemma. What we see in the newspapers' reporting of the so-called compromise, is that it cuts \$52 billion in spending in 1986. That is not the case. That is absolutely false. You read that in the news. The Chamber comes up here, the Business Round Table comes up here, and the Federation of Independent Businesses come up here. These are the sort of sentries at the gate for the fiscal future of the United States, and we have total confusion because they use Rose Garden Defense figures and not the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

The compromise does not cut \$52 billion, it cuts \$37 billion. And it does not get the deficit down to \$98 billion by 1988. It gets the deficit down to \$145 billion. And it does not produce a balanced budget by the decade's end—that is absolutely false. The deficit in 1990 is \$107 billion. So the Senators who are called to sacrifice and lose their programs in EDA, REA, SBA, Amtrak, feeding, housing, student loans—and we are asking 1 million students to drop the course as the President chants stay the course—these Senators lose all of these vital programs and the deficit never goes below \$100 billion. But we have decimated education and the investment in the human infra structure. Why? To continue investment in the corporate infrastructure. It is an imbalance. Yes. They can see oil companies needing incentives. Put that down, double space it, and underline it. Put it down solid. Oil companies need incentive. Little children—you give them a 30-cent breakfast, and you have ruined them for life. They become drones, they become immoral, and they will never work. That is what they will tell you in these board rooms around here. And if you look at the National Government's budget, 28 percent of it goes for those 65 years of age and over—and less than 6 percent goes for the youth, for the feeding, for the day care center, for women, infants, and children feeding, for school lunches, student loans, Pell grants. All of these—less than 6 percent. We are supposed to prepare the next generation for the future in this land, and we turned this into a welfare machine with pollster politicking. We see that posterity under those polls can do nothing for us.

We see no reason we should do anything for posterity. We look to the next election rather than the next generation and to the seniors, the poor seniors. We never think of the future of this country. It has gotten to be a national disgrace. I do not know how they will ever get it back into focus with all the shenanigans that go on with respect to budgets. It is a misallo-

cation. The administration says do away with Pell grants and student loans so that General Electric does not have to pay taxes. Do away with the Small Business Administration—and listen to the Chamber of Commerce who is supposed to be the business representative. The small businesses in America—who really represents them? The National Association of Manufacturers is big business; the Round Table is big business; big business has a lot of representation.

Well, the Chamber is supposed to represent small business too. But they came and they said, "We want you to approve doing away with the Small Business Administration so General Dynamics and 127 others do not have to pay taxes."

That is what they tell the national Congress in their zeal to get behind the so-called compromise, which is not even a compromise.

I wish I could get our friends in the media to cover the budget so people can understand it. I appreciate it is difficult. But what has made it difficult is using the flim-flam of the national administration with the so-called Rose Garden figures.

There is another objection I have to the Chiles plan. On defense the plan used OMB economies and in the other parts, it uses CBO. That is why I draw attention to the budget plan chart behind to show my colleagues what each plan does.

I wish the distinguished Senator from Florida would read the RECORD today on his cuts. The best I can find out is they are 10 to 25 percent in certain programs. I have yet to find out where those programs are and what the cuts may be.

Be that as it may, we are not going to get anywhere unless we get a bipartisan approach on all segments of the budget. The President of the United States comes on national TV and his words are, "No part of the budget is spared."

It spares defense to the tune of \$24 billion. You are not sparing defense. He wants to increase that.

He spares the space program and foreign aid. He spares social security to the tune of \$7 billion. More increases.

He spares revenues. He does not want them touched. He says no part of the budget is spared and then he looks at us and says, "by the way, get rid of the old, filthy Amtrak and the Small Business Administration and we can balance the Government's budget."

That is a reallocation. It is a flim-flam. That is not a compromise we are voting on this afternoon. It is a flim-flam and we all know it.

I would like to get into the debate and into the issues so we can decide where we will allocate our priorities of our national government.

We could not find support for deficit reduction last May—even though we had 38 Senators vote for a bipartisan freeze—because the administration had a higher priority of reelecting the President. I understand that. They could not find a crisis or a problem.

Now they find the crisis and the problem but they jump to a halfway solution of doing away with all programs.

I believe in cuts. We have in our bipartisan plan exactly what we had in the Budget Committee. We started in the Budget Committee with the Hollings-Andrews-Exon freeze. Senator STENNIS was with us on this, too, and Senator KASSEBAUM voted for it along with Senators ANDREWS and GRASSLEY in the Budget Committee.

Where we could get less than the freeze, I stood quiet because we can cut some and we cut some \$4 billion below a freeze through extensive reductions in foreign aid, transportation, energy, and agriculture. Those are still included in this bipartisan approach.

We took the Chiles mark on education; the Domenici mark on international affairs. We tried really to fashion a political document to get the most votes and get the job done. There was give-and-take where we could to try to attract the most votes.

I think we have, by far and away, the best proposition here that does the job. There could be many, many votes on this floor, including many popular votes on domestic programs but they do not do the job.

The Hollings-Andrews-Exon-Stennis-Bingaman freeze is the only one that is bipartisan and, the only one that will do the job and lower the deficit to 2 percent of the GNP by 1988. The 2 percent is the goal set by the administration and the Federal Reserve. None of the other plans reach that objective but we do. And the administration does not cut \$52 billion in 1986 but only \$37 billion—while we cut \$51 billion.

The only plan that brings the deficit down on a gradual curve, puts Government in the black, allows the investment community to count on the Congress finally having controlled itself and avoid the inflation recession that we are all terrified about—the only one that does that is our bipartisan plan.

If anyone has a better one, I hope they will submit it. I will be glad to support it. I feel just as seriously as the majority leader does that the No. 1 problem we have before us is the deficit.

I met with the National Governors Conference in February and they endorsed the freeze. I met with the Republican Governors who said they do not understand Washington going full speed down the road with continued spending in all regards and not paying the bills.

With respect to the mayors, I met with them they support a freeze. What we are saying to President Reagan with all of his "make my day" and "veto" baloney is, "Mr. President, you ran on this budget last year. You said it was a good budget. You took 49 of the 50 States."

No one is really suffering at the present moment, certainly not the Defense Department, which has \$52 billion backed up in the pipeline in unobligated funds. It is like force feeding a goose over there. They are falling all over the place. That is why you see all the waste, fraud, and abuse. Contractors cannot physically imbibe, consume, or allocate \$150 billion in 5 years. You cannot do it. That has been proven. The DOD needs to steady the boat some and show restraint.

We are saying, "Mr. President, we have given you a good, workable budget on all the programs for 1 more year. If you were mayor of a city, this is exactly what you would have to do."

We print dollars in Washington. They do not print dollars in a Governor's office or a mayor's office back home. Only in this way are we going to be able to control ourselves.

I thank the Senator from Wyoming, the distinguished majority leader, and my distinguished minority leader for yielding this time. We have a vote coming in the Commerce Committee.

I hope Senators will consider and look at this particular chart, which really brings it into focus. That is not HOLLINGS or STENNIS or EXON focusing, but the Congressional Budget Office showing exactly what we do.

We are talking this language of freeze. The President says, "We are freezing defense."

Robert Louis Stevenson said years ago, man does not live by bread alone but principally by catchwords.

You hear the President and he says, "We are freezing defense," and goes on to say a certain percentage. The inference, of course, is that it is frozen. No one really believes and understands that the President of the United States is asking for \$24 billion more under this compromise in outlays and \$21 billion in budget authority. There is no freeze there.

The press crowd continues on reporting the President's doublespeak. How do you make sense on the floor of the national Congress if we cannot get hold of ourselves and understand exactly what we are doing?

The President, is leading the way for more increases in space and social programs. The President even has an increase in his budget for the National Endowment for Democracy. That is \$30 million to the political parties so they can go to Geneva and sit and eat and tell them about government in the United States.

I mean, a tight budget, a sacrifice? There is no sacrifice at all in this so-

called White House compromise that they are voting on today. It is a redistribution. It is the other extreme.

I should note for the record what really occurred between 1969 and 1979 was seven tax reforms. We cut taxes and cut taxes and cut taxes, to the tune of \$720 billion lost in revenues.

While those cuts were going on under the Democrats, Republican Senator ROTH and Congressman KEMP said, "You Democrats are just redistributing the wealth." If you cannot beat them, you are going to join them.

"So we are going to give you the Kemp-Roth, 5-10-10-percent tax cuts." The distinguished Senator from Kansas said that was totally unheard of and ridiculous; we would never do that.

Well, we have done it. A 25-percent tax cut.

That is exactly what happened in those years. We have been cutting rather than raising national taxes.

Now comes the President of the United States and he goes totally overboard with Kemp-Roth. David Stockman described it as having hogs feeding at the trough.

We decimated the corporate taxes. If any corporation is paying a tax, they better get a new CPA. There is something wrong with them. I do not blame GE or General Dynamics. I blame us. We, in the Congress, put it in but they do not want to say that on either side of the aisle. We are the ones who put those provisions into law.

So hogs feeding at the trough, but now the hogs are coming home to—not to roost but to wallow, and we here in the hog pen are wallowing with them.

And many of the Members still give the media the doublespeak about the great sacrifice when there is no sacrifice; the great compromise with no compromise; the great freeze with no freeze; the great cut in spending with increases in spending.

And they keep that babble going. And they wonder why Washington gets by with it.

You would not let me get by with that. If I were Governor of South Carolina at this time last year, and I came down the capitol steps in Columbia and you put that microphone under my nose and said, "Governor, what are you going to do about the \$200 million deficit"—which compares with the \$200 billion Federal deficit—and I rared back and said, "Oh, ho, ho, ho, this is an election year, there is a lot of political cost in doing anything in an election year; but after my reelection, we are going to go to work on this thing," you would say to me, "Son, there is not going to be any reelection for you unless you get to work between now and next November. You have to get the job done."

They do not let us get by with that. But all our distinguished reporters,

great thinkers and great budgeteers fall into the psychology of the thing, that the budget is a heck of a lot of facts, and just get in rhythm and show yourself as the great eruditer of the situation—that is what has been occurring in this entire budget process.

We are not sacrificing, we are not compromising, we are not cutting spending. We are increasing spending in different areas. That is what they are asking us to vote on this afternoon. I am saying, stop everything—revenues, social programs, Social Security, defense—they all have to hold the line for just 1 year.

That is not all that difficult, frankly, I say to the Senator from Arkansas, Governor PRYOR, if you were to do that in Arkansas, and I did it in South Carolina, the people in the media would commend us for it. But they keep writing the doublespeak in the news columns and we keep doing it on the floor of the U.S. Senate. That is how we got into this particular mess.

Reaganomics, we are going to grow out of it. The President comes here in February and says, we have the 39th month of the greatest economic boom. Just the other night, less than 1 week ago, he got on TV and said we are doing fine, we are doing good. Then Don Regan, his right arm, said the economy is not healthy. Finally we got Regan straightened out. Now, if we could only get some facts before the President so he could learn what's in his budget.

I am glad the Senator from Florida is back. He has been more than generous with his time. I appreciate it very much.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. KASTEN]. Who yields time?

If neither side yields time, the time runs equally on both sides against the amendment.

RECESS UNTIL 2 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 12 noon having arrived, in accordance with the previous order, the Senate now stands in recess until 2 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12 noon, the Senate recessed until 2 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mrs. KASSEBAUM].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 p.m. having arrived, who yields time? If no one yields time, the time will be equally charged.

Mr. METZENBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Madam President, how much time remains on the present amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A minute and a half.

Mr. METZENBAUM. And the Senate is not in a quorum call at the moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Madam President, I move that the Senate recess for 15 minutes and that immediately after the Senate reconvenes, the Senate shall immediately proceed to a vote on the Moynihan-Byrd-Riegle-et al. amendments to restore Social Security cost-of-living increases to current law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's motion is not a motion but a unanimous-consent request.

Is there objection?

Mr. DOLE. I object.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Madam President, I did not hear what the Chair said. What did the Chair say?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair said that the Senator's motion is not a motion but a unanimous-consent request and as such would require unanimous consent, and an objection has been heard.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Madam President, I appeal the decision of the Chair, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the decision of the Chair stand as the decision of the Senate? The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOLE [continuing]. To be charged against the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The quorum will be charged against the resolution. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislation clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I did not hear that.

Mr. DOLE. I am just calling off the quorum.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question before the Senate is, Shall the order of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? The ruling of the Chair is that the motion of the Senator from Ohio is not in order. The motion of the Senator from Ohio is that the Senate recess for 15 minutes and that immediately after the Senate reconvenes, the Senate shall immediately proceed to a vote on the Moynihan-Byrd-Riegle-et al. amendment to restore Social Security cost-of-living increases through current law.

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

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. EAST] is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. EAST] would vote "yea."

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

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall vote No. 33 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Abdnor	Gramm	Murkowski
Andrews	Grassley	Nickles
Armstrong	Hatch	Packwood
Boschwitz	Hatfield	Pressler
Byrd	Hawkins	Quayle
Chafee	Hecht	Roth
Cochran	Helms	Rudman
Cohen	Humphrey	Simpson
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Specter
Danforth	Kasten	Stafford
Denton	Laxalt	Stevens
Dole	Long	Symms
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Durenberger	Mathias	Trible
Evans	Mattingly	Wallop
Garn	McClure	Warner
Goldwater	McConnell	Weicker
Gorton		Wilson

NAYS—45

Baucus	Ford	Melcher
Bentsen	Glenn	Metzenbaum
Biden	Gore	Mitchell
Bingaman	Harkin	Moynihan
Boren	Hart	Nunn
Bradley	Heflin	Pell
Bumpers	Hollings	Proxmire
Burdick	Inouye	Pryor
Chiles	Johnston	Riegle
Cranston	Kennedy	Rockefeller
DeConcini	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dixon	Lautenberg	Sasser
Dodd	Leahy	Simon
Eagleton	Levin	Stennis
Exon	Matsunaga	Zorinsky

NOT VOTING—1

East

So the ruling of the Chair was sustained as the judgment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Ohio is not in order.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 44

(Purpose: An amendment to the pending amendment to the instructions)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, and other Senators, proposes an amendment numbered 44.

In the pending amendment, do the following:

On page 2, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$736,200,000,000".

On page 2, line 9, strike the figure and insert "\$793,600,000,000".

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the majority leader?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, for the moment, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$866,300,000,000".

On page 2, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$955,900,000,000".

On page 2, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 2, line 15, strike the figure and insert "\$900,000,000".

On page 2, line 16, strike the figure and insert "\$2,000,000,000".

On page 2, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$3,400,000,000".

On page 2, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$4,800,000,000".

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 22, strike the figure and insert "\$51,000,000,000".

On page 2, line 23, strike the figure and insert "\$56,100,000,000".

On page 2, line 24, strike the figure and insert "\$61,300,000,000".

On page 3, line 5, strike the figure and insert "\$186,200,000,000".

On page 3, line 6, strike the figure and insert "\$200,700,000,000".

On page 3, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$216,900,000,000".

On page 3, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$248,300,000,000".

On page 3, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$1,055,600,000,000".

On page 3, line 12, strike the figure and insert "\$1,076,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 13, strike the figure and insert "\$1,139,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$1,216,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$949,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 18, strike the figure and insert "\$969,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$1,013,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 20, strike the figure and insert "\$1,055,700,000,000".

On page 3, line 24, strike the figure and insert "\$212,900,000,000".

On page 3, line 25, strike the figure and insert "\$175,400,000,000".

On page 4, line 1, strike the figure and insert "\$146,800,000,000".

On page 4, line 2, strike the figure and insert "\$99,800,000,000".

On page 4, line 5, strike the figure and insert "\$1,849,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 6, strike the figure and insert "\$2,088,000,000,000".

On page 4, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$2,316,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$2,529,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$25,500,000,000".

On page 4, line 12, strike the figure and insert "\$238,700,000,000".

On page 4, line 13, strike the figure and insert "\$228,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$213,100,000,000".

On page 4, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$52,900,000,000".

On page 4, line 23, strike the figure and insert "\$69,200,000,000".

On page 4, line 25, strike the figure and insert "\$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 3, strike the figure and insert "\$30,000,000,000".

On page 5, line 5, strike the figure and insert "\$74,500,000,000".

On page 5, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$27,400,000,000".

On page 5, line 12, strike the figure and insert "\$74,400,000,000".

On page 5, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$25,600,000,000".

On page 5, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$79,000,000,000".

On page 5, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$68,200,000,000".

On page 6, line 6, strike the figure and insert "\$292,600,000,000".

On page 6, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$252,000,000,000".

On page 6, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 6, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 6, line 12, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 6, line 15, strike the figure and insert "\$312,800,000,000".

On page 6, line 16, strike the figure and insert "\$276,100,000,000".

On page 6, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 6, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 6, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 6, line 24, strike the figure and insert "\$334,900,000,000".

On page 6, line 25, strike the figure and insert "\$298,400,000,000".

On page 7, line 1, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 7, line 3, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 7, line 5, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 7, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$359,600,000,000".

On page 7, line 9, strike the figure and insert "\$321,400,000,000".

On page 7, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 7, line 12, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 7, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 7, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$25,300,000,000".

On page 7, line 18, strike the figure and insert "\$18,000,000,000".

On page 7, line 20, strike the figure and insert "\$11,500,000,000".

On page 7, line 22, strike the figure and insert "\$10,300,000,000".

On page 7, line 24, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 8, line 1, strike the figure and insert "\$21,000,000,000".

On page 8, line 2, strike the figure and insert "\$17,800,000,000".

On page 8, line 4, strike the figure and insert "\$8,200,000,000".

On page 8, line 6, strike the figure and insert "\$12,300,000,000".

On page 8, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 8, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$20,200,000,000".

On page 8, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$17,100,000,000".

On page 8, line 13, strike the figure and insert "\$7,800,000,000".

On page 8, line 15, strike the figure and insert "\$12,300,000,000".

On page 8, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 8, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$20,500,000,000".

On page 8, line 20, strike the figure and insert "\$16,600,000,000".

On page 8, line 22, strike the figure and insert "\$7,900,000,000".

On page 8, line 24, strike the figure and insert "\$12,300,000,000".

On page 9, line 2, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 9, line 5, strike the figure and insert "\$9,100,000,000".

On page 9, line 6, strike the figure and insert "\$8,700,000,000".

On page 9, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 9, line 9, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 9, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 9, line 13, strike the figure and insert "\$8,800,000,000".

On page 9, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$8,700,000,000".

On page 9, line 15, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 9, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 9, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 9, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$9,000,000,000".

On page 9, line 22, strike the figure and insert "\$8,800,000,000".

On page 9, line 23, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 9, line 25, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 10, line 2, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 10, line 4, strike the figure and insert "\$9,300,000,000".

On page 10, line 5, strike the figure and insert "\$9,000,000,000".

On page 38, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$11,353,000,000".

On page 38, line 12, strike the figure and insert "\$7,416,000,000".

On page 38, line 13, strike the figure and insert "\$12,509,000,000".

On page 38, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$9,566,000,000".

On page 38, line 24, strike the first figure and insert "\$2,622,000,000".

On page 38, line 24, strike the second figure and insert "\$2,216,000,000".

On page 38, line 25, strike the figure and insert "\$1,416,000,000".

On page 39, line 1, strike the figure and insert "\$1,077,000,000".

On page 39, line 2, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,633,000,000".

On page 39, line 2, strike the second figure and insert "\$1,368,000,000".

On page 39, line 13, strike the first figure and insert "\$2,962,000,000".

On page 39, line 13, strike the second figure and insert "\$2,253,000,000".

On page 39, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$2,723,000,000".

On page 39, line 15, strike the figure and insert "\$2,579,000,000".

On page 39, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "\$2,720,000,000".

On page 39, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "\$2,814,000,000".

On page 40, line 2, strike the first figure and insert "\$719,000,000".

On page 40, line 2, strike the second figure and insert "\$306,000,000".

On page 40, line 3, strike the figure and insert "\$1,208,000,000".

On page 40, line 4, strike the figure and insert "\$1,451,000,000".

On page 40, line 5, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,720,000,000".

On page 40, line 5, strike the second figure and insert "\$2,112,000,000".

On page 40, line 15, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 40, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "\$8,117,000,000".

On page 40, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "\$0".

On page 40, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$18,934,000,000".

On page 40, line 18, strike the first figure and insert "\$0".

On page 40, line 18, strike the second figure and insert "\$28,137,000,000".

On page 41, line 3, strike the figure and insert "\$192,000,000".

On page 41, line 4, strike the figure and insert "\$47,000,000".

On page 41, line 5, strike the first figure and insert "\$275,000,000".

On page 41, line 5, strike the second figure and insert "\$109,000,000".

On page 41, line 6, strike the figure and insert "\$282,000,000".

On page 41, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$140,000,000".

On page 41, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "\$375,000,000".

On page 41, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "\$0".

On page 41, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$3,101,000,000".

On page 41, line 18, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,325,000,000".

On page 41, line 18, strike the second figure and insert "\$0".

On page 41, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$7,332,000,000".

On page 41, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,370,000,000".

On page 41, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "\$0".

On page 41, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$9,097,000,000".

On page 42, line 6, strike the first figure and insert "\$3,404,000,000".

On page 42, line 6, strike the second figure and insert "\$1,299,000,000".

On page 42, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$3,826,000,000".

On page 42, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$3,446,000,000".

On page 42, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "\$4,291,000,000".

On page 42, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "\$4,231,000,000".

On page 42, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$882,000,000".

On page 42, line 20, strike the figure and insert "\$1,258,000,000".

On page 42, line 21, strike the first figure and insert "\$2,034,000,000".

On page 42, line 21, strike the second figure and insert "\$2,101,000,000".

On page 42, line 22, strike the figure and insert "\$2,594,000,000".

On page 42, line 23, strike the figure and insert "\$2,275,000,000".

On page 43, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$858,000,000".

On page 43, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$791,000,000".

On page 43, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,332,000,000".

On page 43, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "\$1,496,000,000".

On page 43, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$1,725,000,000".

On page 43, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$1,987,000,000".

On page 43, line 20, strike the figure and insert "\$192,000,000".

On page 43, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$87,000,000".

On page 43, line 22, strike the first figure and insert "\$201,000,000".

On page 43, line 22, strike the second figure and insert "\$151,000,000".

On page 43, line 23, strike the figure and insert "\$211,000,000".

On page 43, line 24, strike the figure and insert "\$181,000,000".

On page 44, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$3,899,000,000".

On page 44, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$4,610,000,000".

On page 44, line 12, strike the first figure and insert "\$3,773,000,000".

On page 44, line 12, strike the second figure and insert "\$6,540,000,000".

On page 44, line 13, strike the figure and insert "\$4,258,000,000".

On page 44, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$10,326,000,000".

On page 44, line 19, strike the first figure and insert "\$0".

On page 44, line 19, strike the second figure and insert "\$376,000,000".

On page 44, line 20, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 44, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$894,000,000".

On page 44, line 22, strike the first figure and insert "\$0".

On page 44, line 22, strike the second figure and insert "\$1,424,000,000".

On page 45, line 8, strike the first figure and insert "\$9,159,000,000".

On page 45, line 8, strike the second figure and insert "\$4,028,000,000".

On page 45, line 9, strike the figure and insert "\$9,730,000,000".

On page 45, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$6,870,000,000".

On page 45, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "\$10,379,000,000".

On page 45, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "\$8,550,000,000".

On page 45, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$2,838,000,000".

On page 45, line 22, strike the figure and insert "\$1,316,000,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike the first figure and insert "\$3,183,000,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike the second figure and insert "\$3,202,000,000".

On page 45, line 24, strike the figure and insert "\$3,549,000,000".

On page 45, line 25, strike the figure and insert "\$3,865,000,000".

On page 46, line 9, strike the figure and insert "\$5,188,000,000".

On page 46, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$8,187,000,000".

On page 46, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "\$3,871,000,000".

On page 46, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "\$10,159,000,000".

On page 46, line 12, strike the figure and insert "\$3,958,000,000".

On page 46, line 13, strike the figure and insert "\$13,539,000,000".

On page 46, line 23, strike the figure and insert "\$192,000,000".

On page 46, line 24, strike the figure and insert "\$47,000,000".

On page 46, line 25, strike the first figure and insert "\$275,000,000".

On page 46, line 25, strike the second figure and insert "\$109,000,000".

On page 47, line 1, strike the figure and insert "\$282,000,000".

On page 47, line 2, strike the figure and insert "\$140,000,000".

On page 47, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 47, line 12, strike the first figure and insert "\$64,000,000".

On page 47, line 12, strike the second figure and insert "\$0".

On page 47, line 13, strike the figure and insert "\$3,699,000,000".

On page 47, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "\$0".

On page 47, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "\$5,203,000,000".

On page 47, line 25, strike the first figure and insert "\$540,000,000".

On page 47, line 25, strike the second figure and insert "\$292,000,000".

On page 48, line 1, strike the figure and insert "\$559,000,000".

On page 48, line 2, strike the figure and insert "\$402,000,000".

On page 48, line 3, strike the first figure and insert "\$634,000,000".

On page 48, line 3, strike the second figure and insert "\$526,000,000".

On page 48, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "\$401,000,000".

On page 48, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "\$379,000,000".

On page 48, line 15, strike the figure and insert "\$293,000,000".

On page 48, line 16, strike the figure and insert "\$352,000,000".

On page 48, line 17, strike the first figure and insert "\$394,000,000".

On page 48, line 17, strike the second figure and insert "\$450,000,000".

On page 49, line 2, strike the figure and insert "\$375,000,000".

On page 49, line 3, strike the first figure and insert "\$0".

On page 49, line 3, strike the second figure and insert "\$3,037,000,000".

On page 49, line 4, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,325,000,000".

On page 49, line 4, strike the second figure and insert "\$0".

On page 49, line 5, strike the figure and insert "\$7,183,000,000".

On page 49, line 6, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,370,000,000".

On page 49, line 6, strike the second figure and insert "\$0".

On page 49, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$8,850,000,000".

On page 49, line 17, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,895,000,000".

On page 49, line 17, strike the second figure and insert "\$469,000,000".

On page 49, line 18, strike the figure and insert "\$3,091,000,000".

On page 49, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$1,950,000,000".

On page 49, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "\$4,170,000,000".

On page 49, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "\$3,161,000,000".

On page 50, line 5, strike the figure and insert "\$882,000,000".

On page 50, line 6, strike the figure and insert "\$1,258,000,000".

On page 50, line 7, strike the first figure and insert "\$2,034,000,000".

On page 50, line 7, strike the second figure and insert "\$2,101,000,000".

On page 50, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$2,594,000,000".

On page 50, line 9, strike the figure and insert "\$2,275,000,000".

On page 50, line 18, strike the figure and insert "\$858,000,000".

On page 50, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$791,000,000".

On page 50, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,332,000,000".

On page 50, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "\$1,496,000,000".

On page 50, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$1,725,000,000".

On page 50, line 22, strike the figure and insert "\$1,987,000,000".

On page 51, line 6, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 51, line 7, strike the first figure and insert "\$7,600,000,000".

On page 51, line 7, strike the second figure and insert "\$0".

On page 51, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$14,456,000,000".

On page 51, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "\$0".

On page 51, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "\$21,809,000,000".

On page 51, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$313,500,000,000".

On page 51, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$335,600,000,000".

On page 51, line 20, strike the figure and insert "\$360,400,000,000".

On page 52, line 1, strike the figure and insert "\$136,700,000,000".

On page 52, line 3, strike the figure and insert "\$138,200,000,000".

On page 52, line 4, strike the figure and insert "\$143,100,000,000".

On page 54, line 20, strike the figure and insert "8".

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. I yield for that purpose.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The cosponsors of the amendment (No. 44) are: Mr. DOLE, for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr.

BOSCHWITZ, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GARN, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HECHT, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MATTINGLY, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. ROTH, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. WALLOP, and Mr. WARNER.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader has now offered his amendment which, as I recall, would be amendment C on page 58, of the Book on Senate Procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. In other words, it completes the tree of amendments on a motion to recommit with instructions.

The distinguished majority leader's amendment is not amendable at this point.

Now, Mr. President, thus far in this debate the distinguished majority leader has offered amendments to fill out the tree of amendments on page 70, which allows any number of amendments up to and including seven amendments. So he has filled every space in that tree. He has left no opportunity for a Senator on this side of the aisle or a Senator on the other side of the aisle to offer an amendment, as long as he sought to do so himself.

Then once that tree of amendments was completed, he moved to recommit the resolution with instructions that it be reported back forthwith with the language in amendment A. Now, he has offered an amendment to amendment A, which is in the C position, and no other Senator has had an opportunity to offer amendments because the distinguished majority leader has the right of first recognition, by custom. It is a custom that is accepted on this side of the aisle, and has been for a long time.

Now that the distinguished majority leader has completed the tree of amendments on page 58, I would ask him if the Democrats could offer the next amendment.

Before I pause for him to respond to that question, may I say this: I have no quarrel with the distinguished majority leader in anything that he has done by way of using the rules that are there to fill out both of these amendment trees that I have described, and which the Members may see on pages 58 and 70. I have no problem with that. I do have problems with it, but I have no quarrel with it, because the distinguished majority leader has pursued the rules and has used his right to recognition very effectively.

But as of now, Senators on this side of the aisle have not had any opportunity to offer an amendment because we are all shut out by the distinguished majority leader's use of right of recognition.

Even so, it has been our time on this side of the aisle on the overall resolution that is also being consumed. There are only 50 hours overall on the resolution; and amendments thereto, while they may have 1 or 2 hours, depending on the nature of an amendment and to what vehicle it may be offered, the time for amendments comes out of the overall.

So while we Democrats have been made to keep silent as far as offering amendments is concerned, it has been half of our time which is being used by the other side.

Even so, I have no quarrel with the distinguished majority leader about that.

But now that he has completed the offering of his own amendments, and when the vote occurs on amendment C, on page 58, we Democrats would want to offer the next amendment.

Of course, the distinguished majority leader did not take me up on the offer on last Thursday, to vote on a somewhat similar amendment; nor did he take us up on our offer to vote on Friday at noon. But I do not quarrel with him for that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD. So he rejected my offer or declined it—declined in a very courteous fashion our offer to vote at noon on Friday. I do not blame him for that because he was not sure whether or not he had the votes. I was not certain, either.

Here we are now with the same amendment and he probably wants a vote on it today.

Once we vote on his amendment, whether it be today or tomorrow, then amendment A, on page 58, as amended by amendment C, will be open to further amendment. There is where the rub will come.

At that point, we Democrats want to offer an amendment. The distinguished majority leader has now offered nine amendments, including the motion to recommit, and we Democrats say patiently and humbly, hoping to offer some amendments. The other day, I stated on this floor that I would hope that, once the distinguished majority leader's "compromise" amendment was voted on, I would hope we could alternate then; that the Democrats would have a shot and then we would alternate the rest of the way—first the Democrats, then the Republicans, and so on.

Now, I am going to ask that question again. We Democrats have wanted to offer an amendment restoring the Social Security COLA. We indicated, days ago, that that was an amendment we wanted to offer, that was an issue that we wanted to deal with, soon. I offered a Senate joint resolution, that went on the calendar. I offered a simple resolution and it went on another calendar, which amendments pressed to restore the Social Security cuts in the COLA. The President has broken his promise to the old folks of this country. But I am not going to break mine. I am going to do everything I can to restore those COLA's. Most Senators on this side of the aisle feel as I do.

But how are we going to be able to represent the elderly and get an amendment in, and have it voted on to restore the COLA's if we cannot get recognition for the offering of such an amendment? We just cannot do it.

It is not just the Democrats. A lot of those elderly people out there beyond the beltway are Republicans, and it may also be that some of our friends on the other side of the aisle would support our amendment.

I plead and beseech, and I implore, and I beg the distinguished majority leader, that once his amendment C is acted on, then would he let us Democrats have an opportunity, for the first time—for the first time since we have been on this resolution—to offer an amendment that says to the elderly people of this country, "The President broke his campaign promise but we are not going to break ours." It would enable a lot of our Republican friends also to keep that promise to the elderly people of this country.

All I am asking the distinguished majority leader is, will he relent and let the Democrats offer the first amendment after his perfecting amendment "C" is agreed to, as I believe it will be agreed to. I am sure that the distinguished majority leader, being a good vote counter, is not going to let that vote occur until he is pretty confident of the vote. I do not blame him for that.

But we also want our chance to offer amendments. It is only fair that Democrats, who number 47 in this body, have the opportunity to offer an amendment on behalf of the elderly people of this country to protect them against the social security cuts in the COLA.

We have not yet had an opportunity to offer an amendment and yet we have been charged for half of the time on this resolution.

I would hope and believe that if—I yield myself 2 more minutes—if the distinguished majority leader would do that, I think it might pay off down the road to his benefit. The distinguished Senator from Kansas, who is our illustrious majority leader, is playing hard-

ball. Let us say he calls up an amendment for someone else on his side, once he gets Senate action on the last amendment he has offered in filling the amendment trees. Maybe he will not do so. I hope he will not. But if he does then begin to call up amendments for other Senators, I would say that he would then be abusing—I do not think the majority leader would ever abuse his right of recognition as majority leader, but let us just say for the sake of the record that he calls up a Senator's amendment on that side, because that Senator cannot get recognition over the minority leader.

The minority leader, under the customs that have heretofore been followed, has first recognition after the majority leader. And my friends on the other side of the aisle know that if I get recognized, I am going to call up the Moynihan-Byrd-Riegle Social Security amendment to restore the cuts in Social Security COLA's. But if the able majority leader uses his recognition power—I do not believe he will, but if he were to, that would be an abuse of the first recognition rights of the distinguished majority leader. And I just cannot believe that he would do that. But if he does use the right of recognition to shut out the minority party, then he can go right on down the line until the 50 hours are all gone. I do not believe he will do that, surely. But if he were to do that and use the whole 50 hours, using his power of recognition to call amendments up for Senators on the other side, we on our side would be completely shut out. When we reach the 50th hour, we would not have any oil in our lamps, and all we could then do is offer amendments and have them voted on without debate.

Now, one final word. Why would the distinguished majority leader—and I do not believe he will—why would the distinguished majority leader—and I feel rather badly about this, because I have not given the distinguished majority leader an opportunity to tell us yet, but if he were to do that, one might ask why would he do that? Could it be that the distinguished majority leader, in order to get the votes to enact his White House compromise—remembers, he would not accept our vote offer on Thursday, nor our offer on Friday—as was noted in the newspapers, one might come to the conclusion that the reason, perhaps, why the distinguished majority leader would not accept our offers last week was that he simply did not have the votes at that time.

Now, there has been a rumor going around—and this is Washington, a place rife for rumors—that maybe the able leader has picked up the needed votes by offering to call up somebody else's amendments. Let us say there is a Senator on the other side of the

aisle who wants to be "fustes' with the mostes'" on Social Security—

Mr. HOLLINGS. Oh, no, I do not believe he would do that. I just cannot believe that.

(Mr. DENTON assumed the chair.)

Mr. BYRD. I have Senator HOLLINGS with me on this one. He and I are drinking out of the same quill on this one. I do not believe the majority leader would do that.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I do not believe it.

Mr. BYRD. I cannot believe it. I just cannot believe it.

But let us say that he does. Let us say that the distinguished majority leader has a Senator on that side of the aisle who is hard pressed to appear to be the Senator who restored the Social Security COLA cuts. Just using that as an example—and if the leader said, "Well, now, if you would vote for me on my package, I would guarantee you would be the first to get your amendment up"—I am not saying the distinguished majority leader would do that, because I do not know, but I can imagine how a majority leader might do that.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Never.

Mr. BYRD. That being the case, I can see why the distinguished majority leader might be under the compulsion to call up amendments on that side of the aisle for one, two, three, four, or five Senators in a list of commitments.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, would the distinguished minority leader yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. If I could just finish my thought—yes, I yield.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Could I ask the distinguished minority leader if he has had an opportunity to read this report in this morning's Washington Post by David Hoffman and Helen Dewar in which the distinguished majority leader is quoted as saying he plans to do exactly what the minority leader has speculated?

I cannot believe it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRD. I shall have to read it with my own eyes before I believe it. And I will not believe it even then.

But laying all the humor aside and speaking seriously, Mr. President, if the distinguished majority leader does call up amendments for other Senators, and if the reason were to be that he had made promises that he would get their amendments up first if they would but vote for his package, then I say to my fellow Democrats that we are under no compulsion over here to help the distinguished majority leader fulfill his commitments.

I think I shall now yield the floor to the distinguished majority leader if he wishes, and I hope that he would say in response to my question that Democrats will be offered an opportunity to call up the next amendment once his

package is adopted, if it is adopted, and we can all proceed from there.

Let me say in closing that I have the utmost respect for the distinguished majority leader.

I hope the distinguished majority leader will relent and let Democrats offer the first amendment to his package once it is adopted, if it is adopted, and I dare say it will be.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Speaking on the resolution, Mr. President, I appreciate very much the comments of the distinguished minority leader, who is the recognized expert on procedure, history, and precedent. Many of the parliamentary ideas that I have come across I can attribute to the distinguished minority leader either when he was minority leader or majority leader. But in moving forward on this resolution I do not intend to do anything that would violate the rules. I have discussed this matter with the distinguished minority leader and he indicated to me that, "As long as you are within the rules, there is no quarrel."

I would indicate that even though we have offered eight amendments, I think, instead of nine, these eight amendments are really in essence only one. We have been trying to get to that one amendment. We had to offer eight amendments to get to that one. I never fully understood why I had to do all that. I talked to the Parliamentarian. He wrote it down. I said, "It sounds like a good idea," and so we have offered eight to get to this one amendment—the Senate leadership White House budget package. We would like to vote on that amendment today.

I would point out that the first vote on this resolution came at the insistence of a member on that side of the aisle. We have not had any votes on this side of the aisle. I must say we had mixed feelings on this side whether to adopt the Metzenbaum proposal and not to try to sustain the Chair. Then we could have amended that motion and voted on our package very quickly. Nevertheless, that procedure if we sustained would be a total thrashing of the rules, bordering on abuse of the rules. I have always understood that in this body it is the right of the majority leader to recess the Senate. I recall that we had a discussion on this very subject just about 5 or 6 weeks ago. At that time, on February 25, the minority leader reassured me that the motion to recess was a prerogative normally preserved for the majority leader. And so we studied very carefully the effort by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. It was a close call, but in the long run I think the Senate would have been injured if we followed this procedure. We would have gained a short-term

advantage by then amending the motion, having the vote, and following that procedure in the Senate at least this year and the next year. We could break all filibusters, by moving to recess, reporting back in 5 minutes and voting on anything, so as long as you had more votes than the other side. I would assume that would be an advantage. But, again, I am certain the distinguished minority leader probably knew that in advance. I had to learn it rather quickly.

So far as what amendments may be offered after the vote on so-called White House leadership amendment, we have thought about a number of ways to address that problem. Maybe we could adopt a proportional allocation based on the number of votes we have on this side for the leadership package and the number of votes we have on that side for the leadership package. If half of you vote for the package, you get to offer half of the amendments. So we have looked at a number of ways to deal with it because it is a serious matter. But I cannot say this proposed procedure is without precedent. I am certain there is precedent for it. What I want to do as the majority leader is to get the deficit reduced.

I would hope that in the final analysis there is going to be a big bipartisan vote for a deficit reduction package, some from that side and some from this side. But if we cannot demonstrate up front as the majority party that we have the ability to at least start with a package, or in effect describe the parameters as \$300 billion or more in deficit reduction, then I am not certain why we are the majority party.

It is my responsibility on this side to make certain that we win some votes, if I can. If I cannot, we lose. And it would not be an end of the process if the so-called White House leadership package is voted down. We could then start amending the leadership package. There is no doubt in my mind there are 68- or 70-some amendments pending right now. I can assure the distinguished minority leader that I am not going to offer all of those amendments. Nevertheless, I may offer a few, not to frustrate the process, but there is just as much concern on this side as there is on that side about senior citizens, veterans, the handicapped, farmers, and all the other constituencies affected by this package. If we all adopt the attitude that we cannot do anything that affects in any way this group or that group or that group, then it does not make much difference who offers the amendments; they are all going to pass. So we finish the exercise, but there is nothing left in the package except an increase in taxes and a cut defense, which in the view of most Americans is not the way to go.

So I say to the distinguished minority leader I will certainly be in constant touch with him, visiting with him, and having dialog with him, as I have tried to do for the past several months. He has been most accommodating—but I am not prepared to say at this time we are going to rotate amendments. I have searched the Budget Act and I cannot find a rotation requirement in that law. There is nothing in the Budget Act that says you have to take all the heat on one side and all the pleasure on the other side in this body. If we are serious about reducing the deficit, the fun and games will end one of these days. We are going to be faced with the question of whether or not we are going to vote yes or no on a final package. I am convinced there is a majority on both sides who are sincerely concerned about deficit reduction. I would hope in the final analysis, though I cannot now give an affirmative answer to the distinguished minority leader, that we will do what the American people expect us to do, that is make some hard decisions. If we do not want to make some hard decisions, it does not make any difference who offers the amendments. We cannot have everything. We cannot say, "We can't cut agriculture because I'm from a farm State; we can't cut something else because somebody else is from a different State," and end up with anything but a big fat deficit, higher taxes, more inflation, and more people out of work. So we are prepared to initially indicate to everyone—our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and the American people—that for one brief moment at least we agreed that we had to reduce the deficit \$300 billion. Then there will be those who want to start the dismantling process. We have Members on this side who want to knock out of the package the Social Security 2-2-2 proposition. We have other Members who want to cut more from defense spending—not many but some. I do not agree with those positions, but I would hope that as majority leader of the Republican side I have some right to protect the Republican side and the Members who make up the Republican side.

I would assure the distinguished minority leader that I have no intention of abusing the rules or of frustrating the good intentions of any Senator. But I also have the responsibility to try to protect my side.

I do not think rotation is a plan that has a great deal of appeal to me at this time. There will be all the votes the Democrats want on their package. I know of at least three Democratic budget packages. The distinguished minority leader is working on one, the distinguished ranking member on the Budget Committee has one, and the distinguished Senator from South

Carolina discussed his plan this morning. They all have certain appeal. Ours may have certain appeal to Senators on that side. I am not trying to bully anyone, I am not trying to dictate to anyone, but I am trying to reduce the deficit without raising taxes, and by cutting spending, at this point I would have to indicate to the distinguished minority leader, who asked the question in good faith, that I would not be prepared to say that following the vote on the so-called leadership package the next amendment will be offered from that side.

Mr. CHILES addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Who yields time?

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might use from the resolution.

Mr. President, it is our wish that we have the first opportunity of amendment, and our wish that we have a rotation of amendments after that. We have used that process several times before.

Even if the majority leader is correct that there is no obligation on his part to assure, such a procedure, and that there is nothing in the Budget Committee rules that says it must be done that way, normal Senate comity should be considered. The normal rules of recognition in the Senate, generally provide that the person first on his feet and obtaining recognition of the Chair, is the person entitled to move the amendment.

There is an exception. The exception is that the majority leader gets the first crack and the minority leader gets the second crack. I think we all know there is good reason for that exception. The reason, as I understand it, is that the majority leader has the duty of putting motions to adjourn, motions to recess, motions to recommend, together with those duties that fall on him as majority leader, to conduct the affairs of the Senate. But this Senator has never felt that those rules giving the majority leader first recognition were ever designed or to be used for getting recognition to move an amendment for somebody else.

When you start doing that in this Chamber, comity is going to break down. There is no doubt about it. If you start using the power of recognition to move an amendment that you are not even for; that goes against the package that you have proposed; that is helping to dismantle the package you put up—when you start doing that, based solely on the right of first recognition, then comity breaks down.

If you step in either of our cloak-rooms right now and watch the House of Representatives on television, you will see and hear an acrimonious debate going on about abuse of power. It is interesting, because in that instance the minority party, the Republicans, are talking about the unbridled

use of power and criticizing the Democrats. The minority feels they have great justification. There has even been talk about chaining themselves to the rostrum to prevent the House from going on. Fortunately, we have not had that over here.

As the Senator from Florida sees it, generally speaking, we observe comity in this body. It is the common practice in the Senate to allow the Chair to recognize the person on his feet first. That is the procedure we are all accustomed to in this body. That is the way I have always known it.

I cannot remember Mike Mansfield ever demanding recognition so he could allow the Junior Senator from Florida at that time to call up his amendment. I cannot remember Majority Leader BYRD demanding recognition under his power as the majority leader to have the Senator from Michigan present an amendment. I cannot remember that ever happening. Maybe the rules allow it. The rules would have allowed, I suppose, a majority to overturn the ruling of the Chair. But we heard the distinguished majority leader say that would be trashing the rules, and I think that is true. Once we start doing that, it would be trashing the rules.

I hope that because a power is there and was put there for a good purpose—to allow the majority leader and the minority leader to carry out their duties and their functions of leadership—it would not be distorted to allow recognition or the presenting of an amendment which is not theirs.

If it is an amendment the distinguished majority leader believes in, if he is a cosponsor of it, then perhaps he is entitled to recognition. But to do it five times, to do it on a series of things, I think would be an abuse of recognition by the Chair.

The majority leader has said that he hopes there will come a time, as I do, that there can be some bipartisan movement to adopt a deficit reduction package. That is what this is all about. That is what the American people want. But I say to him I do not think we are helping that process if the majority uses its power in an abusive manner, in obtaining recognition, under the power of the Chair, to put someone else's amendment.

It is one thing to say: "I don't feel I owe the responsibility to you, as the minority party, to guarantee you every other motion or to guarantee you the first right of recognition." I think it is another thing to say: "I am going to use my power as majority leader to obtain recognition and then call up amendments for someone else." I certainly hope the distinguished majority leader will not do that.

Perhaps, he cannot work out an arrangement allowing us every other vote. Perhaps he would not allow us to have the first amendment. Perhaps we

would feel we have been shut out by a skillful use of the rules. That has been done by this side, so we cannot complain. I hope it will not go further than that, to undo the normal recognition process where he who is on his feet first and seeks recognition is automatically recognized. When you go beyond that and say, "We are going to alter the power of the majority leader," that will cause a breakdown of comity in this body, and I think that is something that will hurt the Senate.

Mr. METZENBAUM and Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, speaking on the resolution, I know we are walking a fine line and I know this matter is very sensitive.

If we had 62 or 63 votes on this side, there would not be any problem. The Democrats enjoyed big margins here in Senate, on and off, for 26 years. They did not have 52 or 53 votes. We really have 52, because one Member is hospitalized. So we have to assess where we are with that many votes.

As I look back at the first budget resolution in 1981, there were 18 Democratic amendments and 5 Republican amendments. There were 18 Democratic amendments offered in a row.

In 1977, when the distinguished minority leader was majority leader, the first three amendments—not all this tree building—were offered by the majority party, the Democrats.

So I think that before we have all this anguish and all the soul searching about fairness or whatever, we can go back and take a look at the past history.

It may be that I will offer a few amendments.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield.

Mr. CHILES. Can the Senator tell me when those 18 amendments were offered? Was recognition obtained by the majority leader and then assigned to a Member, or was it on the basis of who stood up and said they wanted to offer an amendment?

Mr. DOLE. I would have to go back and check that, but I do not believe there is anything inconsistent. If we were to agree to recognize three Republicans other than the majority leader, it is the same thing.

Mr. CHILES. I say to my distinguished friend that I do not think it is the same thing. I think it is one thing to say that perhaps in the first resolution we had more people seeking to offer amendments; but the thing is, were they recognized because they were on their feet first, was the majority leader on this side obtaining recognition and assigning it to those Members? That is what we are talking about.

Mr. DOLE. I know we cannot resolve that today.

I know that Social Security is very sensitive. There is a lot of political mileage to be gained, and everybody wants to offer the first amendment. I do not know what the actual count is on that side, but in some of these packages, the Democrats want to freeze Social Security COLA's. I know that the distinguished Senator from Florida has a package in which he freezes Social Security COLA's.

We should get off this kick that only Republicans want to do anything with Social Security. That is why I suggest, in the final analysis, that maybe we can work a package out. Maybe the strategy is, "Let's embarrass the Republicans up front. We're trying to protect the senior citizens."

Most senior citizens have children and grandchildren who may want to find work in a year or two, who probably do not want inflation to go back up, and who are concerned about the economy and sustaining growth.

In our package, we have a guaranteed COLA of 2 percent, 2 percent, and 2 percent, notwithstanding present law, which says that when inflation is less than 3 percent, you do not get any Social Security COLA. It is a moderate approach to a very important problem.

So we become a little tender about being jumped on by certain Democrats, who assert that somehow the Republicans are against the old people, the senior citizens, and that if it were not for Democrats, they would not be protected. We can make all those arguments when we get into it, but I hope the politics would not decide who is going to be first.

I think the best political advantage may be based on who is going to reduce the deficit. And I am prepared to make some very difficult votes to do that and I think the American people have been prepared for about the last 2 years. The President is on board. He is talking about reductions. It is probably the only opportunity we are going to have for a long time.

I do not want to break my pick with my friends on the other side, but I do hope they understand that sometimes you just have to do what you have to do.

Mr. METZENBAUM addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Who yields time?

Mr. CHILES. I yield the distinguished Senator such time as he might need off the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I think we ought to understand where we are and where we are not and understand who is trashing the rules around here and who is bordering on abuse. We should not get the idea that somebody is in here with a halo

around their head to reduce the deficit and the rest of us do not share that commitment.

I believe that there are 100 Members of this body and every one of them wants to reduce the deficit. And each of us probably has his own way or her own way as to how we should go about doing it.

So we brought to the floor better than a week ago the budget resolution. I serve on the Budget Committee, and I know that that committee wrestled with the issue of how to reduce the deficit and fought about it and finally came out with a package.

That package was available and was supposed to be called up a week ago Monday, a week ago yesterday. Nothing happened on Monday. Not a vote, not a word. And nothing happened on Tuesday. The Senate was dark.

And then Wednesday it was brought up, but we could not vote because the President was going to address the country that night. So we were not ready to really get into the meat of doing our job.

So we sat here on Thursday and we sat here on Friday and we played games with each other—that is they played games with us. We did not participate in those games. And it was the first amendment and the second amendment and the substitute amendment. And then we went over to the other side of the page and we went down that part of the tree. Then we came in yesterday, as I understand it, or this morning and we came in with a motion to recommit and then we wanted to be certain to lock that in. And all the time we have not spent 1 minute on the issue before the Senate, and that is reducing the deficit.

Somehow we have got a great big flag raised high, and it is waving around, and we have got to get the White House Republican package before the Senate, notwithstanding the fact that every single Member of this body knows that that is not going to be the final package. Certain deals were made with Senators from this State and that State. "You can offer this amendment, just go along with the original package."

Then they have come up with this new kind of hokum—and this is hokum. "This is just a procedural motion. This is just a procedural motion." It is not a procedural motion at all. It is the budget resolution that is being offered to the Senate, and we are being called upon to act upon it.

And then nobody should have the audacity to come forward with an amendment. What difference does it make if that budget eliminates the Job Corps? Who cares about the fact that the Appalachian Regional Commission will no longer be operable? What difference does it make that the charitable organizations across this country—the American Heart Association,

American Cancer Society, all the churches will lose their postal subsidies.

The President says he is not going to have any new taxes, but he is going to sock it to all those charitable organizations. He is going to sock it to the second-class rural newspapers, eliminate their postal subsidies. "But don't offer an amendment on it, not until we get our package in place."

Who is abusing the rules? You are abusing the rules. You are not letting us proceed in a normal manner. You are letting the clock run without anything being achieved.

No Federal subsidy for Amtrak. That is the end of Amtrak. Knock out the SBA Program almost in its entirety. Federal crop insurance, slash that. Knock out part of the subsidy for school lunches. Eliminate revenue sharing. Eliminate the Rural Loan Program. Eliminate UDAG for cities.

But be sure you do not offer any amendments having to do with defense spending. No, those are issues we do not want to get into until we get the package. And nobody, nobody has the right to offer an amendment. The majority leader has priority rights under the rules of the Senate to be recognized and say, "He offers his first amendment and he offers his second amendment and he offers his substitute amendment," and goes right on down the tree. So he says to all of us, "You can't offer any amendment."

And so, indeed, those of us who believe that this body ought to address itself to the issue of slashing Social Security wanted to have some way to bring that issue to the floor. And then we read in the paper that a deal had been cut in some way; that the deal was that some would vote for the package and then, after the deal was made and the package was put in place, then a few select people would have the right to offer the amendment to eliminate the Social Security cuts.

Talk about abusing the rules. Talk about comity. Talk about the question of whether or not we are proceeding here in a manner that we proceeded in the past.

I have been in this body long enough to say that I have never, never before seen an instance where a U.S. Senator of either party could not get his amendment up after a week and a half on the same issue. A week and a half on the same issue and we cannot even get an amendment called up.

So, indeed, the Senator from Ohio had no reservation in letting it be known that we want to bring up the Social Security issue. And the only way I could figure out to do it, in view of the fact that we had been precluded from offering an amendment to the bill, precluded from offering a motion to recommit, was to offer it as an

amendment on a motion to recess. An unusual procedure I would agree.

The fact is this body is proceeding in a way that I have not seen in history and to the best of my knowledge it has not proceeded in this same manner at any time in the past. Not alone are we talking about the fact that nobody can get an amendment offered before the sacred package is voted upon, but, beyond that, we are saying, as the majority leader just said, he is not sure when the members of the minority are going to have an opportunity to offer an amendment.

What kind of body are we? What is so unfair about offering an amendment? It is not our fault whether he has got the votes or does not have the votes or whether he has 52 or 53 or 60 Members in the majority. We live in a political system. That is the way this Government operates. But does that mean that we deny some in the minority the opportunity to vote, the opportunity to offer an amendment?

I cannot believe what is transpiring in the Senate at the moment.

And I would say to the distinguished majority leader that if I can figure out some other way to bring the issue of eliminating the cuts in Social Security to this floor before the package is considered, or any one of a host of other amendments that I think we ought to be considering. I will not hesitate to use the rules to do that, just as the majority leader is using the rules to provide an ironclad fist and say, "No amendment. No opportunity for anybody to bring an issue to this floor."

Why not? What is so terrible? What is there about putting the package in place? Does it mean that we can run and tell the President, as we wave him bye, bye on the plane, "Mr. President, we got the budget resolution through, the White House package"? Is that what we are worried about? Well, we wish the President bon voyage.

We wish him a good trip. We wish him a healthy trip. But the fact is we wish him a trip where we could report to him regularly that we just adopted an amendment to reject the Social Security cuts for the senior citizens of this country, and to save so many other programs that should be saved. Why can we not vote? Why can we not offer an amendment? Is there some special reason that we are not permitted to offer our amendments? I indicated the other day on the floor of the Senate that after the seven steps were taken that I would be prepared to offer a motion to recommit, and I discussed that this morning with the Parliamentarian. It was not so long thereafter that the majority leader offered just such a motion himself, and then put in the first two steps as well to preclude my offering any kind of motion of that kind. Why? What is there so sacred about requiring the Senate to vote on this package as a

package and why, can we not get an opportunity to offer an amendment?

I cannot for the life of me understand the procedure. It may make good sense to the majority leader, and I have a lot of respect for him. But I do not think it makes good sense to the American people. He says it is because we want to reduce the deficit. Let us reduce defense spending another 3 percent instead of increasing it. We would not be cutting it. All we would be doing is holding it to the inflation figure. Why should we be increasing defense spending? We want to reduce the deficit. Give us an opportunity to vote on whether or not we should increase defense spending as provided in this package that the White House and the majority party have agreed upon that will reduce the deficit an additional amount. No. No votes, no opportunity to get into the issue. I can only say this: I am disappointed that we do not have an opportunity to proceed in a normal way for each Member of the Senate to have an opportunity to be heard and offer such amendment as he or she might want to in order to bring it to a vote. I say to my colleague, the leader of the Senate, that this may be a procedure that you are happy with at the moment, but I am afraid that it will be a rather shallow victory, and a rather hollow victory if and when you prevail because I do not believe that the American people will look favorably upon it.

Mr. CRANSTON. Does the Senator from Florida yield time?

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DENTON). Who yields time?

The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the amendment. I designate the distinguished Senator, Senator DOMENICI, chairman of the Budget Committee, to manage time on the amendment. I guess the question now is, Are we going to vote this evening? I have heard all of this rhetoric. The question is whether we are going to vote. There are a number of Senators who have conflicts between 6 and 8 on both sides. If there is no plan to vote between 6 and 8, I guess the next question is if we can vote after 8. There are, as I understand it, less than 40 minutes on the amendment itself remaining. So I have obtained recognition to determine whether or not we can agree that there will be a vote before 6, or after 6 and, if so, how long after 6.

I would like to get into the merits of the proposal rather than a lot of other things. But I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for yielding. There has been a great deal said back and forth across the aisle this afternoon about who is being fair

and who is being unfair. That is not the issue. Before we vote on the so-called compromise that is now before the Senate, I think there are a lot of Senators in this Chamber who would like to express themselves on the issue of Social Security. For example, I have voted previously to freeze at the present level Social Security as long as everything else in the entire Federal budget is frozen, including national defense. But, that is not this package before us. It cuts COLA's without a defense cut. So, before we vote on the so-called compromise, this Senator would like to express himself on Social Security.

I am wondering if the majority leader, at the conclusion of the pending amendment now before the Senate, would allow me to be recognized to introduce a sense-of-the-Senate resolution relative to the cost-of-living increases for our Social Security recipients. It seems eminently fair. I do not think we have to debate it. But I am just hoping that I would have an opportunity to at least present this sense-of-the-Senate resolution before we vote on the package before this body.

Mr. DOLE. Let me say to my colleague, first, I would like to see the amendment. If it is what I think it is, the answer would probably be "No." I do not know what is in it.

Mr. PRYOR. That is what I am afraid of. Of course, the majority leader knows it is nonbinding. It is an expression that would probably get support from both sides of the aisle. I hope the majority leader will consider having mercy on this Senator, and allow me this opportunity.

Mr. DOLE. I want to have mercy on the Senator, but I want to have mercy on the country, too. There are a lot of people who are going to be suffering if we do not do something on the deficit. I can see we are ginning up the PR machine to see who can protect the senior citizens the most. I would vote for a freeze except, or I would vote for this except, or I would vote for something else except. There is never that perfect package. The American people know there is not going to be a perfect package where everybody can vote in some painless way, I would be happy to look at the amendment. That would be an indication to me that we are not going to vote this evening. If we can confirm that, then we can determine what course of action would be this evening for all Senators. If every Senator wishes to give some testimony on social security, so it will appear in his next newsletter or mailing, then that would take some time.

I think there are just as many people on this side concerned about the senior citizens. In fact, there are a few more—52 to 47 on that side. If we can get a vote now that is all right

with me. But I understood the Senator from Ohio just complaining about all the time we have been using and no votes. I am not certain I have the votes on the package. But I am willing to vote. I hope we can vote tonight before midnight or 1 or 2 a.m. It will take us quite a while to fly over there. We could get word I guess by the time they landed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the majority leader has expired.

Mr. DOLE. I yield the balance of the time on the amendment to the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, may I ask for some time on our side?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am going to sit down in a moment. I have a half hour or so to speak, but I want to make a parliamentary inquiry. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President: How much time do we have remaining on the pending amendment? How much time does the minority have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 24½ minutes, and the minority 19½ minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time remains on the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 16 hours, 30½ minutes and the minority has 19 hours 20½ minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you, Mr. President. For those who are interested in discussing the substance of deficit reduction, and the pending amendment, I raised the parliamentary inquiry so everyone will understand there is plenty of time. On the amendment itself there is 24½ and 19½ minutes for the majority and the minority, respectively. Clearly the Senator from New Mexico within reason is prepared to yield time off the resolution to anybody who would like to speak here in the event they want to discuss substance.

I think you all heard that there remains 16½ hours and about 19½ hours for the majority and minority, respectively on the resolution. I do not know how long it will take, but the majority leader has answered all the possible procedural and time limitation questions related to the pending resolution. That is not up to the Senator from New Mexico. As I understand it, the pending business is the Domenici-Dole amendment offered to complete the parliamentary process, wherein it will receive a vote without any other amendment, but thereafter it will be subject to further amendments.

I want to make just one comment about Social Security and then I am going to sit down and invite Members who want to talk about deficit reduction, who have been asking me for the last 5 or 6 days when they would have an opportunity to give their first remarks about it, to proceed. I would

invite them on my side to come to the floor.

I have been working on this budget in particular and on the process in general for a long time. I have been working at trying to put a package together that was equal to the problem, the problem of deficits between \$200 and \$250 billion, and as far out there as you can see, assuming good economic times. So when I say I have been trying to put together a package equal to that, clearly I have been working at a major package that would be commensurate with that problem.

Almost everyone now has reached some consensus that we ought to cut that deficit in half, at least by half, in 3 years. I started months ago trying to do that. I worked in open committee hearings for 2 weeks trying to do that.

Finally, we got a package that was reasonably good. It came here to the floor and everybody knows what has happened since then.

But I want to share with the Senators, in the event they have not thought about it, and with the American people in the event they are interested, that I think we are in an amazing dilemma here. The leadership package has the equivalent of a cost-of-living freeze for all Social Security and Federal pensions. It is spread differently, but it is about the same as a freeze. Everybody seems now to be anxious to get the first amendment so they can take that out of the package.

Well, I look around and I see amendments on the other side of the aisle, a whole package, not a single amendment, and I say this with all compliment to those who are proposing them, that I see one from the distinguished Senator who used to be the ranking member of the Budget Committee, and indeed chairman for a short period of time, Senator HOLLINGS. He has one for a 1-year freeze on cost-of-living adjustments for all Social Security and Federal pensioners. I see an overall deficit reduction package from my friend, the ranking member of the Committee and senior Senator from Florida, that freezes for 1-year cost-of-living increases for pensioners and on Social Security and effectively does that with some reserve to ameliorate the major problem.

It is a peculiar situation. I have not counted heads yet, but I would say without fear of being wrong that well over 60 U.S. Senators from both sides of the aisle are for a cost-of-living freeze on Social Security and pensions. I am hearing that one group is for protecting the senior citizens and it is attributed to one side of the aisle. I hear our distinguished leader say there are some on our side who want to put back the full cost-of-living because that is perceived to be protecting the seniors.

But I repeat, if I go back and check the record of last year's votes on the HOLLINGS' freeze, and now he has an

other amendment similar to it with co-sponsors, and I have looked at the package that my good friend from Florida has, I have looked at our own and I know how many votes there are for ours, and when I add it all up I think we all ought to understand that there is somewhere between 55 and 60 Senators right now who are for a cost-of-living freeze on all pensions, including Social Security.

I want to state the nature of the problem as I see it.

They are for freezing Social Security and pensions, if they can get what they want in the rest of the package to lessen the burden of the projected deficits on future generations of Americans.

I think that, in and of itself, speaks of the tremendous consensus in the Chamber to reduce the deficits. Those people on the other side of the aisle who were on budget packages that will freeze Social Security are just as much in favor of freezing Social Security as Republicans, or maybe more. It is just that we are for it with this package and they are for it with some other combination of restraint or taxes.

I do not think that means that we are more for deficit reduction than they are, or that they are more for it than we are. Nor do I think it means that they are more for senior citizens than we are, or we are less for them than they are. I think we are going through the normal processes of the U.S. Senate, with open, free democratic debate, and sooner or later we are going to come to the consensus that we have to put a deficit reduction package together and if it is not ours, it has to be somebody's. It has to be commensurate with the problem, and it has to address the cost-of-living indexes on pensions. It has to address the cost of defense. It has to address a lot of other programs.

I clearly do not want to argue with my friend from Ohio about his statement as to who is doing what to whom here procedurally, but we have not had any substantive debate. We have not had any amendments because all we have been trying to do, because the Senate has very, very complicated rules, is to get a vote on a package and then let everybody have their day in the sun amending it thereafter.

From my standpoint, I believe that there will be other packages offered and which will be voted on. I believe there are Senators on that side of the aisle who want their vote and I believe they will find a way to get a vote on their packages.

I do not think that we will have to go through a complicated arduous process to give them that vote. Frankly, speaking only for myself, when the distinguished Senator from Florida is ready to offer his package, and I think I know what it is, I have described one

aspect of it, I hope he can get a vote up or down on it.

When the distinguished Senator HOLLINGS from South Carolina is ready to offer his package, I hope we get a vote on it. I do not think that is asking too much of the institution. That is all we ask of ourselves, to get a vote on the package and start amending it afterwards.

I have taken only a few minutes at the outset to put this issue of cost-of-living indexes for all pensioners in the United States into perspective because it is going to be very, very strange for those watching the Senate to do the counting of who is for and who is against. It is going to be who is for the cost-of-living freezes if they get everything else they want. I think everybody ought to know that.

So when you make that original count and say these people are against the cost-of-living freeze, it is going to be amazing in about 4 or 5 days some of those same ones who voted against it are going to be for it. Then maybe a couple of days later when another package is offered, there will be a whole different group of Senators voting for a freeze on cost-of-living indexes. They will have voted against it, they probably will have voted against it when Senator CHILES offers his, and they will be for it when another Senator offers it. I really do not think any of us are for or against senior citizens, and I surely think it does not mean that we know who is for or against freezing the pensions and pay of our Federal employees for 1 year in order to put together a package that is substantial and commensurate with the dimension of this problem of deficits.

Mr. President, I yield the floor at this point.

Mr. CRANSTON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Who yields time?

Mr. CHILES. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, it is almost as difficult to follow what has been happening on the floor now as it is to follow the chart of the tree of amendments that the majority leader keeps referring to and inspecting on the desk.

Let me summarize what has occurred.

The first vote of the Senate respecting the budget resolution has now been held on the issue of Social Security. Virtually all Democrats voted to bring up the Moynihan-Riegle amendment that would give Social Security recipients a full cost-of-living increase. All Republicans voted against bringing up the Moynihan-Riegle Social Security amendment.

This may be an arcane, inside parliamentary victory for the Republicans, but the fact is that it is the first step in the defeat for President Reagan.

The fact is that the Republicans want to thwart Democratic efforts to undo what Ronald Reagan wants to do on Social Security, cut the COLA's, because certain Republicans want to get the credit for undoing what Ronald Reagan wants to do with Social Security.

The Republicans have offered a budget package negotiated with President Reagan that reduces the value of Social Security by denying the full cost-of-living increase. That diminishes the purchasing power of every Social Security check received by every Social Security recipient. Therefore, it is tampering with Social Security.

But the Republican intention is to give Members of their own party the first opportunity to amend the budget package to grant a full COLA. They want a Republican name on the Social Security amendment. I submit that that would be a false label.

They want a Republican name on a Social Security amendment that their own President opposes. They want a Republican name on a Social Security amendment that they refuse to include in their Republican budget package.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] just stated that 60 to 70 percent of Republicans want a budget package that will freeze Social Security COLA's—not even grant the 2-percent increase that is proposed in the package, but freeze them. Obviously, these Republicans must depend on Democratic votes to pass their Social Security amendment to get them off the political hook upon which they now find themselves impaled.

Mr. President, I say we need truth in labeling in the Senate. The Social Security amendment we vote on should be the Democratic Moynihan-Riegle amendment.

Let me briefly respond to this question: Why do most Democrats and some Republicans favor a full COLA for Social Security recipients? First, for all the reasons that Ronald Reagan was advancing throughout his campaign and stayed with until very recently. As the President has stated, the Social Security fund has a surplus. It has nothing to do with the deficit, and it has its own separate trust fund that is not part of the overall Federal budget.

Second, another reason, not advanced by the President, is that something like one-third of Social Security recipients are getting 90 percent of what they live on from Social Security. They are old or they are totally disabled, they are unable to work now, and most are unable to find other sources of income. The average Social Security check is \$450 a month—a little bit less than that. We all know it is hard to make do on \$450 a month.

The fact is that, according to the Congressional Budget Office, if the COLA is granted only halfway as the Republican package proposes, approximately 575,000 senior citizens would be pushed below the poverty line. That would be something like 75,000 Californians.

Mr. President, I oppose that happening to any American. I certainly oppose its happening to any Californian.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI address the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield myself time off the amendment. I do not know of any Republicans who desire to speak at this time. Once again, I would say if there are any on our side who desire to speak with reference to the pending amendment or the problem we are confronted with in terms of the deficit, we have some time now.

In deference to making sure that the record is correct, the distinguished Senator from California would not yield for a question as he spoke, and I understand that. But I believe I said 55 to 60 U.S. Senators from both sides of the aisle, in my opinion, are for and will vote for a cost-of-living freeze on Social Security. I believe there will be substantial numbers from that side of the aisle. It is just that they will do that only in the context of the kind of budget that they support.

I did not say 60 percent of the Republicans or 60 percent of the Democrats. I just said there are a number for Senator HOLLINGS' amendment, which is an entire package, a freeze; there is another group of Senators that are for the Chiles proposal, which has a Social Security freeze with a small reserve. I think when you are through adding those up, you will find that my rough estimate as of tonight will be correct and, if anything, it will be on the short side.

Mr. President, this week we embark on one of the most important debates of the past 40 years. The outcome of this debate may well determine the economic health and vitality of the Nation for the rest of this century. Unlike many debates, in which we battle over fundamental goals or objectives, this debate will focus on different ways to reach what everyone in the Senate has agreed is our final goal—large deficit reduction this year and in the years to come.

Indeed, when we began this year's budget deliberations back in January, our leadership established a very clear goal. That goal was embodied in S. 1 as introduced by our distinguished majority leader and which I cosponsored. That goal, simply stated, was and is that deficits must be reduced as a per-

centage of our gross national product [GNP] from their current level of 5.2 percent, down to 4 percent in 1986, 3 percent in 1987, and 2 percent in 1988, and by the beginning of the next decade, the Federal budget must be in balance. That goal has guided not only the early discussions with the administration but all serious budget proposals since that time. This goal reflects not only the view of many that any budget action this year must be significant but, most particularly, the views of Federal Reserve Chairman Volcker that the budget savings must be at least \$50 billion in the first year to have an impact on financial markets. That means on interest rates.

The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. CHILES] has already divulged his plan that would save \$58 billion off the deficit in 1986 and \$316 billion over the fiscal year 1986-88 period. The chairman of the House Budget Committee, Representative GRAY, has announced that he wishes to devise a package that will save \$50 billion from the deficit in 1986. The President of the United States offered a plan in his February budget submission that saved about \$51 billion off the deficit in 1986. The Senate Budget Committee reported out earlier this month a plan that cut the projected 1986 deficit by approximately \$57 billion. And, finally, the Senate leadership and the White House have compromised on a budget plan, which I believe will be the starting point this week for debate, that cuts the 1986 deficit by \$52 billion. In short, I think it is fair to say the major players in this immense debate at least agree on objectives. Certainly it is obvious here today that we disagree on means.

Yet, even in our debate on means, I believe it is important to distinguish precisely the size and nature of our disagreement.

As I have worked through the long process to reach consensus on the budget, I have applied two basic tests in making judgments about how much to cut or whether to terminate a program entirely. My first test is simply this: In times of \$240-billion-plus deficits, is this the kind of program we would start? Or, is this program something that would be nice to have, but which has become unaffordable as we try to reduce the burgeoning Federal debt.

My second test is more general, but it may also be more important. I ask myself a simple question: For the average working man and woman, with two kids at home and takehome pay of about \$20,000 a year, is this the kind of Federal program that I would ask them to pay taxes to support? Or, is this a program that helps so narrow a constituency that it is truly unfair, with these kinds of deficit, to ask working men and women to aid it with their tax dollars?

These two tests, I have found, are useful as we compare the major public budget plans. Let us compare, for example, the major elements of the plan devised by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. CHILES] with the Senate-White House agreement. I will, of course, be discussing Senator CHILES' plan at greater length later in the debate, if he offers it. I hope he will, and I hope he gets a vote.

On defense, Senator CHILES would give zero real growth in fiscal year 1986 and 3 percent real growth in 1987 and 1988. The Senate-White House compromise would give 3 percent real growth in all 3 years. There are many who have adopted a lot of myths about the impact of various proposals as they apply to defense on this budget. But in strictly money terms, the differences are not large when we are talking about \$300 billion in total budget savings. But, in terms of program and policy, the difference between the two proposals is substantial. Senator CHILES' proposal would mean cuts in some conventional and strategic weapons systems below minimal economic production rates. Congress has repeatedly supported these systems, and we will end up buying them sooner or later. If we wait until later, we will end up paying a much higher price for them.

On Social Security cost-of-living adjustments, there are some differences between Senator CHILES' proposal to freeze cost-of-living adjustments for Social Security recipients for 1 year and the 3-year COLA restraint contained in the Senate Republican-White House compromise. However, both proposals recognize that all groups in this society must share in the burden of Federal spending restraint—including, all pensioners, including Social Security recipients.

I commend Senator CHILES for his courage in putting forward such a proposal. He represents a State that has many retirees as do I. What he was proposed not only requires great political courage and leadership but also reflects how very serious he views our budget problems today and in the future.

Senator CHILES' proposal illustrates a basic problem we face. For most non-defense programs, he proposes a freeze at the 1985 level or modest cuts below that level. This approach will simply hold the growth in these programs in check temporarily. This Senator, for one, will tell anyone who is willing to listen that this is not just a period of temporary austerity; this is a period of permanent readjustment in the level and mix of Government spending that will determine that long-run growth of Federal spending not only for this decade but for this century. This Government simply cannot pay for all of the programs it now sponsors at any

reasonable tax rate—even one that is higher than we now have.

It is for this reason that I strongly advocate some program eliminations and reforms contained in the Senate-White House compromise. The Senate-White House budget plan eliminates 20 programs, some of them minor, some of them major, reforms 40 additional programs and freezes nearly all of the remaining hundreds of Federal activities. Unfortunately, the only way to assure that the difficult actions we take today will have permanent effects in the future is to make the hard choices now and eliminate many programs that may be worthy but do not meet the two tests which I started with earlier in my comments. This is Not easy for me and I do not expect it to be easy for anyone else. As a matter of fact, I do not enjoy it very much. Some of the programs I think in different times under different circumstances I could staunchly advocate. But I am supporting these reductions and, in some cases, the elimination of programs I have supported during my entire Senate career of over 12 years. Indeed, I will confess that I helped create some of them.

Finally, this brings us to the issue of taxes. There are some, I am sure, who will propose a minimum tax as a way out of the deficit problem. This is like trying to pass the proverbial camel through the eye of a needle. I have looked at the conventional proposals and I can find no more than \$15 to \$20 billion dollars in increased revenues over 3 years from the minimum corporate tax because you cannot raise any more than that. This is, some will say, a noble gesture, but it is hardly perceptible in a package of \$300 billion in budget savings. But there is a more important issue. We can raise taxes, certainly. Some of the proposal before us say we should. One proposes that we raise \$67 billion over the next 3 years. We can raise taxes by eliminating existing preferences in the tax code, freezing tax expenditures, or we can adopt some other scheme.

But the question remains, do we want to use this added revenue to finance existing Federal spending programs or do we want to offset some of the added burden of these higher taxes through lower tax rates on working men and women and the poor. The Children's Defense League recently released a major study on the taxation of the poor. Since the late 1970's, thousands of poor, probably hundreds of thousands of poor, have been pushed on to the tax rolls because their meager increases in income—which only kept pace with inflation—were measured against a minimum tax threshold which has not been adjusted since 1978.

Why has Congress not made the necessary adjustments? Simply because

changes in the tax burden at the low end of the income scale result in substantial revenue loss. A study by Representative RANGEL, of the House Ways and Means Committee, last year showed that the revenue loss from exempting the poor from taxation would cost \$16.6 billion in the first year alone—that is to say to that group of Americans, as I believe we should—if we are going to reform taxes, we ought to start with that one—if we take them off the tax rolls, we will have to find \$16.6 billion in tax revenues somewhere just to come out even, that is an amount almost equal to the amount we will spend this year on food stamps and AFDC.

In short, we have not been able to afford to remove the poor from taxation because the Federal Government's insatiable appetite for revenue to finance rapidly rising levels of Federal spending made it, for all practical purposes, impossible.

Some Senators have asked how the Senate-White House budget compromise differs from what was reported out of the Senate Budget Committee. Before I outline those differences and the many similarities between the two budgets, let me say a word about the deliberations of the Senate Budget Committee.

Frankly, things looked somewhat bleak as the committee began its work. We had been unable to forge an independent Republican plan as we had hoped before the committee began its work. I began markup of the budget without any agreement among Republicans or among a bipartisan group on my committee. But I did one thing right, I think, as I look back. I initiated the discussion with a proposal of my own, a comprehensive proposal that reached the goals we have all set for ourselves for deficit reduction. I called that plan the promised land, and I held it up to the committee as the standard against which other proposals should be measured.

The President's February budget, as we all remember, fell short of meeting the goals set in the promised land budget. This meant that my proposal had to incorporate many of the reforms and terminations the President and the Congressional Budget Office had recommended over the years, but also had to go beyond the President in two major areas—defense and Social Security.

In defense, my original proposal presented to the Budget Committee had real growth of 3 percent in budget authority for each of the 3 years, fiscal years 1986-88. That is the same level now contained in the Senate-White House compromise, which has been given the title of the "taxpayers' protection plan." So, I feel comfortable with the 3-percent real growth figure we will have before the Senate this

week, since I originally offered that level in committee.

In Social Security, I offered, as I indicated earlier, a 1-year freeze. But I have advocated a CPI minus 2 or CPI minus 3 approach in the past, so I feel comfortable with the proposal now contained in the promised land No. 2, or the taxpayers' protection plan.

In major domestic programs, my original proposal accepted almost all of the reforms, terminations, and cuts proposed by the President, plus a few more cuts that he had not recommended. So, again, I feel comfortable with the program cuts, terminations, and reforms assumed—not mandated—in the budget package compromise before the Senate.

As we proceeded with markup of the budget resolution, a curious thing happened, and, I suspect it might happen on the floor of the Senate. I hope not. Almost every Member had an amendment. Most amendments would have added back spending. Some amendments would have cut more in one place or the other. We had 60 votes in committee. But when all was said and done, many spending increases were adopted, and the committee was dissatisfied with the outcome. The deficits were too large.

It was at that time that I offered a variation on my original proposal, and a majority of the committee voted to report it out of committee. Some of those who voted for the revised plan said that they did not like parts of it. Some of those who voted against the plan said that they did like parts of it. As I have said many times, there was something to offend everyone in the resolution reported by the Senate Budget Committee.

But, Mr. President, I want to make clear the one thing that happened that made all of the turmoil and difficulties of producing a budget worth while. We succeeded. We did report out a budget.

I must at this time compliment all of those in the committee who worked for responsible numbers. At times, I thought I would get only one or two votes for my proposals. But our committee, on both sides of the aisle, showed courage and farsightedness of the highest order, and I thank those on my side of the aisle who helped so much. I also thank those, like Senator CHILES and Senator HOLLINGS, who played a large role in the debate and who had major plans of their own.

It is now time to compare the major differences between what our small band in the budget committee produced and what the deliberations between the Senate leadership and the White House have yielded.

Not surprisingly, the differences are small and the similarities many.

First, in defense. The committee reported out zero percent real growth in 1986, followed by 3 percent real

growth in 1987 and 1988. The compromise has 3 percent real growth in all 3 years.

Second, in Social Security. The committee approved a 1-year freeze on the cost-of-living adjustment, with a full COLA for SSI recipients and, most important, an increase for all SSI recipients beyond the full adjustment for inflation. This additional \$1.4 billion was our way of acknowledging that SSI recipients and the poor need special consideration in our budget package. The compromise before us guarantees at least a 2-percent cost-of-living adjustment for each of the next 3 years and retains the SSI increase proposed by the committee.

Third, in domestic programs the Senate Budget Committee budget resolution reformed, cut, or terminated about 83 programs. The Senate-White House agreement reforms, cuts, or terminates about 85 programs in the domestic area, in addition to a general freeze on domestic spending. The budget committee resolution would have saved about \$137 billion through reconciliation to the individual committees. The agreement calls for reconciliation savings of almost \$156 billion. The difference is about \$19 billion, over 3 years.

The major changes are as follows: The compromise assumes savings in farm credit reform, phasing-out federally subsidized crop insurance, the levying of Coast Guard user fees for non-search and rescue operations, reform of non-GSL student financial assistance, and a cap on the COLA for veterans pensions similar to that for Social Security and other programs. All of these are new and were not contained in the Senate Budget Committee reported resolution.

In addition, the compromise assumes more savings than the Budget Committee did in such areas as farm price-support programs, the Export-Import Bank, Urban Mass Transit Program reform, Amtrak termination, Medicare and Medicaid reform, elimination of general revenue sharing at the end of its authorization period, termination of the Job Corps, termination of the Small Business Administration Business Assistance Program, and reform of the Veterans' Administration medical system. All of these latter items were addressed by the Senate Budget Committee. The compromise asks for more savings in these areas, most often by termination or phaseout.

In a few cases, of course, the compromise adds back money to a program. We added back funds for food and nutrition service programs, we changed the nature of handling fees to be charged by Government-sponsored credit agencies, we added a slight amount back for foreign aid activities, we lowered our savings level assumed from management and work force re-

forms in the civil service system, and, finally and importantly, we added substantial sums to elementary and secondary education programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table reflecting the comparison between the Senate Budget Committee reported budget resolution and the Senate-White House compromise be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE-WHITE HOUSE AGREEMENT (CHANGE FROM SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 32, AS REPORTED)

[In billions of dollars and fiscal years]

	1985	1986	1987	1988
050: National defense:				
Budget authority.....	+10.3	+11.5	+12.8	
Outlays.....	+3.0	+6.3	+8.4	
150: International affairs:				
Budget authority.....	-0.2	+0.1		
Outlays.....	+0.2		-0.2	
250: General science, space, and technology:				
Budget authority.....				
Outlays.....				
270: Energy:				
Budget authority.....	-0.3	-0.3	-0.1	
Outlays.....	-0.3	-0.3		
300: Natural resources and environment:				
Budget authority.....				
Outlays.....				
350: Agriculture:				
Budget authority.....	-3.9	-3.8	-6.1	
Outlays.....	-3.8	-4.6	-7.4	
370: Commerce and housing credit:				
Budget authority.....	+1.2	-0.6	-0.7	
Outlays.....	-0.2	-0.5	-0.5	
400: Transportation:				
Budget authority.....	-0.4	-1.4	-1.9	
Outlays.....	-0.5	-0.7	-1.1	
450: Community and regional development:				
Budget authority.....	-0.4	-0.4	-0.4	
Outlays.....	-0.1	-0.1	-0.2	
500: Education, training, employment, and social services:				
Budget authority.....	+0.1	-0.3	-0.1	+0.1
Outlays.....	+0.1	-0.2	-0.1	
550: Health:				
Budget authority.....		-0.3	-0.8	
Outlays.....		-0.4	0.8	
570: Medical insurance:				
Budget authority.....	-0.6	-0.3	-0.2	
Outlays.....	-0.7	-0.5	-0.4	
600: Income security:				
Budget authority.....	+0.8	+1.1	+0.4	
Outlays.....	+1.2	+1.6	+0.6	
650: Social security:				
Budget authority.....	-4.0	-0.7	-0.5	
Outlays.....	+2.8	+0.5	-4.1	
700: Veterans benefits and services:				
Budget authority.....	+0.1	-0.1	-0.5	
Outlays.....	+0.3		-0.4	
750: Administration of justice:				
Budget authority.....				
Outlays.....				
800: General government:				
Budget authority.....	+0.1	+0.1	+0.2	
Outlays.....	+0.1	+0.2	+0.1	
850: General purpose fiscal assistance:				
Budget authority.....	+2.3	-2.3		
Outlays.....	+1.7	-1.1	-0.5	
900: Net interest:				
Budget authority.....		+1.4	+2.0	
Outlays.....		+1.4	+2.0	
920: Allowances:				
Budget authority.....	+0.8	+1.5	+1.8	
Outlays.....	+0.8	+1.5	+1.8	
950: Undistributed offsetting receipts:				
Budget authority.....				
Outlays.....				
Total:				
Budget authority.....	+0.1	+5.5	+5.4	+6.1
Outlays.....	+4.6	+3.1	-2.8	
Revenues.....	-0.2	-0.3	-0.3	
Deficit change.....	+4.8	+3.4	-2.5	

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me conclude where I began, by asking my colleagues as we debate during these next, critical days, to use the same two tests as I have used as we consider terminating or reforming programs: Would we begin this program if

we faced \$200-plus billion deficits, and is this the kind of program that working men and women in this Nation should be paying their taxes to support? This Senator will have no trouble saying that we ought to reform the Eximbank, which benefits some of the wealthiest corporations in the world, or that we ought to terminate Amtrak, which has mostly well-to-do businessmen as riders, or end other subsidies to the well-to-do. I do not think working men and women making \$20,000 a year for their families ought to be paying taxes to subsidize those better off than they are. And while Amtrak is something we wish we could afford, the simple fact is that we could not make such a commitment if we had faced \$200 billion deficits 12 years ago. I will make these arguments in greater detail as we face the dozens of amendments I anticipate later this week and next.

The issues are clearly before the Senate and they are not trivial. The issue of the Federal deficit goes directly to the underlying structure and evolution of our free, democratic political economic system. The politics of the budget are intertwined with the fundamental principles of our Government: Federal and State responsibilities, private and public rights, economic equity, and economic efficiency.

I am reminded of what our former distinguished majority leader Howard Baker once said. He said, "We live in troubled times; a final judgment on our stewardship would be premature. For those of us who wear the mantle of politicians, these are by no means favorable times." He concluded, however, on an optimistic note—that the complexities and obstacles will no doubt be present, but within this Chamber, they will be met by a will and conviction and a determination that will insure responsible action and responsible governing. I believe that, despite our differences at the outset, a fair and enduring consensus is possible. I believe that the Senate will report a major deficit reduction plan. I have made it clear how I believe that plan must be structured and I intend to defend those views. But I also intend to work with my colleagues as I have in the past, to assure that we meet our responsibilities with the commitment and consensus that Senator Baker foresaw as the necessary ingredient of responsible governance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. EVANS]. Who yields time?

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, will the Democratic manager of the bill yield time to me?

Mr. CHILES. I yield the Senator from Montana 5 minutes on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I believe this is the fourth day that we have been talking about having a vote on this particular proposal. I believe it is called the Republican leadership-White House proposed budget. Whatever it is called, it is a farce.

Nobody expects us, in the final analysis, to approve a budget that results in a \$183 billion deficit for the coming fiscal year, according to CBO's mathematics, or, if we are going to use the current method on this package, I think they say it is \$175 billion. Whatever method you use, it is too much.

We know that this is not going to fly. Yet, we are held here 4 days waiting to vote on it. I do not mind voting on it, because once it is voted upon, we can get into the amendments.

What I really would like to happen is that we get into some amendments of substance or some packages of substance that might put together the majority vote in the Senate for final passage of a meaningful budget resolution. Nobody in the Senate or nobody in the country, I hope, wants us to have a budget which ends up for the fiscal year with a \$180 billion deficit. That is no progress.

Despite what the leadership on the Republican side might be saying, this proposal is outrageous. It does not cut the deficit sufficiently and does not get into the area of cutting the deficit that they claim is essential. Why is that, since it knocks out a number of programs? Let me read some of the things this does.

It causes Medicare recipients to put in a \$5 billion out-of-pocket increase in order to pay the bill. That is a tax increase if I ever heard of one. Social security COLA's are cut. Revenue sharing is terminated. Education and training is cut over 3 years by \$10 billion. Child nutrition is cut. The veterans are cut. Programs that are eliminated include SBA, Amtrak, mass transit, housing, UDAG. I cannot believe that UDAG would be eliminated completely, but I guess it is seriously cut.

At any rate, all these things are cut and cut rather drastically, and you still end up with a big deficit. Why is that? There is a sacred cow in here. There is some feeling, apparently, in the Senate, and I do not think it is shared all that strongly by the rest of the country, that the sacred cow of Pentagon spending is going to be protected.

The taxpayers who have filed by April 15 will be delighted to know that some of their tax dollars can go for the \$44 light bulbs that the Pentagon found a need for, or the \$640 toilet seat covers, or the \$7,000 coffeemakers for the C-5, or the \$180 flashlight, or the \$40 washer.

That is outrageous waste which everybody says we should eliminate, but this particular proposal indicates that

we should increase the spending by inflation plus 3 percent. I do not believe that is going to be the final vote in this Senate, and certainly it is not what the country wants.

So I am all for getting on and getting into the substance of doing something, and I suggest that the first thing that can be done is to somehow get beyond the point where I suppose the Republicans and Members of the Senate on that side of the aisle are going to vote for it just to get something rolling, and I suppose those of us who vigorously oppose it will have an opportunity to show our disinclination to support it.

Really, Mr. President, I have to respond on one point that has been discussed here this afternoon, and that is whether or not there should be some means of correcting the inequity on corporation taxes. We look at the top 20 moneymakers for the last couple of years that are reported and find it very discouraging that companies can make as much as \$1 billion or \$2 billion in profits and pay little or no Federal income taxes.

I think the people of this country have made a judgment on that sort of loopholes, and they say, "Close them," and why we should wait to close them, I do not know.

Despite what has been said just a few moments ago by the very distinguished chairman of the Senate Budget Committee that I am talking of \$3 billion per year of additional revenue, oh, no, I am talking about more than that, because the loopholes are there. They exist. They must be closed, and now is the time to do it. We should have done it 1 year or 2 years ago or we should not have opened the gates as much as we did in the last couple tax packages that were unwisely passed by Congress to allow this to happen.

But there will be substitutes offered. There will be packages offered. They merit support, and they will be based on fairness and equity and assuring competitiveness and economic growth in making investments in our future both in the terms of human and fiscal needs.

I have not mentioned one area that this budget drastically reduces, and I do want to bring it up. That is that rural programs would be cut over the next 3 years by 41 percent. That, Mr. President, is totally unlikely to happen, but it does send out shock waves, as to these other proposals that I have listed, among the people throughout the country.

We can better serve all of our citizens of this country by quickly going through this farce of voting this thing into place so we can start to do something with it.

It is an impossible proposition that we are going to finally approve a budget deficit package that results in

\$180 billion in Federal deficit for the next fiscal year, and we know that will not happen. We know that there will not be cuts and elimination of programs I have mentioned to the degree that are proposed in this budget resolution. We know that will not happen, and so we will have to start piecing it together correctly.

Mr. President, finally, I note that I believe that in all comity for the Senate to function properly, the obvious time-worn and time-tested procedure of recognizing the minority leadership for amendments cannot be abused. I believe the right of the majority of the Senate to determine how we take up the amendments is, of course, their prerogative, but the rights and privileges, I might add, of any one Senator can certainly cause some of the abusers of the time-tested system here in the Senate to want to play the same type of hard ball. I hope that will not happen, but, Mr. President, the possibility is very strong if we are not allowed from our side to present amendments that we think ought to be considered. We waited, after all, 4 days and we could have voted at any time during these 4 days. It simply has not occurred. So it has served the pleasure and desires of the majority, which I do not object to up to this point, but I will certainly be offering my next amendment that is offered.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Who yields time?

MR. GORTON. Mr. President, as the Senate begins debate on the first concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 1986, I want to take this opportunity to offer some observations on the proposals we will be considering. I say this partly as a matter of record, but also because I hope that my colleagues will approach the debate with a sense of urgency and seriousness appropriate to the situation in which we find ourselves.

A budget resolution has two primary purposes. First and foremost, it is the one document through which the Congress addresses Federal fiscal policy. Until Congress created the budget process in 1974, the legislative branch simply did not address fiscal policy in any systematic fashion. Because congressional oversight over monetary policy is relatively indirect, we were in an astonishing situation, in that the Congress of the United States had no mechanism for expressing itself on questions of Federal economic policy. Monetary policy was determined by a quasi-independent Federal Reserve, fiscal policy emerged from whatever tax and appropriations bills Congress passed on a piecemeal basis, so the ability of Congress to guide economic policy was extremely limited. What-

ever the other shortcomings of the congressional budget process, it has at least given Congress a method for addressing economic policy.

The second major purpose of a budget resolution is, of course, to judge the relative importance of various specific programs funded by the Federal Government. From a fiscal policy point of view, not much would be lost if the budget resolution consisted only of two numbers: total spending, and total revenues. But a budget resolution, by virtue of the fact that it includes instructions as to budget authority and outlay figures for each of the 21 functions of Government, has far broad implications. It is the document in which we describe what we think Government should be: What functions it should perform, what activities it should support, and what the role of the Government should be in our lives.

For my part, I cannot help but have distinctly different reactions to the principal budget proposal before us—the so-called Rose Garden II plan—depending upon which aspect I focus on.

From the point of view of fiscal policy, I believe the plan is a good one, indeed, a very good one. It achieves a substantial amount of deficit reduction, and it does so on the spending side alone. Measured against the Senate Budget Committee baseline, the proposal yields \$52 billion in deficit reduction in 1986, and over \$300 billion in deficit reduction over its 3-year life. The deficit is reduced to 4.2 percent of GNP in 1986, 3.2 percent of GNP in 1987, and 2 percent of GNP in fiscal 1988. It meets the principal fiscal goal that most of us set when we began consideration of the budget.

In addition, by achieving this deficit reduction entirely on the spending side, we derive two further benefits. The first is purely economic: A smaller Federal Government is most consistent with steady and sustained economic growth generally, so it is important that we achieve as much deficit reduction as possible through spending cuts. In addition, we are likely to have to consider, later this year, a proposal for comprehensive tax reform. Everyone in this Chamber knows that passing such a reform measure, valuable though it would be, will be one of the most difficult tasks this body has had to confront in recent years. It is important that we retain maximum flexibility for this battle; that we not spend tax increases now. For every tax we raise now is surely a tax we cannot trade off later, during the consideration of tax reform. As a consequence, we will make that task easier for ourselves if we can avoid tax increases at this time.

Of course, to reach these spending reduction goals we have had to consider many spending cuts which will be

politically unpopular. Would that it were not so. But the hard fact is simply that even an across-the-board spending freeze does not come close to generating the kind of deficit reduction that the present challenge demands, and is insufficient from a fiscal standpoint.

From the point of view of what this proposal says about our priorities for government, however, I have some deep reservations. I do not believe that this proposal is as fair as was the resolution originally passed by the Budget Committee, in terms of its distribution of the burden of deficit reduction. Once again, we have focused to an excessive degree on the discretionary, nondefense side of the budget. If I could write the budget by myself, my own preference would be for a number of spending restorations, matched by some deeper cuts. I will not enumerate these now—I have registered my concerns previously in the Budget Committee Report, and the next 2 weeks will provide ample opportunity to expand on this issue.

I would point out, in addition, that not every budget cut contained in the Rose Garden II proposal is motivated purely by budgetary considerations. It is clear that the administration, led in this effort by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Mr. Stockman, has seized upon the budget as a vehicle for proposing and, it hopes, passing a number of program terminations. In this effort its motives are more ideological than fiscal. I suspect many Senators will have differences of opinion with the administration over many of these proposals. I know that this Senator does.

Not surprisingly, Mr. President, I would like to restore spending for some programs in the budget. We have not reached the final act in this year's drama, and I suspect I may have an opportunity, before this is over, to try to make a mark on the Senate's budget. Perhaps I will succeed; perhaps I will fail. Perhaps the final package on which I will have an opportunity to vote will be the so-called Rose Garden II proposal.

In that case, I will confront a dilemma. For, as I have indicated, I believe that budget to be admirable on fiscal grounds, but flawed as a guideline to general government. Nevertheless, should I be confronted ultimately with the choice of whether or not to support this proposal, I will do so. I believe that reducing the deficit is, of necessity, our most important national goal at this time. Should we fail in this task, we will condemn the economy to a continuation of high interest rates, an overvalued dollar, an accumulation of debt, and ultimately, an economic burden it will be unable to sustain. The most important social program we can support is that the economic environment will be congenial to steady

and sustained economic growth. This will be of far greater benefit, to far more people, than any of the individual spending proposals we will debate over the next 2 weeks. I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will keep this in mind, and not be dissuaded by the many spokesmen for special interests—and I know how forcefully and persuasively they will present their cases—into sacrificing this general good.

I do not know how this budget debate will turn out. But I do know that what we do here in the next 2 weeks is of the most profound importance to our prosperity for the balance of this decade. We will be judged harshly, Mr. President, if we fail to provide a budget resolution that deals clearly and convincingly with the principal economic problem facing the Nation: The size of the Federal deficit.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am casting my vote in support of this amendment as a procedural step forward. Republicans, as the majority party, must move the Senate along, and move toward some form of agreement soon on a deficit reduction package for fiscal year 1986.

It is my desire to stress, Mr. President, that I view this vote not in terms of the substance of the amendment. It is well known I intend to offer, indeed I have been assured of offering, a 1-year, across-the-board freeze as a substitute to this plan; I further intend to offer an amendment to reduce the fiscal year 1986 defense budget from its present level of 7 percent in this compromise budget to the level of the increase in entitlement COLA's. This will be a test vote in the Senate for establishing fairness and an overall mood of true deficit reduction.

I have also made it known that I have difficulties with many other provisions of the compromise package, and disagree with its general approach of shifting domestic funds to defense expenditures. I do not disagree with saving money on the domestic side, but those savings should not be used to increase defense. I particularly do not favor increases in defense unless and until substantive changes are made in the way the Pentagon does business.

Again, I reiterate my support to proceed with action on the fiscal year 1986 budget, and fully intend to amend the package for fairness and equity.

Mrs. HAWKINS. Mr. President, the vote I am casting today is strictly a procedural vote. I know that it has been touted as a vote to decrease Social Security COLA's and therefore that it must be my intention to do so. However, I believe that my votes in the past on Social Security COLA's, the resolution I introduced last week not to decrease the fiscal year 1986 COLA, and the accurate news reports

that I am dedicated to preventing a reduction in Social Security in this budget process clearly show my commitment to Social Security and keeping a full COLA for fiscal years 1986-88. I am as concerned as any Senator in this Chamber with our Federal deficits and have every intention of reducing them—but decreasing the COLA is not the way to do it—the money saved cannot be used for any other purpose.

This is why I have introduced legislation to separate Social Security from the unified budget. It does not cause the deficit problem, and it should not be used as a band-aid. Now that we have a budget package before us, I will fight to ensure that the Social Security COLA is not decreased by any amount. I feel confident that my colleagues will recognize that restoring the full COLA is the only logical and conscionable action, and doing so will not increase this Nation's debt.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I strongly support adoption of the comprehensive substitute amendment offered by the distinguished majority leader, Senator DOLE. This amendment, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, embodies what has become known as the Senate administration deficit reduction plan, which would achieve substantial reductions in the projected Federal budget deficits over the next 3 fiscal years.

Mr. President, it is absolutely essential to the economic well-being of this Nation that we take immediate, strong, and decisive steps to reduce the Federal deficit. The plan we have before us here today would do just that.

This budget proposal would reduce projected deficits in fiscal year 1986 by more than \$52 billion. Over the 3-year period of fiscal years 1986-88, projected deficits would be reduced by \$297 billion. Adoption of this plan would put us clearly on the path toward achieving a balanced Federal budget by the end of the decade, and hopefully, bring to a close the practice of placing the burden of our fiscal irresponsibility on the backs of our children and grandchildren—a burden which today already totals \$1.5 trillion in public debt.

Mr. President, over the last few months, and particularly within the last few weeks, many of us have heard from great numbers of our constituents, as well as special interest groups, on budgetary matters. The phone calls and letters I have received from my constituents number in the thousands, and I am certain other Senators have experienced similar interest on the part of their constituents.

I am very pleased that so many South Carolinians, while expressing concern over how a particular budget reduction will require a sacrifice on their part, have stated their willing-

ness to accept sacrifice in order that all may share in the benefits that will result from the savings this resolution would achieve.

In regard to the issue of sacrifices, Mr. President, I would like to clarify just what adoption of this budget proposal would do, and what it would not do.

This budget proposal, the Senate/administration deficit reduction plan, if adopted, would require, and I repeat, would require, that the various authorizing committees of the Congress report legislation achieving a total of \$52 billion in savings in fiscal year 1986, from programs within their respective jurisdictions. Adoption of this budget proposal would not, and I repeat again, Mr. President, would not require that any particular programs be cut or eliminated.

While it is certainly true that cuts will have to be made in many programs, and that others may have to be eliminated, in order to achieve savings totaling \$52 billion in fiscal year 1986, this proposal does not dictate how those savings are to be achieved. The program reductions and eliminations we have reading and hearing so much about lately are the assumptions underlying the spending targets this proposal would establish.

These assumptions are merely examples of means by which the required savings can be achieved. They do not have to be achieved in the assumed way; and I would say to my colleagues, that I intend to work closely with the various authorizing committees toward achieving savings, in several of the budget function categories, in ways other than those outlined in the assumptions underlying this budget proposal.

I strongly support adoption of the Senate/administration deficit reduction plan because I believe the reduction it would bring about in the Federal deficit are essential to the economic health and vitality of this Nation. At the same time, I share some of the concerns many have expressed over several of the suggested program cut-backs and eliminations underlying the proposal. For instance, under the agriculture function, one assumption is a phaseout of Rural Electrification Administration programs over an 8-year period. Another is a reduction of the soil and water conservation program.

These are both worthwhile, solid, cost-effective programs which have been of tremendous benefit to rural America. These are programs which I have long supported and plan to continue to support. I believe the savings this proposal would require under the agriculture function can be achieved in ways other than phasing our rural electrification programs, and in ways other than drastically reducing soil and water conservation programs. Accordingly, I plan to work closely with

Senator HELMS and other members of the Senate Agriculture Committee on these matters.

In this regard, Mr. President, I am pleased that the administration has made some concessions already, and am encouraged by the willingness Senator HELMS has expressed to me and others to work toward developing a number of different ways the required savings can be achieved under the agriculture function of the budget. Additionally, I would point out to my colleagues that the Senate/administration deficit reduction plan calls for substantially less reductions in agriculture function programs than did the February budget request.

Another assumed program saving that is of concern to me involves the manner in which the supposed cap on Federal Medicaid expenditures would be applied to the respective States. It is assumed that the proportion of future Federal Medicaid matching moneys available to each individual State would be based upon respective amounts received in fiscal year 1985.

In my opinion, such an allocation formula would disproportionately impact States which, because of their limited tax base, have had difficulty in raising the funds required to match Federal dollars, and therefore, have maintained relatively stringent Medicaid eligibility requirements. Therefore, in the event the Senate Finance Committee deems it necessary to limit overall Federal Medicaid expenditures, I plan to work with members of that committee on ways to allocate whatever funds are available to the respective States in a fairer and more equitable manner than would the underlying budget assumptions.

Mr. President, I have these and other concerns about the assumptions underlying the Senate/administration deficit reduction plan. However, I feel it would be most unwise to oppose the entire budget proposal simply because the underlying projected changes—which merely suggest one possible format for achieving the overall savings required—recommend some program curtailments with which I do not agree. Major deficit reductions are simply too important to the future economic vitality of the Nation for me to do less than lend my full support to the adoption of this measure. Certainly the fate of no single program, or group of programs, which might be affected by this budget proposal is as crucial to the Nation as is the success of this package of budget reforms.

If we do not act now to reduce the size of future deficits, we will be unable to maintain strong economic growth. Interest rates will once again rise; American dollars will continue to be overvalued in foreign exchange transactions, leading to a worsening of the already bloated trade deficits; and the economic gains achieved under the

leadership of President Reagan will begin to sharply erode.

On the other hand, Mr. President, the benefits expected to accrue from deficit reductions of the magnitude in the Senate/administration deficit reduction plan would assure continued economic expansion for the remainder of this decade. Economists estimate passage of this package would mean a drop of at least 1 percent in interest rates over the short term and 2 to 3 percent over the long term. Such a decline in interest rates would be of tremendous assistance to all sectors of the economy.

For example, a 1-percent decrease in interest rates would result in a 10-percent—\$2.15 billion—increase in net farm income. It would result in 300,000 more home sales, and a reduction of almost \$50 per month in monthly mortgage payments on a median-priced home.

A 2-percent decrease in interest rates would result in a 20-percent—\$4.3 billion—increase in net farm income, and also produce 600,000 more home sales. Such a decrease would also produce a savings of nearly \$100 per month in mortgage payments on a median-priced home.

In addition, a drop in interest rates should result in a decline in the relative value of the dollar, thereby improving American competitiveness in world markets. American jobs would be protected and preserved, and the current unfavorable trade balance would be much improved.

Mr. President, we simply cannot continue the fiscal policies of the past. The Federal Government has run a deficit in 37 of the last 45 years, and 24 of the last 25 years. The gross Federal debt is estimated to reach \$1.841 trillion in 1985. It currently stands around \$1.5 trillion; equivalent to approximately 48 percent of our gross national product.

In 1985, interest on the national debt will cost taxpayers \$130 billion. This equals the sum total of all Federal spending from the founding of the Republic through the first 36 years of this century. It is equivalent to the total Federal outlays of 1966, and the entire defense budget in 1980. Approximately 40 percent of all revenue collected in personal income taxes by the Federal Government will go to pay interest on the debt.

Most alarming to me, Mr. President, are the inevitable, disastrous consequences which continued fiscal irresponsibility on our part will visit upon future generations of Americans. If we do not exercise political courage and act now, we will almost certainly end up with a \$300 billion deficit in 1990, and a national debt of \$2.8 trillion. Interest on the debt will consume \$230 billion, or almost one-half of all personal income tax revenues. This would

be a terrible, unthinkable burden to place on future generations. We simply cannot afford to be politically expedient or shortsighted. For the sake of a continued strong America, bold, decisive action is necessary now!

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting adoption of the Senate/administration deficit reduction plan.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, the matter before us is one of the greatest importance and of the greatest urgency. We are deciding a matter no less serious than the future of the American economy. Although the motion may seem procedural and technical—whether or not to agree to a second degree amendment to a motion to recommit a Senate concurrent resolution to committee—it has far more significance.

Mr. President, this Nation cannot long survive with annual deficits exceeding \$200 billion. Our economy cannot absorb the massive shock of a national debt rapidly approaching \$2 trillion. The annual deficit must be reduced. The rate of growth of the national debt must be slowed.

We have before us a plan, a compromise, a package put together by the Senate Republican leadership and the White House. This proposal will cut the deficit. It will slow the rate of growth of our national debt. It is a step in the right direction.

The question, however, is, Is it the right step? Is this the best way to reduce the deficit?

Frankly, this proposal is not the one I would have chosen. I have suggested a nearly across-the-board freeze on discretionary Federal spending as an alternative. I have suggested the adoption of a meaningful corporate minimum tax. I have suggested modest reductions in many Federal programs.

Some of my suggestions have been accepted, others have not. Some of the options which I oppose have been included in this package, others have not. On the whole this package is a reasonable one, but one that can use some modification.

The most important modification is clearly the need to reiterate our commitment to our mothers and fathers. This package's most glaring defect is its proposal to reduce Social Security cost-of-living increases by 2 percent each year for the next 3 years. I do not and I cannot support this discriminatory reduction.

We made our commitment to our elderly. We promised them that they would no longer be victimized by the ravages of inflation. We promised them not luxurious living, not a steadily increasing benefit, but merely the ability to keep pace with rising costs. They deserve no less. We should give them no less.

I have numerous arguments to make as to why we must keep the commit-

ment of full COLA's for Social Security, but I will not make them now. I will save them for when an amendment is offered to restore full COLA's to this package.

In the interim, however, I wish to explain why I am voting to move this budget package along on this crucial procedural vote, despite its flaws. I am doing so for the very simple reason that I see no other way to truly pass a deficit reduction package this year. Once we get past this procedural vote I will offer an amendment to restore full COLA's to this package. I will support other amendments to correct flaws in this package. I will work for a better deficit reduction package than the one we have here.

But to vote against moving forward on this crucial procedural vote is not a realistic option. That would leave us without any plan for meaningful deficit reduction. We have many opportunities still ahead to correct the defects in this package. Let's get on with our business.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I am voting in favor of the substitute budget proposed by Senator DOLE, the Majority Leader, because I wish to support the Republican Senate leadership/White House commitment to deficit reduction; and this amendment still leaves me free to support additional amendments which are important to Pennsylvania's interests.

I totally agree with the commitments expressed by President Reagan and Senator DOLE for deficit reduction. In 1982, I supported the constitutional amendment for a balanced budget which passed the Senate by a vote of 69 to 31. In my judgment, steps should be taken to reduce the deficit beyond any of the proposals yet submitted for fiscal year 1986.

The Dole substitute makes substantial changes on the resolution passed by the Budget Committee. I agree with some of the changes and disagrees with others. For example, this amendment is preferable to the Budget Committee resolution on the cost-of-living adjustment on Social Security for senior citizens. The Budget Committee amendment gives no cost-of-living increase while this amendment gives a 2-percent increase. Neither is satisfactory. I plan to support an amendment to provide for a cost-of-living adjustment equal to the inflation rate.

Similarly, this amendment is preferable on student aid since it lifts the cap from \$4,000 to \$8,000 and the maximum parental earning from \$32,500 to \$60,000. Again, neither is satisfactory; and I intend to vote to retain the student aid in the fiscal year 1985 budget.

In agreeing to support this amendment, I have advised Senator DOLE, and the chairman of the Budget Com-

mittee, Senator DOMENICI, of my reservation of rights to propose and support amendments which are important to Pennsylvania. I intend to offer amendments or to support amendments offered by others on a wide range of issues including, but not limited to, Social Security COLA, student aid, Amtrak, mass transit, Medicaid, Appalachian Regional Commission, Economic Development Administration, community development block grants, urban development action grants, Small Business Administration, Job Corps, Rural Electrification Administration, veterans benefits, and soil and water conservation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The majority time on this amendment has expired.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes off the resolution to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, a lot has been said here about the impact on the elderly and the significance of the upcoming vote in regards to the Social Security cuts. But I draw attention to another aspect of this vote. I know it has been counted as just a procedural vote that we are going to be voting on here, but a lot of times in procedural votes there really is more substance than there is procedure. So it is with this vote that we are going to be taking this evening, especially in the area of agriculture.

I think we have to be very clear about the exact nature of the vote and the severe hardship that this will create for our family farmers, who are already facing a crisis not seen since the days of the Great Depression. Quite frankly, the vote on this amendment is a vote to gut the farm program. It is a vote to cut more than \$18 billion from our farm programs over the next 3 years, and it is a vote, quite simply, to cut the lifeline to our family farmers at a time when it is most needed.

We all want a budget that is both responsible and fair and a budget that does indeed cut the deficit. But this so-called compromise is filled with thorns. It is neither fair nor responsible. At the same time President Reagan is gutting the farm program, he is also asking for a 3-percent growth in real spending in the Pentagon's budgets. So I ask where is the fairness and where is the sharing of pain here?

Mr. President, our family farmers are not greedy. Mr. President, they are not stupid, either. President Reagan will tell you that this farm program is too expensive and it must be restrained.

Well, he is partially right. The farm program is too expensive, and it is too expensive because he conceived of irrational programs like the PIK pro-

gram that gave billions away to the largest of our farmers. Fifty percent of the PIK program went to less than 5.4 percent of our largest farmers.

But let us look at what the Rose Garden plan will do:

First, it will reduce both support prices and farm income support over the next 3 years.

Second, it will gut the Farmers Home Administration operating and ownership loans.

Third, it will eliminate emergency disaster loans.

Fourth, it will eliminate crop insurance subsidies.

Fifth, it will reduce conservation programs drastically.

This budget does not address the needs of the family farmers and it does not address the needs of this Nation. It is nothing short of shameful when it comes to helping our farmers who are already hurt enough.

The truth is in the numbers. Farm programs account for a mere 2 percent of the budget outlays over the next 3 years, but 6 percent of the total cuts in the compromise are laid on the backs of our family farmers. Two percent of the budget for agriculture, and yet they have to absorb 6 percent of the cuts. That is not fair and that is not reasonable, and it is being done at a time when we are throwing more money at defense contractors and we are throwing it at them faster than they can spend it, and that is why we are paying \$600 for hammers and \$10,000 for haircuts for defense industry executives.

This is not sensible and it is not good policy.

The vote this evening is purely and simply a vote that will gut farm programs, and it is a vote that is eminently unfair when we are asked to take 6 percent of the total cut when we only make up 2 percent of the budget. If we were to do absolutely nothing with our farm programs over the next 3 years, from the baseline this vote represents a 41-percent cut in our farm programs.

It is a cut that will devastate Farmers' Home programs, providing housing for 200 low-income Americans every day, though 10 million still live in substandard housing. It will shut off the tap on Farmers Home programs which make water drinkable for families in rural areas, though one-fourth of our rural households' drinking water is unsafe and unhealthy. And it will slam the door on Farmers' Home programs which encourage industry and business in small towns and provide basic services like fire protection, though this is becoming more and more an effort when the farm crisis is turning our small communities into ghost towns.

So let us be clear about the vote coming up this evening. It cannot be counted as a procedural vote. It may be passed off as a procedural vote, but

it is purely and simply a substance vote, a vote to gut our farm programs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. CHILES. I yield the Senator 1 more minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. It is a vote on substance, the substance of which is to gut our farm programs and to do in our farmers at a time more than ever since the Great Depression that they need a lifeline to get them through these tough times, a lifeline to get them into the future.

What this vote this evening does is to cut the lifeline and to throw our farmers and our farm families to the wolves without even a BB gun to protect themselves.

I yield back the balance of my time. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. CHILES. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan 4 minutes.

Mr. RIEGLE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

I wanted to say on the Social Security issue that there are items in this budget package that hurt senior citizens so severely that by themselves I think they constitute a sufficient reason to vote this package down. But I want to put the numbers on the record now because anybody who votes for this package in a minute is voting for these cuts. I want to make sure that they know they are voting for them, so in the future there is no excuse for a vote in favor of this package by those later who may want to cover their tracks and say that that is not what they meant.

With the 3-year, 2-percent COLA elimination that is planned for the average person on Social Security who would receive about \$450 a month, they would be losing in the first year about \$9 a month by the cut in the COLA protection. They would lose a second \$9 a month in the second year which would mean a total of \$18 a month in real buying power and in the third year of the cut proposed by the Republican package they would lose another \$9 a month for a 3-year total of \$27 a month, of a loss in their buying power below where they are at the present time.

But, in addition to that, in the Republican package are also cuts in the Medicare Program, both in the amount of the premiums and the deductibles as well as reducing the reimbursement that would normally be available. You add that up and that amounts to a total dollar figure per month for the average person on Social Security of about \$33.10 by 1990. So by the time we get to 1990, if this package is accepted just in those two items, Social Security COLA reductions and Medicare cost increases,

the average person on Social Security will lose over \$60 a month from where they are today in terms of value of their Social Security coverage at the present time.

But that is not all of it. There are also cuts in the Older Americans Act. There are cuts in senior feeding programs, weatherization programs, and a low-income energy assistance to the elderly, transportation, and the list goes on.

So for anybody who feels that they can vote for that package with those kinds of Social Security cuts over 3 years and reductions in Medicare protection over 5 years, and then come back and put it back in later, they ought to understand clearly what they are doing now, because they are no friends of the senior citizens.

The best estimates are that about 450,000 senior citizens in the first year under Social Security will be driven below the poverty line as a result of the Social Security cuts contained in this package.

So I asked my friends on the other side of the aisle on the Budget Committee how they propose to deal with the new poor that they would be creating by these cuts in the cost-of-living adjustments. And they say, "Well, they will have to go on welfare. We will put some more money in the Supplemental Security Income [SSI] Program and they can go on the welfare."

So their answer is for people that are driven below the poverty line on Social Security, that they should sign up for public assistance, file the records necessary and become basically a welfare client. I think that is absolutely an inexcusable kind of thinking. The whole point of Social Security, for which people pay in during a lifetime of work, is to avoid having to go on welfare. We do not want people on public welfare. We want people off welfare.

And to drive another half million senior citizens below the poverty line in order to take and shift that money over into the Defense Department—and make no mistake about it, that is what is happening—is just as wrong as it could be.

President Reagan, back in March this year, after the election, after he made the promise to protect Social Security, himself in his press conference said:

Social Security is running on a surplus and is totally funded by a tax that can only be used for that purpose. So when we talk about Social Security, we are not really getting at the deficit problem at all.

Well, the President understood it on March 21 of this year, but apparently he does not understand it now. Caspar Weinberger does not need this money. He does not need to loot the Social Security system of its reserves in order to pay for this bloated defense build-

up. But that is precisely what this package does.

It is far worse than the package that came out of the Budget Committee with only the votes of Republicans a short time before. The package we're voting on now is a 3-year cut in Social Security, and in fact it permanently reduces the buying power. Any notion that this is an increase is wrong. It does not provide an increase, because the cost-of-living adjustment comes a year later and is only designed to restore what inflation has taken away.

So I would hope we would defeat this package.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Who yields time?

Mr. CHILES. I yield myself 5 minutes from the amendment.

Mr. President, we are about to vote on this package. I find it curious that its characterized in different ways. On one hand, I hear it characterized as a procedural vote. It is only supposed to be a little vote on procedure and everybody can vote for it because it is just a housekeeping matter, mere mechanics.

On the other hand, I hear it characterized as a very symbolic vote. It is going to be a great symbol that the President's package and the Republican leadership package has support.

I think it is certainly more than a procedural vote. I do not think there is any way you can say voting for this particular package is only procedural.

It seems to me that once you have bitten the apple, once you have voted for 2-percent cuts 3 years in a row off of Social Security, you voted for a major structural change on COLA's.

Once you've cast that vote you can't come back and just say, "Well, that is procedure and that does not count." You cannot fool anyone with that. What you have really said is this: "That is all right, even though the pain is not shared equally, even though some wealthy corporations that are making billions of dollars and are not paying any tax, in fact are being paid by taxpayer. You are saying that is acceptable. We do not need to do anything about them. We do not need to do anything about all of those people we read about every day that are making over \$200,000 a year and paying no tax. We do not have to ask them to be a part of the sacrifice. But, we are going to make this structural change in Social Security. If you vote for this package, you are putting your stamp of approval on all that."

You will also be saying something else. And here it is: "We are going to ask you to pay more on your health bills. We just feel that is right. We are not satisfied to just freeze the providers. We are going to ask the individual recipients to go on and pay more on their health bills."

Vote for this package and you will be saying that is all right now because it is only "procedure". We are going to come around and maybe change that later.

It seems to me this is a major vote. Everybody needs to view it that way. I think this sets the blueprint. Even if some amendment are made at a future time, this package will return. And when this package returns after it has been amended, I am sure some people are going to be called on. The majority will be saying to their Members, "Wait a minute, now, you voted for this once. You have already voted for it. You can't change now. You're locked in."

So it seems to me this sets the precedent. If it is wrong to change COLA's structurally now without asking everybody to share the pain of dealing with this deficit, if that is wrong, it is as wrong on this vote as it will be tomorrow, as it will be the day after tomorrow, and the day after that. And it would seem to me if that is wrong, then it ought to be voted that way and we ought to turn this down and start off with this package the way it is normally done. Lay it down, allow the Senate to work its will and amend it. Evidently we are not able to do this. It seems to me that if we are going to put something together to deal with this deficit, it must include revenues. We must restrain defense, we must restrain all of the other domestic programs. Are we willing to restrain everything on the domestic side, including the entitlement programs, and including the COLA programs? If we are, then I think we are serious about this deficit. If we are not, then I think we are talking about a package that puts more of the pain, and more of the burden on certain people as opposed to what we put on the others. So, Mr. President, this is no procedural vote. I think it is a major, substantive vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, the so-called White House-Senate leadership package.

Mr. President, it must be clearly understood. What are we asked to vote on?

The Senate is not asked to freeze Government spending, to freeze spending across the board; it is asked to stop spending, to stop spending on transit, and on urban development; it is asked to slow spending on education, cleaning the environment, taking care of the sick, the elderly; and it is asked to accelerate military spending, to accelerate spending on defense which has already gone up 30 percent over inflation since 1981.

That is what we are asked to vote on.

We are asked not just to cut the deficit. I want to cut the deficit. I think every Member in this body believes that the record deficits created by this administration must be cut.

But we are asked to not just cut the deficit, we are asked to undercut Americans, who rely on Government for a dignified retirement, for an education, for a clean environment.

We are asked to undercut the foundation of our economy, an economy that depends on essential spending on transportation, research, and exports. We are asked to undercut our future.

We are asked not to raise taxes—the taxes, that is, of corporations that pay none—but we are asked to hide taxes on the average citizen, to hide the taxman on the buses, collecting higher fares because transit subsidies will be ended. The taxman will be hiding at the schoolhouse gate, collecting higher costs for education. The taxman will be standing at the hospital door, dipping deeper into the pocket of elderly in need of medical care because Medicare has been cut.

We are not asked to break the spending spiral, we are asked to break a promise to senior citizens, who were told that once Social Security was taxed, once one cost-of-living increase was postponed, that Social Security would be safe. We are asked to break that promise and banish over 600,000 seniors to poverty.

That Mr. President, is what we are asked to vote for. That is the budget we are asked to vote for. That is a budget I cannot endorse.

Every Member in this body would welcome the days of mere \$70 billion deficits, the kind we had before this administration, the kind of deficit that's dwarfed by the \$200 billion deficit we see now.

Every Member in this body would welcome the days of a mere trillion dollar national debt, the kind we had before this administration, a debt that is dwarfed by the nearly \$2 trillion debt we have now.

Beneath the veneer of recovery, budget deficits are eating away at our economic future; 1.3 percent growth in the GNP is a sign that the recovery may be rotting away.

The Nation's borrowing keeps interest rates high. High rates keep the dollar overvalued. So, our exports are priced out of the foreign markets, while imports flood our own. Manufacturers and the thousands of people they employ are running harder and harder just to stay in place. They are losing jobs at home and markets abroad; they are losing jobs and markets that they may never regain.

Our diet for debt feeds on foreign capital. As a net debtor Nation, owing out more to others than they owe to us, the United States will be less secure, and less a master of its own economic destiny.

What is worse, the problem feeds on itself. The Nation borrows to finance the deficit, and then borrows to pay interest on its borrowing. Since 1980,

interest on the national debt has grown faster than any other sector of the national budget. On the present path, the Nation will spend more on debt service by the end of the decade than it will spend on all nondefense discretionary programs combined. That is, more in interest than in feeding our people, educating them, and building for the future.

In sum, Mr. President, we must get hold of our fiscal policy, if we care about the economy, if we care about the future.

But, if that is our goal, we should not support the amendment before us. In the coming days, Democrats will offer an alternative, an alternative that imposes sacrifice fairly and does not sacrifice our future.

Mr. President, we must fight a winning war against rising budget deficits. But the budget before us would wage a futile assault, and the casualties will only be those who have suffered so much before, the casualties will be the future we want to protect.

Until all of America is enlisted in the battle, we cannot succeed.

I will vote against the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

IMPROVING THE BUDGET COMPROMISE

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I have decided to vote against this package not because it does too much to reduce the deficit but because it does too little. We can, and should, do better.

What does this package do to the deficit? Proponents contend that it will reduce the deficit to about \$100 billion in 1988. But this package is based on economic assumptions which make Pollyanna look like a pessimist.

The Congressional Budget Office—a nonpartisan, congressional agency—has estimated the level of deficits using economic assumptions which are still optimistic but more reasonable. They say the deficit in 1988 will be around \$150 billion. If the economy continues to perform as it has over the last three quarters, that estimate may be optimistic.

These figures point to the most attractive feature of the package. It makes a serious attempt on the domestic side of the budget to bring Federal spending under control. It ends, or drastically cuts, a number of politically popular programs. The administration deserves credit for making such difficult recommendations.

To my colleagues, who hope to save this or that favorite program, I say look at those figures on the deficits. They demonstrate that sooner or later we in Congress are going to be forced to face the issue of how much can we afford to spend. After doing so, I believe our answers will not be that much different from those recommended by the administration.

If the administration has done a reasonably good job on the domestic side

of the budget, where else should we look for additional savings? One answer is in the defense budget.

Every inefficient or obsolete domestic program has its counterpoint in the defense budget. If the Small Business Administration is inefficient, then the Divad antiaircraft gun is equally so. If subsidizing Amtrak riders to the tune of about \$35 a ride is bad policy, then so is the Defense Department paying \$400 for a hammer.

Think how much we could have saved if the administration had applied the same standard to Defense as it did to domestic spending. Only the administration has the knowledge and staff to go through the Defense budget in this manner. We in Congress can make the judgment about how much is enough. But we cannot make certain that the money we appropriate is spent wisely. In an agency as large and complex as the Defense Department, that responsibility lies with the agency itself.

The Defense Department has refused to make those judgments. It has taken an all-or-nothing attitude.

Mr. President, we seldom see an executive agency make a mistake of historic proportions, but in my opinion, the Defense Department has done so. Only 4 years ago, the American people and the Congress were solidly behind the administration's efforts to improve our defense. The Carter administration started the buildup, the Reagan administration expanded it, and Congress cheered.

Now, Congress is likely to freeze defense spending and only the administration will protest. In my 27 years as a Senator, I have seldom seen a more rapid change in public sentiment. And the lion's share of blame for this change lies at the doors of the Pentagon. They stonewalled. They cried wolf. They denied the problem. Those chickens are now coming home to roost. As a result—the final irony—we will probably spend less money on defense under this administration than we would have had Walter Mondale been elected.

Where else can we look for savings? The simple fact is that we are going to have to raise more revenue. Tax loopholes now cost the Treasury over \$300 billion a year.

As with domestic and defense spending, many of these loopholes are inefficient and obsolete. They are defended by powerful special interests, to be sure. But is not every program in the budget? These tax loopholes should not be exempted from our efforts to reduce the deficit.

If I were advising the corporate lobbyists clustered around our offices—and I do not—I would point to what happened to defense. The newspapers are now reporting that a number of major corporations pay no income taxes. That information is sinking into

the American public's mind, just as did the information about outrageous spare parts prices. After it does, the public may support tax increases on corporations that could be punitive. Corporations will be better served by supporting efforts to close the most outrageous loopholes—that would be my advice.

Someone will argue that the President is dead set against tax increases. His campaign statements about taxes left the door open for tax changes if we cut spending. Those statements were much less adamant than were his promises about protecting Social Security.

In that instance, the President was right. The Social Security trust fund is financially sound. The program is not causing the deficit. Instead, it is paying its own way and then some. Before even considering cuts in Social Security, let us go through the defense budget and the Tax Code. Let us cut those programs that are not paying their way. If we do so, then this Senator is confident that we will have resolved the deficit problem without having to touch Social Security.

Mr. President, this compromise does too little to reduce the deficits. Let us keep its good features intact and add to them. It is a start, but we can improve it. Let us start today.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, the substitute budget resolution proposed by the Republican leadership and supported by the President violates not only the long-standing agreement between this country and its elderly and retired people, but also reneges on President Reagan's personal promise. President Reagan and his Republican colleagues ran for election last year on the promise of reducing the deficit but promised there would be no tax increases, no cuts in defense spending, and no cuts in Social Security.

We in the Democratic Party warned that such a promise could not be kept. We said that if when it came show-down time on the budget, the Republicans would renege on their promises. History showed, and we tried to sound the alarm, that if one part of this promise could not be kept; if one group had to sacrifice while others were held harmless; if one segment of our population had to bear a disproportionate share of the burden of deficit reduction, this administration would choose that group of Americans most unable to survive such singling out: our elderly and retired citizens.

Unfortunately, the Democrats turned out to be better prognosticators than campaigners. We lost the elections in 1984, although we were somewhat successful in the Senate, and on their first at bat, the Republicans and the President have tried to knock Social Security out of the ballpark.

Last July, the Senate voted to insure the full Social Security COLA for January 1985. The vote was 87-3. Supporting the resolution was Senator DOLE, now the majority leader; Senator DOMENICI, the chairman of the Budget Committee; and the President of the United States. Of course, this vote was in the middle of the election campaign.

Just 2 years ago we in Congress passed the Social Security Act Amendments of 1983. This reform package was the result of a bipartisan effort by Democrats and Republicans led by President Reagan's Commission on Social Security Reform. As part of that package, to insure the continued solvency of Social Security, we had to swallow some bitter medicine. We delayed COLA's for 6 months permanently. That is, every year the Social Security COLA will be issued 6 months later than it would have been absent that legislation. We taxed Social Security benefits for the first time ever. We increased the retirement age, we added Federal workers to the Social Security rolls, we increased penalties for early retirement and increased taxes on the self-employed. All of these provisions were painful. But we voted for this package because it was balanced, necessary, and workable.

Fortunately, the Social Security Act amendments were successful. The Social Security trust funds are thriving. Next year the trust funds should realize a surplus of \$4.9 billion; the following year, \$4.4 billion; and in 1987, \$7.6 billion. These surpluses are necessary to prepare the trust funds for the retirement in the next century of the baby boom generation. In any event, the action we took in 1983 to solve a very immediate problem has worked.

In 1983, we told our Social Security beneficiary constituents that the reform package was necessary, that it would work, and that we would not need to affect Social Security benefits again for a very long time. And we do not. Cutting the COLA will not really help us reduce the deficit problem. Admittedly, if we cut the COLA, less money will be spent by the Federal Government and on paper the deficit will be reduced. This savings cannot be spent to reduce our deficit though. It has to, by law, stay in the Social Security trust funds. It can only be used to buy Federal savings instruments, thereby driving up interest rates across the board.

I will support an across-the-board freeze on spending that includes Social Security COLA's. I will not support a piece-meal approach that singles out one group for sacrifice and allows others to continue their Government-sponsored prosperity.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET COMPROMISE: A BAD COMPROMISE ON PRIORITIES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I recognize the need for a responsible ap-

proach to the Federal budget, an approach which will help reduce the crushing burden of debt which today's huge deficits create.

In 5 years, the current administration will have doubled the national debt—doubled the debt that it took 39 Presidents almost 200 years to accumulate. This administration is the biggest spender of all time. But the plan supported by the President is not the right answer.

The priorities reflected in this amendment are dead wrong. Many of the areas that the President has targeted are the very areas which need to be maintained if America is to stride confidently into the future. This budget shortchanges the future, by cutting education and research. It does nothing to curb outrageous waste in our defense establishment. This budget is unfair. It breaks the President's own promises to our Nation's elderly. It hurts children and middle income families.

A \$200 billion deficit is a very serious national problem. It is a problem that will take an all-out national effort to solve. It is already taking its toll. America has become a debtor nation. We are losing out to foreign competition. It is costing us millions of jobs.

But we must tackle this important task in a manner which resolves the deficit problem without sacrificing the future of our Nation.

The budget debate is not just a dry exercise in balancing figures. A budget is a road map for our future. Make no mistake about it, the budget we finally enact and the choices reflected in that budget will affect each American citizen directly and will shape the future of this great country.

Let me give an example of how budget choices impact on future directions for years to come. Back in 1961, President Kennedy urged Congress to invest in the research and education required to land astronauts on the Moon. Today, hundreds of thousands of Americans are working in space technology and rocketry because we made that commitment as a nation. Computers are part of many homes. Countless people are benefiting from breakthroughs in medical research which were paid for by the National Institutes of Health. Literally millions of jobs exist solely because we invested in the future.

Let me say in the most emphatic and most unmistakable way that Democrats want to reduce the deficit. We will work with the President to reduce the deficit, and we will deal with it directly and responsibly. But, the program being offered today is a formula for future economic disaster. Education holds the key to the future. But this budget will deny thousands of youngsters the chance to get a college education. This budget undermines our scientific and medical research,

job training, and many other areas so desperately needed if we are to maintain our economy and prepare for our future in a competitive world. Let us be clear about one thing. We cannot remain a political power in the world if we are not economically strong.

Democrats believe that our present Tax Code is a nightmare which needs to be simplified in order to make it fair. It is simply not fair to ask Social Security recipients, middle income families, coal miners, and farmers to sacrifice while the largest, richest, most profitable corporations in America are permitted to get a free ride.

This budget fails to get serious about Pentagon waste. A few days ago, on April 15, most Americans paid their taxes. Every citizen who paid \$500 in taxes to the Federal Government bought the Pentagon a hammer and two lightbulbs. Every citizen who paid \$10,000 in taxes bought a coffee maker, three toilet seat covers, and a tape measure.

Such waste in our defense establishment is a national scandal; yet, the budget compromise before us at this moment does nothing to deal with the problem. Democrats have consistently tried to address the problem of Pentagon waste, and we have been fought every step of the way by the current administration. Two years ago, Democrats managed to create an office of inspector general to try to tame Pentagon mismanagement, and we were forced to accomplish this essential reform over the strong objections of the White House. On the basis of this experience, we know that further savings can be made in the Pentagon budget without jeopardizing in any way our basic national security. This ought to be the goal of any budget proposal for the Pentagon; yet, it is not the goal of the so-called Republican compromise before us today.

Today, the Defense budget is three times greater than it was in 1968 when we had a million more people under arms. With all of this spending, we are still dangerously thin in our ability to fight nonnuclear combat in areas where our national interest might some day be threatened. As in other areas of the budget, the President's choices do not target the real challenges which may face us in the future. We need to tighten this Defense budget so that our readiness to fight a conventional war is increased and waste and inefficiency are eliminated.

If the compromise before us is misguided in its emphasis on spending more on the Pentagon, it is even more misguided in those programs it proposes to cut. The cuts proposed in this budget fall on some of the most important and most vulnerable groups in American society. The proposal would erode the value of Social Security—the

critical life support system for the elderly. It would increase the elderly's medical bills, by making deep cuts in Medicare. It would hurt the Nation's farmers, the backbone of the greatest food production system in the world. This budget would reduce the ability of families to finance college education for their sons and daughters. The proposal would slash nutrition programs for infants and children—surely the key to any bright future for our country.

Democrats believe that these are misguided priorities. Democrats have a vision for the future, and we want this year's budget resolution to reflect that vision. We are determined to strengthen this Nation's ability to compete in global markets. We are determined to see that our children have the best education that we as a nation can offer them. We are determined to stress technological research so that the jobs of the future can be filled by Americans. We are determined to stop exporting American jobs overseas. We are determined to restore this Nation's manufacturing capability before it is too late. We are determined to address the deficit problem in a fair way that inspires the faith of our people and reassures their perceptions about the fairness of their government. We are determined to ensure a strong and sound national defense for our people.

To realize these goals, Democrats are prepared to offer concrete alternatives in this year's budget debate. In the coming days, Democrats intend to offer budget proposals which establish the proper priorities for our Nation, now and in the future. Democrats will try to set this Nation on a positive course for our future. We will offer the alternatives needed to achieve this great vision that we all want for our country.

These are the reasons I will vote against the so-called "compromise" budget which is before us at this time. I believe the Senate will have ample opportunity in the days ahead to debate specific items in the budget. This debate will help clarify the crucial issue at stake, and will, I hope,

result in a budget which meets the needs of the country.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I shall vote against the budget presented to the Senate by the administration and the Republican leadership.

In acting on a budget for the next fiscal year, the Senate faces two challenges: The huge Federal budget deficits must be reduced, and of equal importance, the deficit must be reduced in a way that is fair, and equitable and that reflects our real national priorities.

The administration budget proposal meets the first challenge—it reduces the deficit—but it fails to meet the second challenge of fairness and recognition of essential national goals.

I am committed to reducing the budget deficit and I will be supporting other proposals here in the Senate to reduce the huge deficits that have ballooned during the past 4 years.

What is wrong with the administration budget?

The administration budget continues the runaway increase in defense spending, costing the taxpayers an added \$20 billion next year.

While increasing defense spending by the rate of inflation plus 3 percent, the budget would give the elderly retired on Social Security an adjustment of inflation minus 2 percent.

In education, the real pillar of our national strength, this budget would eliminate assistance for up to 1 million needy young people pursuing post-high-school education.

This budget would also destroy Amtrak, leaving the United States as the only industrialized nation without a rail passenger service system. It would eliminate completely the modest programs that have proven successful in helping entrepreneurs develop their own businesses.

And in the process of cutting Federal Government spending, this budget would shift many of the real costs of essential services to our State and local taxpayers, to the elderly, and to middle-class families. These kinds of budget cuts don't save a buck, they just pass the buck.

All Americans, I believe, share the vision of an opportunity society but this budget would reduce educational opportunities for young Americans, and opportunities for essential medical care and a dignified retirement for elderly Americans. To a great extent, these opportunities would be sacrificed to provide another \$20 billion for military spending that has proven wasteful, nonessential and poorly managed.

I regret that this budget is being presented to the Senate on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. The budget before us is described as a compromise, but it is a compromise only between the President and some members of his own political party.

Although this compromise budget has been changed almost daily for the past 3 months, we are now told that any and all changes must be opposed and that we must take the package as it is or leave it.

Faced with that choice, I regretfully shall vote to leave it.

If the majority of the Senate votes in support of this budget, I look forward to the opportunity to change it and improve it through amendments and substitute proposals that will reduce the deficit effectively, but in a fairer and more constructive way.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Vice President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the list made by the Congressional Budget Office of the increases in budget authority and outlays contained in the President's budget submission. A similar list of increases in budget authority and outlays for the President's compromise has not been compiled by CBO because the information to provide such a list has not been submitted.

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

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM,FUNC,SFUN,TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Appropriations Committee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1 BA	COL2 - COL1 OUTLAYS
ALLOWANCES						
Civilian agency pay raises						
Allowances						
Allowances for:						
Coast Guard military pay raises						
99 6006 0 1 921						
NEW:	6,900	6,600	27,700	26,900	20,800	20,300
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	6,900	6,600	27,700	26,900	20,800	20,300
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. AP Appropriations Committee						
NEW:	6,900	6,600	27,700	26,900	20,800	20,300
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	6,900	6,600	27,700	26,900	20,800	20,300

Note: Some committee totals may not reflect exact jurisdiction because accounts with joint jurisdiction appear in total in only one committee.

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Agriculture Subcommittee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1 BA	COL2 - COL1 OUTLAYS
NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT						
Conservation and land management						
Department of Agriculture						
Soil Conservation Service						
Conservation operations						
12 1000 0 1 352						
NEW:	351,190	322,278	354,179	325,136	2,989	2,858
PRIOR:		28,939		28,912		-27
TOTAL:	351,190	351,217	354,179	354,048	2,989	2,831
AGRICULTURE						
Agricultural research and services						
Departmental Administration						
Standard level user charges						
12 0117 0 1 352						
NEW:	67,254	67,254	77,300	77,300	10,046	10,046
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	67,254	67,254	77,300	77,300	10,046	10,046
World Agricultural Outlook Board						
World agricultural outlook board						
12 2100 0 1 352						
NEW:	1,610	1,397	1,619	1,409	9	12
PRIOR:		197		213		16
TOTAL:	1,610	1,594	1,619	1,622	9	28
Human Nutrition Information Service						
Human Nutrition Information Service						
12 3501 0 1 352						
NEW:	7,462	5,745	13,416	10,344	5,954	4,599
PRIOR:		1,400		1,717		317
TOTAL:	7,462	7,145	13,416	12,061	5,954	4,916
COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT						
Area and regional development						
Rural Electrification Administration						
Rural communication development fund						
12 4142 0 3 452						
NEW:	1,604	1,604	1,834	1,834	230	230
PRIOR:		2,899		3,899		1,060
TOTAL:	1,604	4,503	1,834	5,733	230	1,230
HEALTH						
Consumer and occupational health and safety						
Department of Health and Human Services						
Food and Drug Administration						
Program expenses						
75 0600 0 1 554						
NEW:	407,500	359,082	409,072	363,326	1,572	4,244
PRIOR:		45,387		47,412		2,025
TOTAL:	407,500	404,469	409,072	410,738	1,572	6,269

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CEO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Agriculture Subcommittee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
INCOME SECURITY						
Food and nutrition assistance						
Department of Agriculture						
Food and Nutrition Service						
Food donations program						
12 3503 0 1 605						
NEW:	139,546	109,623	174,607	142,672	35,061	33,049
PRIOR:		53,600		29,923		-23,677
TOTAL:	139,546	163,223	174,607	172,595	35,061	9,372
Food stamp program						
12 3505 0 1 605						
NEW:	11,661,528	11,486,998	11,858,000	11,679,770	196,472	192,772
PRIOR:		209,240		175,230		-34,010
TOTAL:	11,661,528	11,696,238	11,858,000	11,855,000	196,472	158,762
Food program administration						
12 3508 0 1 605						
NEW:	82,503	74,422	86,406	78,025	3,903	3,603
PRIOR:		7,752		8,095		343
TOTAL:	82,503	82,174	86,406	86,120	3,903	3,903
Women, infants and children programs (WIC and CSFP)						
12 3510 0 1 605						
NEW:	1,448,501	1,293,110	1,513,849	1,346,040	65,348	52,930
PRIOR:		152,850		165,000		12,110
TOTAL:	1,448,501	1,446,000	1,513,849	1,511,040	65,348	65,040
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. AR Agriculture Subcommittee						
NEW:	14,168,698	13,721,513	14,490,282	14,025,856	321,584	304,343
PRIOR:		502,304		460,401		-41,903
TOTAL:	14,168,698	14,223,817	14,490,282	14,486,257	321,584	262,440

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Commerce, State, Judiciary	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS						
Conduct of foreign affairs						
Department of State						
Administration of Foreign Affairs						
Salaries and expenses						
19 0113 0 1 153						
NEW:	1,434,290	1,128,064	1,475,103	1,268,589	40,813	140,525
PRIOR:		170,942		223,605		52,663
TOTAL:	1,434,290	1,299,006	1,475,103	1,492,194	40,813	193,188
Other						
Soviet-East European research and training						
19 0118 0 1 153						
NEW:	4,800	4,800	5,000	5,000	200	200
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	4,800	4,800	5,000	5,000	200	200
Administration of Foreign Affairs						
Protection of foreign missions and officials						
19 0520 0 1 153						
NEW:	9,500	7,695	9,900	8,019	400	300
PRIOR:		0		1,805		1,805
TOTAL:	9,500	7,695	9,900	9,824	400	2,129
Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan						
19 0523 0 1 153						
NEW:	9,800	8,085	10,000	8,250	200	165
PRIOR:		1,641		1,715		74
TOTAL:	9,800	9,726	10,000	9,965	200	239
Other						
Payment to the Asia Foundation						
19 0525 0 1 153						
NEW:	9,600	6,720	9,785	6,850	185	130
PRIOR:		2,799		2,880		80
TOTAL:	9,600	9,519	9,785	9,730	185	210
Administration of Foreign Affairs						
Representation allowances						
19 0545 0 1 153						
NEW:	4,500	3,852	4,700	4,023	200	171
PRIOR:		598		648		50
TOTAL:	4,500	4,450	4,700	4,671	200	221
International Organizations and Conferences						
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities						
19 1124 0 1 153						
NEW:	47,400	41,238	51,000	44,370	3,600	3,132
PRIOR:		9,363		6,162		-3,201
TOTAL:	47,400	50,601	51,000	50,532	3,600	-69

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Commerce, State, Judiciary						
Contributions to international organizations						
19 1126 0 1 153						
NEW:	487,888	467,885	495,235	474,930	7,347	7,045
PRIOR:		21,341		20,003		-1,338
TOTAL:	487,888	489,226	495,235	494,933	7,347	5,707
Other						
U.S. bilateral science and technology agreements						
19 1151 0 1 153						
NEW:	0	0	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
PRIOR:		2,000		0		-2,000
TOTAL:	0	2,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	2,000
Other Independent Agencies						
International Trade Commission						
Salaries and expenses						
34 0100 0 1 153						
NEW:	24,830	22,942	28,901	26,705	4,071	3,763
PRIOR:		1,551		1,858		307
TOTAL:	24,830	24,493	28,901	28,563	4,071	4,070
Foreign information and exchange activities						
Other Independent Agencies						
United States Information Agency						
Salaries and expenses						
67 0201 0 1 154						
NEW:	545,423	430,247	585,054	461,608	39,631	31,361
PRIOR:		100,871		111,817		10,946
TOTAL:	545,423	531,118	585,054	573,425	39,631	42,307
Acquisition and construction of radio facilities						
67 0204 0 1 154						
NEW:	85,000	8,500	167,947	16,795	82,947	8,295
PRIOR:		13,064		56,070		43,006
TOTAL:	85,000	21,564	167,947	72,865	82,947	51,301
Radio broadcasting to Cuba						
67 0208 0 1 154						
NEW:	8,500	6,706	11,202	8,838	2,702	2,132
PRIOR:		2,500		3,078		578
TOTAL:	8,500	9,206	11,202	11,916	2,702	2,710
Educational and cultural exchange programs						
67 0209 0 1 154						
NEW:	130,000	87,100	159,136	106,621	29,136	19,521
PRIOR:		48,500		41,500		-7,000
TOTAL:	130,000	135,600	159,136	148,121	29,136	12,521
National Endowment for Democracy						
67 0210 0 1 154						
NEW:	0	0	31,300	28,170	31,300	28,170
PRIOR:		11,500		0		-11,500
TOTAL:	0	11,500	31,300	28,170	31,300	16,670
Other Independent Agencies						
Board for International Broadcasting						
Grants and expenses						
95 1145 0 1 154						
NEW:	97,498	90,283	142,125	119,470	44,627	29,187
PRIOR:		13,167		1,755		-11,412
TOTAL:	97,498	103,450	142,125	121,225	44,627	17,775
NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT						
Water resources						
Department of State						
International Commissions						
Construction						
19 1078 0 1 301						
NEW:	2,400	1,832	2,557	1,951	157	119
PRIOR:		293		2,190		1,897
TOTAL:	2,400	2,125	2,557	4,141	157	2,016
American sections, international commissions						
19 1082 0 1 301						
NEW:	3,685	2,491	3,755	2,538	70	47
PRIOR:		1,034		1,156		122
TOTAL:	3,685	3,525	3,755	3,694	70	169
Conservation and land management						
International fisheries commissions						
19 1087 0 1 302						
NEW:	9,100	9,091	9,900	9,890	800	799
PRIOR:		9		9		0
TOTAL:	9,100	9,100	9,900	9,899	800	799
Other natural resources						
Department of Commerce						
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
Aviation weather services program						
13 8105 0 7 306						
NEW:	27,000	22,950	28,000	23,800	1,000	850
PRIOR:		4,050		4,050		0
TOTAL:	27,000	27,000	28,000	27,850	1,000	850

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM,FUNC,SFUN,TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Commerce, State, Judiciary	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	COL1 - COL2
COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT						
Other advancement of commerce						
Administration for Enterprise Development and Opportunity						
White House Conference on Small Business						
13 0104 0 1 376						
NEW:	0	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	0	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Enterprise development and opportunity						
13 0201 0 1 376						
NEW:	49,580	15,359	97,716	61,691	48,136	46,332
PRIOR:		39,773		34,843		-930
TOTAL:	49,580	51,132	97,716	96,534	48,136	45,402
Bureau of the Census						
Salaries and expenses						
13 0401 0 1 376						
NEW:	85,259	76,052	87,962	78,462	2,703	2,410
PRIOR:		6,043		9,207		3,164
TOTAL:	85,259	82,095	87,962	87,669	2,703	5,574
Periodic censuses and programs						
13 0450 0 1 376						
NEW:	80,209	50,612	105,802	69,592	25,593	18,988
PRIOR:		30,114		27,457		-2,657
TOTAL:	80,209	80,726	105,802	97,049	25,593	16,323
International Trade Administration						
Operations and administration						
13 1250 0 1 376						
NEW:	170,885	115,279	171,972	116,597	1,087	1,318
PRIOR:		60,563		59,362		-1,201
TOTAL:	170,885	175,842	171,972	175,959	1,087	117
Other Independent Agencies						
Small Business Administration						
SBA, Small business investment companies, FFB(loan guarantee						
20 4154 0 3 376						
NEW:	0	0	2,471,000	2,522,080	2,471,000	2,522,080
PRIOR:		0		252,920		252,920
TOTAL:	0	0	2,471,000	2,775,000	2,471,000	2,775,000
Department of the Treasury						
Financial Management Service						
Surety bond guarantees revolving fund						
20 4156 0 3 376						
NEW:	0	0	13,572	1,574	13,572	1,574
PRIOR:		0		16,426		16,426
TOTAL:	0	0	13,572	18,000	13,572	18,000
Other Independent Agencies						
Securities and Exchange Commission						
Salaries and expenses						
50 0100 0 1 376						
NEW:	105,337	95,857	107,267	97,536	1,930	1,679
PRIOR:		7,939		9,456		1,517
TOTAL:	105,337	103,796	107,267	106,992	1,930	3,196
Other Independent Agencies						
Other Historical and Memorial Agencies						
Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Jubilee Commission						
76 0800 0 1 376						
NEW:	0	0	220	198	220	198
PRIOR:		220		0		-220
TOTAL:	0	220	220	198	220	-22
TRANSPORTATION						
Water transportation						
Department of Transportation						
Maritime Administration						
Research and development						
69 1716 0 1 403						
NEW:	2,900	1,613	9,900	5,504	7,000	3,891
PRIOR:		11,078		7,414		-3,664
TOTAL:	2,900	12,691	9,900	12,918	7,000	227
COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT						
Disaster relief and insurance						
Department of the Treasury						
Financial Management Service						
Disaster Loan Fund						
20 4153 0 3 453						
NEW:	0	0	36,300	36,300	36,300	36,300
PRIOR:		0		317,000		317,000
TOTAL:	0	0	36,300	353,300	36,300	353,300

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM,FUNC,STUN,TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Commerce, State, Judiciary	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE		
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA	OUTLAYS
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE							
Federal law enforcement activities							
Department of Justice							
Federal Bureau of Investigation							
Salaries and expenses							
15 0200 0 1 751							
	NEW:	1,145,118	915,340	1,195,664	956,179	50,546	40,839
	PRIOR:		103,372		217,305		113,933
	TOTAL:	1,145,118	1,018,712	1,195,664	1,173,484	50,546	154,772
United States Parole Commission							
Salaries and expenses							
15 1061 0 1 751							
	NEW:	8,913	8,200	9,415	8,662	502	462
	PRIOR:		610		713		103
	TOTAL:	8,913	8,810	9,415	9,375	502	565
Drug Enforcement Administration							
Salaries and expenses							
15 1100 0 1 751							
	NEW:	331,812	285,613	345,671	297,277	13,859	11,664
	PRIOR:		36,000		35,959		959
	TOTAL:	331,812	321,613	345,671	334,236	13,859	12,623
Immigration and Naturalization Service							
Salaries and expenses							
15 1217 0 1 751							
	NEW:	575,470	502,848	584,096	509,244	8,626	6,396
	PRIOR:		63,057		71,976		8,919
	TOTAL:	575,470	565,905	584,096	581,220	8,626	15,315
Federal litigative and judicial activities							
The Judiciary							
Supreme Court of the United States							
Salaries and expenses							
10 0100 0 1 752							
	NEW:	14,143	11,102	15,176	11,913	1,033	811
	PRIOR:		2,926		3,041		115
	TOTAL:	14,143	14,028	15,176	14,954	1,033	926
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and other Judicial Services							
Salaries of judges							
10 0200 0 1 752							
	NEW:	77,638	76,147	104,826	102,729	27,188	26,582
	PRIOR:		0		1,491		1,491
	TOTAL:	77,638	76,147	104,826	104,220	27,188	28,073
United States Court of International Trade							
Salaries and expenses							
10 0400 0 1 752							
	NEW:	6,070	5,766	6,538	6,211	468	445
	PRIOR:		287		304		17
	TOTAL:	6,070	6,053	6,538	6,515	468	462
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit							
Salaries and expenses							
10 0510 0 1 752							
	NEW:	5,150	4,903	5,720	5,445	570	542
	PRIOR:		228		247		19
	TOTAL:	5,150	5,131	5,720	5,692	570	561
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and other Judicial Services							
Defender services							
10 0923 0 1 752							
	NEW:	59,575	30,587	68,955	41,373	9,380	10,786
	PRIOR:		16,063		26,440		10,377
	TOTAL:	59,575	46,650	68,955	67,813	9,380	21,163
Salaries of supporting personnel							
10 0924 0 1 752							
	NEW:	375,776	361,146	509,010	489,668	133,234	128,522
	PRIOR:		10,430		12,039		1,609
	TOTAL:	375,776	371,576	509,010	501,707	133,234	130,131
Fees of jurors and commissioners							
10 0925 0 1 752							
	NEW:	43,700	40,675	46,200	42,966	2,500	2,291
	PRIOR:		3,045		3,025		-20
	TOTAL:	43,700	43,720	46,200	45,991	2,500	2,271
Expenses of Operation and Maintenance of the Courts							
10 0926 0 1 752							
	NEW:	115,026	91,370	144,926	120,289	29,900	28,919
	PRIOR:		13,000		23,656		10,656
	TOTAL:	115,026	104,370	144,926	143,945	29,900	39,575

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM,FUNC,SFUN,TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Commerce, State, Judiciary	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE		
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA	OUTLAYS
Administrative Office of the United States Courts							
Salaries and expenses 10 0927 0 1 752							
NEW:	28,336	25,141	32,217	28,576	3,881	3,435	
PRIOR:		1,930		2,093		163	
TOTAL:	28,336	27,071	32,217	30,669	3,881	3,598	
Federal Judicial Center							
Salaries and expenses 10 0928 0 1 752							
NEW:	9,381	7,486	9,923	7,909	542	423	
PRIOR:		1,724		1,895		171	
TOTAL:	9,381	9,210	9,923	9,804	542	594	
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and other Judicial Services							
Court security 10 0930 0 1 752							
NEW:	26,992	26,992	38,116	38,116	11,124	11,124	
PRIOR:		0		0		0	
TOTAL:	26,992	26,992	38,116	38,116	11,124	11,124	
Space and facilities							
10 0931 0 1 752							
NEW:	142,384	126,280	155,018	137,346	12,634	11,066	
PRIOR:		13,549		13,444		-105	
TOTAL:	142,384	139,829	155,018	150,790	12,634	10,961	
Department of Justice							
Legal Activities							
Salaries and expenses, General Legal Activities 15 0128 0 1 752							
NEW:	195,041	174,627	200,277	179,248	5,236	4,621	
PRIOR:		16,387		19,805		3,412	
TOTAL:	195,041	191,014	200,277	199,053	5,236	8,039	
Fees and expenses of witnesses							
15 0311 0 1 752							
NEW:	43,091	32,926	47,900	35,973	4,809	3,047	
PRIOR:		9,433		10,165		732	
TOTAL:	43,091	42,359	47,900	46,138	4,809	3,779	
Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division							
15 0319 0 1 752							
NEW:	42,454	34,801	43,476	35,650	1,022	849	
PRIOR:		7,858		7,729		-129	
TOTAL:	42,454	42,659	43,476	43,379	1,022	720	
Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals							
15 0322 0 1 752							
NEW:	443,947	412,471	478,057	444,593	34,110	32,122	
PRIOR:		41,866		30,888		-10,978	
TOTAL:	443,947	454,337	478,057	475,481	34,110	21,144	
Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service							
15 0500 0 1 752							
NEW:	32,957	16,457	33,217	16,609	260	152	
PRIOR:		15,000		19,500		4,500	
TOTAL:	32,957	31,457	33,217	36,109	260	4,652	
Assets forfeiture fund							
15 5042 0 2 752							
NEW:	5,000	4,887	20,000	15,000	15,000	10,113	
PRIOR:		0		113		113	
TOTAL:	5,000	4,887	20,000	15,113	15,000	10,226	
Federal correctional activities							
Federal Prison System							
Salaries and expenses 15 1060 0 1 753							
NEW:	506,082	469,653	546,884	507,508	40,802	37,855	
PRIOR:		20,233		36,429		16,156	
TOTAL:	506,082	489,886	546,884	543,937	40,802	54,011	
Criminal justice assistance							
National Institute of Corrections 15 1004 0 1 754							
NEW:	13,106	4,706	13,120	5,248	14	542	
PRIOR:		10,400		8,400		-2,000	
TOTAL:	13,106	15,106	13,120	13,648	14	-1,456	

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM,FUNC,SEUN,TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Commerce, State, Judiciary	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	COL1
GENERAL GOVERNMENT						
Central fiscal operations						
Department of the Treasury						
Financial Management Service						
Portfolio Liquidation						
20 1848 0 1 803						
NEW:	0	0	73,961	66,565	73,961	66,565
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	0	0	73,961	66,565	73,961	66,565
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. CJ Commerce, State, Judiciary						
NEW:	7,682,546	6,375,377	11,065,674	9,731,248	3,383,128	3,355,871
PRIOR:		944,351		1,762,043		817,692
TOTAL:	7,682,546	7,319,728	11,065,674	11,493,291	3,383,128	4,173,563

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Defense Subcommittee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	COL1
NATIONAL DEFENSE						
Department of Defense-Military						
Department of Defense--Military						
Military Personnel						
Military personnel, Marine Corps						
17 1105 0 1 051						
NEW:	4,817,506	4,611,000	5,217,400	5,098,000	399,894	397,000
PRIOR:		70,000		144,000		74,000
TOTAL:	4,817,506	4,681,000	5,217,400	5,152,000	399,894	471,000
Operation and Maintenance						
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps						
17 1106 0 1 051						
NEW:	1,640,294	1,334,000	1,667,400	1,354,000	27,106	20,000
PRIOR:		184,000		337,000		153,000
TOTAL:	1,640,294	1,518,000	1,667,400	1,691,000	27,106	173,000
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve						
17 1107 0 1 051						
NEW:	58,642	38,000	61,600	40,000	2,958	2,000
PRIOR:		14,000		21,000		7,000
TOTAL:	58,642	52,000	61,600	61,000	2,958	9,000
Military Personnel						
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps						
17 1108 0 1 051						
NEW:	267,186	234,000	290,000	253,000	22,814	19,000
PRIOR:		6,000		27,000		21,000
TOTAL:	267,186	240,000	290,000	280,000	22,814	40,000
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation						
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy						
17 1319 0 1 051						
NEW:	9,251,506	4,770,000	11,264,300	5,858,000	2,012,794	1,088,000
PRIOR:		3,263,000		3,894,000		631,000
TOTAL:	9,251,506	8,033,000	11,264,300	9,752,000	2,012,794	1,719,000
Military Personnel						
Reserve personnel, Navy						
17 1405 0 1 051						
NEW:	1,127,700	969,000	1,353,600	1,164,000	225,900	195,000
PRIOR:		79,000		117,000		38,000
TOTAL:	1,127,700	1,048,000	1,353,600	1,281,000	225,900	233,000
Military personnel, Navy						
17 1453 0 1 051						
NEW:	15,701,274	15,347,000	17,221,400	16,876,000	1,520,126	1,529,000
PRIOR:		123,000		157,000		34,000
TOTAL:	15,701,274	15,470,000	17,221,400	17,033,000	1,520,126	1,563,000
Procurement						
Aircraft procurement, Navy						
17 1506 0 1 051						
NEW:	10,903,798	981,300	12,062,600	1,085,000	1,158,802	103,700
PRIOR:		7,907,000		8,622,000		715,000
TOTAL:	10,903,798	8,888,300	12,062,600	9,707,000	1,158,802	818,700
Weapons procurement, Navy						
17 1507 0 1 051						
NEW:	4,353,611	479,000	5,705,700	619,000	1,352,089	140,000
PRIOR:		2,781,000		3,338,000		557,000
TOTAL:	4,353,611	3,260,000	5,705,700	3,957,000	1,352,089	697,000
Operation and Maintenance						
Operation and maintenance, Navy						
17 1804 0 1 051						
NEW:	25,103,941	18,586,000	25,797,700	19,023,000	693,759	437,000
PRIOR:		4,529,000		5,797,000		1,268,000
TOTAL:	25,103,941	23,115,000	25,797,700	24,820,000	693,759	1,705,000

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Defense Subcommittee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Operation and maintenance, Navy Reserve 17 1806 0 1 051						
NEW:	827,181	590,000	954,500	676,000	127,319	86,000
PRIOR:		153,000		191,000		38,000
TOTAL:	827,181	743,000	954,500	867,000	127,319	124,000
Procurement Other procurement, Navy 17 1810 0 1 051						
NEW:	5,341,614	534,000	6,601,200	660,000	1,259,586	126,000
PRIOR:		3,154,000		3,812,000		658,000
TOTAL:	5,341,614	3,688,000	6,601,200	4,472,000	1,259,586	784,000
Revolving and Management Funds Navy stock fund 17 4911 0 4 051						
NEW:	473,307	359,700	716,500	544,700	243,193	185,000
PRIOR:		-359,700		85,000		444,700
TOTAL:	473,307	0	716,500	629,700	243,193	629,700
Marine Corps stock fund 17 4913 0 4 051						
NEW:	34,908	26,530	42,700	32,712	7,792	6,182
PRIOR:		-26,530		6,000		32,530
TOTAL:	34,908	0	42,700	38,712	7,792	38,712
Operation and Maintenance National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army 21 1705 0 1 051						
NEW:	914	557	920	551	6	-6
PRIOR:		343		350		7
TOTAL:	914	900	920	901	6	1
Military Personnel Military personnel, Army 21 2010 0 1 051						
NEW:	21,097,085	20,600,000	22,712,000	22,258,000	1,614,915	1,658,000
PRIOR:		265,000		210,000		-55,000
TOTAL:	21,097,085	20,865,000	22,712,000	22,468,000	1,614,915	1,603,000
Operation and Maintenance Operation and maintenance, Army 21 2020 0 1 051						
NEW:	18,403,298	14,747,000	20,190,630	16,173,000	1,787,332	1,426,000
PRIOR:		2,577,000		3,309,000		732,000
TOTAL:	18,403,298	17,324,000	20,190,630	19,482,000	1,787,332	2,158,000
Procurement Missile procurement, Army 21 2032 0 1 051						
NEW:	3,158,300	259,000	3,419,300	277,000	261,000	18,000
PRIOR:		2,287,000		2,578,000		291,000
TOTAL:	3,158,300	2,546,000	3,419,300	2,855,000	261,000	309,000
Procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, Army 21 2033 0 1 051						
NEW:	4,744,500	544,900	5,822,900	356,400	1,078,400	-188,500
PRIOR:		3,278,500		4,004,600		726,100
TOTAL:	4,744,500	3,823,400	5,822,900	4,361,000	1,078,400	537,600
Other procurement, Army 21 2035 0 1 051						
NEW:	5,122,450	308,000	5,712,800	342,000	590,350	34,000
PRIOR:		3,762,000		4,269,000		507,000
TOTAL:	5,122,450	4,070,000	5,712,800	4,611,000	590,350	541,000
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army 21 2040 0 1 051						
NEW:	4,376,115	2,305,000	5,279,900	2,798,000	903,785	493,000
PRIOR:		1,741,000		1,850,000		109,000
TOTAL:	4,376,115	4,046,000	5,279,900	4,648,000	903,785	602,000
Military Personnel National Guard personnel, Army 21 2060 0 1 051						
NEW:	2,889,559	2,651,000	3,430,800	3,109,000	541,241	458,000
PRIOR:		169,000		260,000		91,000
TOTAL:	2,889,559	2,820,000	3,430,800	3,369,000	541,241	549,000
Operation and Maintenance Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard 21 2065 0 1 051						
NEW:	1,424,293	1,200,000	1,605,200	1,400,000	180,907	140,000
PRIOR:		91,000		145,000		54,000
TOTAL:	1,424,293	1,351,000	1,605,200	1,545,000	180,907	194,000

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID.
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Defense Subcommittee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1 BA	OUTLAYS
Military Personnel Reserve personnel, Army 21 2070 0 1 051						
NEW:	2,077,853	1,951,000	2,394,400	2,241,000	316,547	290,000
PRIOR:		115,000		133,000		18,000
TOTAL:	2,077,853	2,066,000	2,394,400	2,374,000	316,547	308,000
Operation and Maintenance Operation and maintenance, Army Reserve 21 2080 0 1 051						
NEW:	724,400	637,000	779,600	683,000	55,200	46,000
PRIOR:		23,000		71,000		48,000
TOTAL:	724,400	660,000	779,600	754,000	55,200	94,000
Revolving and Management Funds Army stock fund 21 4991 0 4 051						
NEW:	366,448	278,500	442,000	335,890	75,552	57,390
PRIOR:		-278,500		-2,047,000		-1,768,500
TOTAL:	366,448	0	442,000	-1,711,110	75,552	-1,711,110
Procurement Aircraft procurement, Air Force 57 3010 0 1 051						
NEW:	26,270,966	2,109,700	26,475,700	2,094,000	204,734	-15,700
PRIOR:		13,108,000		17,583,000		4,475,000
TOTAL:	26,270,966	15,217,700	26,475,700	19,677,000	204,734	4,459,300
Missile procurement, Air Force 57 3020 0 1 051						
NEW:	6,903,345	1,385,000	10,917,700	2,173,000	4,014,355	788,000
PRIOR:		4,457,000		5,047,000		590,000
TOTAL:	6,903,345	5,842,000	10,917,700	7,220,000	4,014,355	1,378,000
Other procurement, Air Force 57 3080 0 1 051						
NEW:	8,853,090	4,431,000	9,538,000	4,769,000	684,910	338,000
PRIOR:		2,742,000		3,422,000		680,000
TOTAL:	8,853,090	7,173,000	9,538,000	8,191,000	684,910	1,018,000
Operation and Maintenance Operation and maintenance, Air Force 57 3400 0 1 051						
NEW:	19,093,165	15,864,000	20,924,400	17,248,000	1,831,235	1,384,000
PRIOR:		2,179,400		2,982,000		802,600
TOTAL:	19,093,165	18,043,400	20,924,400	20,230,000	1,831,235	2,186,600
Military Personnel Military personnel, Air Force 57 3500 0 1 051						
NEW:	17,572,005	17,221,000	19,187,900	18,804,000	1,615,895	1,583,000
PRIOR:		276,000		264,000		-12,000
TOTAL:	17,572,005	17,497,000	19,187,900	19,068,000	1,615,895	1,571,000
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force 57 3600 0 1 051						
NEW:	13,506,247	6,980,000	15,578,500	8,101,000	2,072,253	1,121,000
PRIOR:		4,930,000		5,491,000		561,000
TOTAL:	13,506,247	11,910,000	15,578,500	13,592,000	2,072,253	1,682,000
Military Personnel Reserve personnel, Air force 57 3700 0 1 051						
NEW:	566,631	493,000	622,500	545,000	55,869	52,000
PRIOR:		32,000		60,000		28,000
TOTAL:	566,631	525,000	622,500	605,000	55,869	80,000
Operation and Maintenance Operation and maintenance, Air Force Reserve 57 3740 0 1 051						
NEW:	872,461	770,000	907,700	798,000	35,239	28,000
PRIOR:		35,000		80,000		45,000
TOTAL:	872,461	805,000	907,700	878,000	35,239	73,000
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard 57 3840 0 1 051						
NEW:	1,810,348	1,669,000	1,830,100	1,687,000	19,752	18,000
PRIOR:		79,000		123,000		44,000
TOTAL:	1,810,348	1,748,000	1,830,100	1,810,000	19,752	62,000
Military Personnel National Guard personnel, Air Force 57 3850 0 1 051						
NEW:	868,578	843,000	995,100	966,000	126,522	123,000
PRIOR:		27,000		22,000		-5,000
TOTAL:	868,578	870,000	995,100	988,000	126,522	118,000

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Defense Subcommittee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Operation and Maintenance						
Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies						
97 0100 0 1 051						
NEW:	7,076,069	6,311,000	7,568,900	6,735,000	492,831	424,000
PRIOR:		354,000		822,000		538,000
TOTAL:	7,076,069	6,665,000	7,568,900	7,627,000	492,831	962,000
Claims, Defense						
97 0102 0 1 051						
NEW:	146,500	155,000	158,300	154,000	11,800	-1,000
PRIOR:		33,000		4,000		-29,000
TOTAL:	146,500	188,000	158,300	158,000	11,800	-30,000
Court of Military Appeals, Defense						
97 0104 0 1 051						
NEW:	2,870	2,657	3,200	2,800	330	143
PRIOR:		338		200		-138
TOTAL:	2,870	2,995	3,200	3,000	330	5
Procurement						
Procurement, Defense agencies						
97 0300 0 1 051						
NEW:	1,166,201	186,000	1,391,900	223,000	225,699	37,000
PRIOR:		585,000		735,000		150,000
TOTAL:	1,166,201	771,000	1,391,900	958,000	225,699	187,000
Defense production act purchases						
97 0360 0 1 051						
NEW:	10,000	0	59,000	0	49,000	0
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	10,000	0	59,000	0	49,000	0
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation						
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense agencies						
97 0400 0 1 051						
NEW:	4,236,327	1,882,000	7,053,900	3,174,000	2,817,573	1,292,000
PRIOR:		1,346,000		1,973,000		627,000
TOTAL:	4,236,327	3,228,000	7,053,900	5,147,000	2,817,573	1,919,000
Director of test and evaluation, Defense						
97 0450 0 1 051						
NEW:	59,000	17,000	103,500	31,000	44,500	14,000
PRIOR:		34,000		38,000		4,000
TOTAL:	59,000	51,000	103,500	69,000	44,500	18,000
Revolving and Management Funds						
Defense stock fund						
97 4961 0 4 051						
NEW:	130,700	99,332	193,500	146,610	62,800	47,278
PRIOR:		-99,332		24,000		123,332
TOTAL:	130,700	0	193,500	170,610	62,800	170,610
Allowances						
Other legislation						
97 9912 0 1 051						
NEW:	0	0	188,700	69,800	188,700	69,800
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	0	0	188,700	69,800	188,700	69,800
Defense-related activities						
Other Independent Agencies						
Central Intelligence Agency						
Payment to the Central Intelligence Agency retirement and di						
56 3400 0 1 054						
NEW:	99,300	99,300	109,500	109,500	10,200	10,200
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	99,300	99,300	109,500	109,500	10,200	10,200
Other Independent Agencies						
Intelligence Community Staff						
Intelligence community staff						
95 0400 0 1 054						
NEW:	20,797	13,716	21,900	19,710	1,103	5,994
PRIOR:		7,143		2,029		-5,114
TOTAL:	20,797	20,859	21,900	21,739	1,103	880
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. DE Defense Subcommittee						
NEW:	253,552,283	154,933,192	284,576,950	171,017,673	31,024,667	16,084,481
PRIOR:		66,032,662		80,073,179		14,040,517
TOTAL:	253,552,283	220,965,854	284,576,950	251,090,852	31,024,667	30,124,998

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE		
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	OUTLAYS	
Energy and Water Subcomm							
NATIONAL DEFENSE							
Atomic energy defense activities							
Department of Energy							
Atomic Energy Defense Activities							
Atomic energy defense activities							
89 0220 0 1 053							
	NEW:	5,682,190	3,116,633	8,046,900	4,292,535	2,364,710	1,175,902
	PRIOR:		3,715,936		3,407,465		-308,471
	TOTAL:	5,682,190	6,832,569	8,046,900	7,700,000	2,364,710	867,431
GENERAL SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY							
General science and basic research							
Energy Programs							
General science and research activities							
89 0222 0 1 251							
	NEW:	518,167	350,787	685,400	464,016	167,233	113,229
	PRIOR:		152,930		167,757		14,827
	TOTAL:	518,167	503,717	685,400	631,773	167,233	128,056
ENERGY							
Energy supply							
Energy supply, R&D activities							
89 0224 0 2 271							
	NEW:	1,955,489	993,489	1,969,671	1,002,562	14,182	9,073
	PRIOR:		1,103,488		1,022,525		-80,963
	TOTAL:	1,955,489	2,096,977	1,969,671	2,025,087	14,182	-71,890
Power Marketing Administration							
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration							
89 0302 0 1 271							
	NEW:	35,729	14,283	39,800	15,920	4,071	1,637
	PRIOR:		7,372		18,254		10,882
	TOTAL:	35,729	21,655	39,800	34,174	4,071	12,519
Energy Programs							
Nuclear waste disposal fund							
89 5227 0 2 271							
	NEW:	327,669	187,000	571,460	285,730	243,791	98,730
	PRIOR:		137,208		140,898		3,690
	TOTAL:	327,669	324,208	571,460	426,628	243,791	102,420
Energy information, policy, and regulation							
Departmental Administration							
Departmental administration							
89 0228 0 1 276							
	NEW:	133,789	-8,624	170,424	4,563	36,635	13,187
	PRIOR:		133,474		156,796		23,322
	TOTAL:	133,789	124,850	170,424	161,359	36,635	36,509
NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT							
Water resources							
Department of Defense--Civil							
Corps of Engineers--Civil							
Inland waterways trust fund							
20 8861 0 7 301							
	NEW:	0	0	196,000	137,200	196,000	137,200
	PRIOR:		0		0		0
	TOTAL:	0	0	196,000	137,200	196,000	137,200
Revolving fund							
96 4902 0 4 301							
	NEW:	0	8,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	-1,000
	PRIOR:		-1,900		0		1,900
	TOTAL:	0	6,100	7,000	7,000	7,000	900
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. EW Energy and Water Subcomm							
	NEW:	8,653,033	4,661,568	11,686,655	6,209,526	3,033,622	1,547,958
	PRIOR:		5,248,508		4,913,695		-334,813
	TOTAL:	8,653,033	9,910,076	11,686,655	11,123,221	3,033,622	1,213,145

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE		
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	OUTLAYS	
Foreign Operations Subcomm							
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS							
Foreign economic and financial assistance							
Funds Appropriated to the President							
Multilateral Assistance							
Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development							
11 0077 0 1 151							
	NEW:	139,723	13,972	182,871	18,287	43,148	4,315
	PRIOR:		16,047		37,813		21,766
	TOTAL:	139,723	30,019	182,871	56,100	43,148	26,681
Contribution to the International Finance Corporation							
11 0078 0 1 151							
	NEW:	0	0	35,033	35,033	35,033	35,033
	PRIOR:		0		0		0
	TOTAL:	0	0	35,033	35,033	35,033	35,033

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Foreign Operations Subcomm						
Contribution to the African Development Fund						
11 0079 0 1 151						
NEW:	50,000	0	75,000	0	25,000	0
PRIOR:		68,960		56,150		-12,810
TOTAL:	50,000	68,960	75,000	56,150	25,000	-12,810
Agency for International Development						
Functional development assistance program						
11 1021 0 1 151						
NEW:	1,646,354	202,617	1,655,900	203,676	9,546	1,059
PRIOR:		1,125,286		1,240,908		115,622
TOTAL:	1,646,354	1,327,903	1,655,900	1,444,584	9,546	116,681
Department of State						
Other						
International narcotics control						
11 1022 0 1 151						
NEW:	50,217	16,321	57,529	18,697	7,312	2,376
PRIOR:		24,193		28,674		4,481
TOTAL:	50,217	40,514	57,529	47,371	7,312	6,857
Migration and refugee assistance						
19 1143 0 1 151						
NEW:	325,500	222,968	337,680	231,311	12,180	8,343
PRIOR:		90,106		86,424		-3,682
TOTAL:	325,500	313,074	337,680	317,735	12,180	4,661
Funds Appropriated to the President						
Agency for International Development						
Private sector revolving fund						
72 4341 0 3 151						
NEW:	16,000	6,038	20,000	7,574	4,000	1,536
PRIOR:		4,529		10,914		6,385
TOTAL:	16,000	10,567	20,000	18,488	4,000	7,921
International security assistance						
International Security Assistance						
Economic support fund						
11 1037 0 1 152						
NEW:	3,841,000	2,216,257	4,078,000	2,338,416	237,000	122,159
PRIOR:		1,557,859		1,462,576		-95,283
TOTAL:	3,841,000	3,774,116	4,078,000	3,800,992	237,000	26,876
Military assistance						
11 1080 0 1 152						
NEW:	805,100	792,425	949,350	934,160	144,250	141,735
PRIOR:		18,500		10,466		-8,034
TOTAL:	805,100	810,925	949,350	944,626	144,250	133,701
International military education and training						
11 1081 0 1 152						
NEW:	56,221	25,299	65,650	29,543	9,429	4,244
PRIOR:		23,482		25,822		2,340
TOTAL:	56,221	48,781	65,650	55,365	9,429	6,584
Foreign military sales credit						
11 1082 0 1 152						
NEW:	4,939,500	1,297,190	5,655,000	1,740,349	715,500	443,159
PRIOR:		1,110,300		2,448,209		1,337,909
TOTAL:	4,939,500	2,407,490	5,655,000	4,188,558	715,500	1,781,068
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. FA Foreign Operations Subcomm						
NEW:	11,869,615	4,793,087	13,112,013	5,557,046	1,242,398	763,959
PRIOR:		4,039,262		5,407,956		1,368,694
TOTAL:	11,869,615	8,832,349	13,112,013	10,965,002	1,242,398	2,132,653

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Hud-Independent Subcomm						
GENERAL SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY						
General science and basic research						
Other Independent Agencies						
National Science Foundation						
Research and related activities						
49 0100 0 1 251						
NEW:	1,304,910	664,199	1,397,750	767,365	92,840	103,166
PRIOR:		565,635		554,594		28,959
TOTAL:	1,304,910	1,229,834	1,397,750	1,361,959	92,840	132,125
U.S. Antarctic program						
49 0200 0 1 251						
NEW:	110,080	34,345	120,100	42,035	10,020	7,690
PRIOR:		68,850		75,626		6,776
TOTAL:	110,080	103,195	120,100	117,661	10,020	14,466

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(HAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Hud-Independent Subcomm	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE		
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2	COL1	
Space flight							
National Aeronautics and Space Administration							
National Aeronautics and Space Administration							
Research and program management (Space flight)							
80 0103 0 1 253							
	NEW:	557,200	525,774	581,200	548,653	24,000	22,879
	PRIOR:		32,684		29,930		-3,154
	TOTAL:	557,200	558,458	581,200	578,183	24,000	19,725
Research and development (Space flight)							
80 0108 0 1 253							
	NEW:	501,400	382,092	709,300	548,454	207,900	166,362
	PRIOR:		107,650		108,910		1,260
	TOTAL:	501,400	489,742	709,300	657,364	207,900	167,622
Space, science, applications, and technology							
Research and program management (Space science, applications)							
80 0103 0 1 254							
	NEW:	441,200	405,904	449,600	413,632	8,400	7,728
	PRIOR:		34,469		35,244		775
	TOTAL:	441,200	440,373	449,600	448,876	8,400	8,503
Construction of facilities (Space science, applications, and							
80 0107 0 1 254							
	NEW:	8,300	954	13,000	1,895	4,700	541
	PRIOR:		5,712		7,798		2,086
	TOTAL:	8,300	6,666	13,000	9,293	4,700	2,627
Research and development (Space science, applications, and t							
80 0108 0 1 254							
	NEW:	1,564,000	875,840	1,802,300	1,009,288	238,300	133,448
	PRIOR:		571,822		666,523		94,701
	TOTAL:	1,564,000	1,447,662	1,802,300	1,675,811	238,300	228,149
Supporting space activities							
Research and program management (Supporting space activities)							
80 0103 0 1 255							
	NEW:	58,600	55,670	59,200	56,280	600	610
	PRIOR:		2,941		2,904		-37
	TOTAL:	58,600	58,611	59,200	59,184	600	572
Space flight, control, and data communications (Supporting s							
80 0105 0 1 255							
	NEW:	795,700	572,904	808,300	581,976	12,600	9,072
	PRIOR:		168,500		219,145		50,645
	TOTAL:	795,700	741,404	808,300	801,121	12,600	59,717
Construction of facilities (Supporting space activities)							
80 0107 0 1 255							
	NEW:	85,200	8,520	93,300	9,330	8,100	810
	PRIOR:		59,020		62,556		3,536
	TOTAL:	85,200	67,540	93,300	71,886	8,100	4,346
Research and development (Supporting space activities)							
80 0108 0 1 255							
	NEW:	14,800	10,656	16,200	11,664	1,400	1,008
	PRIOR:		31,083		15,000		-16,083
	TOTAL:	14,800	41,739	16,200	26,664	1,400	-15,075
ENERGY							
Energy supply							
Environmental Protection Agency							
Environmental Protection Agency							
Research and development (energy supply)							
68 0107 0 1 271							
	NEW:	52,337	15,701	61,863	48,559	9,526	2,858
	PRIOR:		19,235		34,050		14,815
	TOTAL:	52,337	34,936	61,863	52,609	9,526	17,673
NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT							
Pollution control and abatement							
Hazardous substance response trust fund							
20 8145 0 7 304							
	NEW:	620,000	210,791	900,000	306,000	280,000	95,209
	PRIOR:		189,709		320,937		131,228
	TOTAL:	620,000	400,500	900,000	626,937	280,000	226,437
Research and development (Pollution control and abatement)							
68 0107 0 1 304							
	NEW:	136,538	39,130	150,537	43,054	13,999	3,924
	PRIOR:		84,296		80,539		-3,757
	TOTAL:	136,538	123,426	150,537	123,593	13,999	167
Abatement, control, and compliance							
68 0108 0 1 304							
	NEW:	453,087	214,742	495,500	233,381	42,413	18,639
	PRIOR:		234,863		249,789		14,920
	TOTAL:	453,087	449,605	495,500	483,170	42,413	33,559

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(HAR40R) CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
 (UNIFIED BUDGET) IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
 P63 SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
 (AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Hud-Independent Subcomm						
Salaries and expenses 68 0200 0 1 304						
NEW:	654,412	571,938	654,696	572,204	284	266
PRIOR:		53,665		77,102		23,437
TOTAL:	654,412	625,603	654,696	649,306	284	23,703
COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT						
Mortgage credit and deposit insurance Other Independent Agencies National Credit Union Administration Central liquidity facility 25 4470 0 3 371						
NEW:	105,000	0	106,000	0	1,000	0
PRIOR:		99,000		101,000		2,000
TOTAL:	105,000	99,000	106,000	101,000	1,000	2,000
Other advancement of commerce General Services Administration Office of Information Resources Management Consumer information center fund 47 4549 0 3 376						
NEW:	1,149	0	1,249	0	100	0
PRIOR:		878		1,149		271
TOTAL:	1,149	878	1,249	1,149	100	271
TRANSPORTATION						
Air transportation National Aeronautics and Space Administration National Aeronautics and Space Administration Research and development (Air transportation) 80 0108 0 1 402						
NEW:	342,400	188,320	354,000	194,700	11,600	6,380
PRIOR:		135,148		148,963		13,815
TOTAL:	342,400	323,468	354,000	343,663	11,600	20,195
COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT						
Community development Department of Housing and Urban Development Policy Development and Research Research and technology 86 0108 0 1 451						
NEW:	16,900	5,070	18,900	5,670	2,000	600
PRIOR:		17,448		13,300		-4,148
TOTAL:	16,900	22,518	18,900	18,970	2,000	-3,548
Management and Administration Salaries and expenses, including transfer of funds (Communit 86 0143 0 1 451						
NEW:	186,074	154,845	191,020	159,693	4,946	4,848
PRIOR:		35,893		31,229		-4,664
TOTAL:	186,074	190,738	191,020	190,922	4,946	184
Disaster relief and insurance Funds Appropriated to the President Disaster Relief Disaster relief 11 0039 0 1 453						
NEW:	100,000	18,750	194,000	194,000	94,000	175,250
PRIOR:		366,629		173,435		-193,194
TOTAL:	100,000	385,379	194,000	367,435	94,000	-17,944
Other Independent Agencies Federal Emergency Management Agency National flood insurance fund 58 4236 0 3 453						
NEW:	95,064	0	98,459	0	3,395	0
PRIOR:		74,964		92,208		17,244
TOTAL:	95,064	74,964	98,459	92,208	3,395	17,244
INCOME SECURITY						
Housing assistance Department of Housing and Urban Development Management and Administration Salaries and expenses, including transfer of funds (Housing 86 0143 0 1 604						
NEW:	74,026	62,500	96,138	81,525	22,112	19,025
PRIOR:		11,526		11,526		0
TOTAL:	74,026	74,026	96,138	93,051	22,112	19,025
VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES						
Income security for veterans Veterans Administration Veterans Administration Compensation 36 0153 0 1 701						
NEW:	10,197,300	9,354,639	10,446,000	9,579,394	248,700	223,755
PRIOR:		842,061		838,106		-3,955
TOTAL:	10,197,300	10,196,700	10,446,000	10,417,500	248,700	220,800

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Hud-Independent Subcomm	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	COL1 OUTLAYS
Pensions						
36 0154 0 1 701						
NEW:	3,854,100	3,538,925	3,940,700	3,621,521	86,600	82,596
PRIOR:		349,975		315,179		-34,796
TOTAL:	3,854,100	3,888,900	3,940,700	3,936,700	86,600	47,800
Burial benefits and miscellaneous assistance						
36 0155 0 1 701						
NEW:	135,700	135,522	144,100	143,922	8,400	8,400
PRIOR:		178		178		0
TOTAL:	135,700	135,700	144,100	144,100	8,400	8,400
Hospital and medical care for veterans						
Medical care						
36 0160 0 1 703						
NEW:	8,781,904	7,640,154	9,090,000	7,908,308	308,096	268,146
PRIOR:		1,000,874		957,172		-43,702
TOTAL:	8,781,904	8,641,028	9,090,000	8,865,472	308,096	224,444
Other veterans benefits and services						
Department of Defense--Civil						
Cemeterial Expenses, Army						
Salaries and expenses						
21 1805 0 1 705						
NEW:	7,759	6,284	14,778	6,502	7,019	218
PRIOR:		2,000		2,164		164
TOTAL:	7,759	8,284	14,778	8,666	7,019	382
Veterans Administration						
Veterans Administration						
General operating expenses						
36 0151 0 1 705						
NEW:	746,120	686,300	749,412	689,459	3,292	3,159
PRIOR:		60,054		59,820		-234
TOTAL:	746,120	746,354	749,412	749,279	3,292	2,925
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE						
Federal law enforcement activities						
Department of Housing and Urban Development						
Management and Administration						
Salaries and expenses, including transfer of funds (federal)						
86 0143 0 1 751						
NEW:	25,965	22,004	26,267	22,590	302	586
PRIOR:		3,524		3,683		159
TOTAL:	25,965	25,528	26,267	26,273	302	745
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity						
Fair housing initiatives						
86 0151 0 1 751						
NEW:	0	0	10,000	6,000	10,000	6,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	0	0	10,000	6,000	10,000	6,000
GENERAL GOVERNMENT						
Executive direction and management						
Executive Office of the President						
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality						
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental						
11 1453 0 1 802						
NEW:	700	683	705	688	5	5
PRIOR:		32		17		-15
TOTAL:	700	715	705	705	5	-10
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. IH Hud-Independent Subcomm						
NEW:	32,027,925	26,403,156	33,794,574	27,777,334	1,766,649	1,374,178
PRIOR:		5,230,318		5,329,376		99,058
TOTAL:	32,027,925	31,633,474	33,794,574	33,106,710	1,766,649	1,473,236
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS						
Foreign economic and financial assistance						
Department of State						
Other						
Compact of free association						
19 0117 0 1 151						
NEW:	0	0	299,270	299,270	299,270	299,270
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	0	0	299,270	299,270	299,270	299,270

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Interior Subcommittee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
ENERGY						
Energy supply						
Department of the Treasury						
Financial Management Service						
Energy security reserve						
20 0112 0 1 271						
NEW:	-5,375,000	0	0	0	5,375,000	0
PRIOR:		50,458		181,654		131,196
TOTAL:	-5,375,000	50,458	0	181,654	5,375,000	131,196
NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT						
Conservation and land management						
Department of Agriculture						
Forest Service						
Construction						
12 1103 0 1 302						
NEW:	35,050	159,598	209,637	128,298	174,587	-31,300
PRIOR:		106,466		91,617		-14,849
TOTAL:	35,050	266,064	209,637	219,915	174,587	-46,149
National forest system						
12 1106 0 1 302						
NEW:	1,094,793	954,968	1,103,342	960,855	8,549	5,887
PRIOR:		121,226		139,823		18,557
TOTAL:	1,094,793	1,076,194	1,103,342	1,100,678	8,549	24,464
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts						
12 5208 0 2 302						
NEW:	766	645	800	674	34	29
PRIOR:		121		121		0
TOTAL:	766	766	800	795	34	29
Miscellaneous trust funds						
12 9973 0 7 302						
NEW:	181,043	88	199,717	5,190	18,674	5,102
PRIOR:		167,334		179,603		12,269
TOTAL:	181,043	167,422	199,717	184,793	18,674	17,371
Department of the Interior						
Bureau of Land Management						
Service charges, deposits, and forfeitures						
14 5017 0 2 302						
NEW:	4,070	840	5,920	1,330	1,850	420
PRIOR:		2,902		3,230		328
TOTAL:	4,070	3,742	5,920	4,560	1,850	818
Range improvements						
14 5132 0 2 302						
NEW:	10,000	6,450	10,460	6,747	460	297
PRIOR:		4,175		3,550		-625
TOTAL:	10,000	10,625	10,460	10,297	460	-328
Recreational resources						
National Park Service						
National park system visitor facilities fund						
14 5078 0 2 303						
NEW:	5,880	2,528	8,500	3,655	2,620	1,127
PRIOR:		3,500		3,236		-264
TOTAL:	5,880	6,028	8,500	6,891	2,620	863
United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
Sport fish restoration						
14 8151 0 7 303						
NEW:	0	0	44,000	0	44,000	0
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	0	0	44,000	0	44,000	0
COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT						
Area and regional development						
Bureau of Indian Affairs						
Operation of Indian programs (Area and regional development)						
14 2100 0 1 452						
NEW:	495,183	345,142	502,208	350,039	7,025	4,857
PRIOR:		159,489		144,648		-14,841
TOTAL:	495,183	504,631	502,208	494,687	7,025	-9,944
Indian loan guaranty and insurance fund						
14 4410 0 3 452						
NEW:	0	0	1,485	1,485	1,485	1,485
PRIOR:		4,470		4,000		-470
TOTAL:	0	4,470	1,485	5,485	1,485	1,015
Miscellaneous trust funds (Area and regional development)						
14 9973 0 7 452						
NEW:	403,503	399,508	418,908	414,759	15,405	15,251
PRIOR:		3,271		3,995		724
TOTAL:	403,503	402,779	418,908	418,754	15,405	15,975

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Interior Subcommittee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE		
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1 BA	COL1 OUTLAYS	
EDUCATION, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT, AND SOCIAL SERVICES							
Research and general education aids							
Other Independent Agencies							
Smithsonian Institution							
Salaries and expenses							
33 0100 0 1 503							
	NEW:	162,415	144,026	180,525	159,385	18,110	15,359
	PRIOR:		17,706		19,338		1,632
	TOTAL:	162,415	161,732	180,525	178,723	18,110	16,991
Restoration and renovation of buildings							
33 0132 0 1 503							
	NEW:	13,475	4,736	14,140	10,317	665	5,581
	PRIOR:		8,864		3,392		-5,472
	TOTAL:	13,475	13,600	14,140	13,709	665	109
Construction							
33 0133 0 1 503							
	NEW:	0	0	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
	PRIOR:		12,000		7,000		-5,000
	TOTAL:	0	12,000	4,000	11,000	4,000	-1,000
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art							
33 0200 0 1 503							
	NEW:	36,085	32,658	36,704	34,778	619	2,120
	PRIOR:		4,813		3,555		-1,258
	TOTAL:	36,085	37,471	36,704	38,333	619	862
Salaries and expenses, Woodrow Wilson International Center f							
33 0400 0 1 503							
	NEW:	2,658	1,485	2,852	1,679	194	194
	PRIOR:		1,173		1,173		0
	TOTAL:	2,658	2,658	2,852	2,852	194	194
GENERAL PURPOSE FISCAL ASSISTANCE							
Other general purpose fiscal assistance							
Department of the Interior							
Bureau of Land Management							
Payments in lieu of taxes							
14 1114 0 1 852							
	NEW:	102,900	102,900	105,000	105,000	2,100	2,100
	PRIOR:		0		0		0
	TOTAL:	102,900	102,900	105,000	105,000	2,100	2,100
United States Fish and Wildlife Service							
National wildlife refuge fund							
14 5091 0 2 852							
	NEW:	12,385	8,666	12,685	12,544	300	3,878
	PRIOR:		3,929		0		-3,929
	TOTAL:	12,385	12,595	12,685	12,544	300	-51
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. IN Interior Subcommittee							
	NEW:	-2,814,794	2,164,238	3,160,153	2,500,005	5,974,947	335,767
	PRIOR:		671,897		789,935		118,638
	TOTAL:	-2,814,794	2,836,135	3,160,153	3,289,940	5,974,947	453,805

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Labor, HHS Subcomm	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE		
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1 BA	COL1 OUTLAYS	
EDUCATION, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT, AND SOCIAL SERVICES							
Elementary, secondary, and vocational education							
Department of Education							
Special Institutions							
American Printing House for the Blind							
91 0600 0 1 501							
	NEW:	5,500	5,500	5,510	5,510	10	10
	PRIOR:		0		0		0
	TOTAL:	5,500	5,500	5,510	5,510	10	10
Higher education							
Office of Postsecondary Education							
Higher education facilities loans and insurance							
91 0240 0 1 502							
	NEW:	14,194	0	17,996	0	3,802	0
	PRIOR:		5,629		1,996		-3,633
	TOTAL:	14,194	5,629	17,996	1,996	3,802	-3,633
Special Institutions							
Callaudet College							
91 0602 0 1 502							
	NEW:	58,700	58,700	58,889	58,889	189	189
	PRIOR:		2,000		0		-2,000
	TOTAL:	58,700	60,700	58,889	58,889	189	-1,811

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE		
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS	
Labor, HHS Subcomm							
Research and general education aids							
Other Independent Agencies							
Corporation for Public Broadcasting							
Public broadcasting fund							
20 0151 0 1 503							
	NEW:	150,500	150,500	159,500	159,500	9,000	9,000
	PRIOR:		0		0		0
	TOTAL:	150,500	150,500	159,500	159,500	9,000	9,000
Training and employment							
Department of Labor							
Employment and Training Administration							
State unemployment insurance and employment service operatio							
16 0179 0 1 504							
	NEW:	23,500	6,850	23,600	6,575	100	-275
	PRIOR:		43,754		16,650		-27,104
	TOTAL:	23,500	50,604	23,600	23,225	100	-27,379
Other labor services							
Bureau of Labor Statistics							
Salaries and expenses							
16 0200 0 1 505							
	NEW:	147,095	138,210	148,294	138,898	1,199	688
	PRIOR:		10,691		10,503		-188
	TOTAL:	147,095	148,901	148,294	149,401	1,199	500
Social services							
Department of Health and Human Services							
Human Development Services							
Family social services							
75 1645 0 1 506							
	NEW:	736,910	731,194	740,994	736,976	4,084	5,782
	PRIOR:		47,955		5,507		-42,448
	TOTAL:	736,910	779,149	740,994	742,483	4,084	-36,666
HEALTH							
Health care services							
Office of Assistant Secretary for Health							
Retirement pay and medical benefits for commissioned officer							
75 0379 0 1 551							
	NEW:	72,121	69,240	97,702	75,909	25,581	6,669
	PRIOR:		2,084		2,124		40
	TOTAL:	72,121	71,324	97,702	78,033	25,581	6,709
Health Care Financing Administration							
Grants to states for medicaid							
75 0512 0 1 551							
	NEW:	21,845,491	21,126,807	23,016,000	22,684,918	1,170,509	1,558,111
	PRIOR:		1,470,193		331,082		-1,139,111
	TOTAL:	21,845,491	22,597,000	23,016,000	23,016,000	1,170,509	419,000
Legislative Branch							
Other Legislative Branch Agencies							
Prospective Payment Assessment Commission							
95 3400 0 1 551							
	NEW:	2,424	2,124	3,240	2,940	816	816
	PRIOR:		1,170		300		-870
	TOTAL:	2,424	3,294	3,240	3,240	816	-54
Health research							
Department of Health and Human Services							
Office of Assistant Secretary for Health							
Public health service management (Health research)							
75 1101 0 1 552							
	NEW:	59,060	27,846	64,180	31,236	5,120	3,394
	PRIOR:		35,601		32,809		-2,792
	TOTAL:	59,060	63,447	64,180	64,045	5,120	598
Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration							
Alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health (Health research)							
75 1361 0 1 552							
	NEW:	375,149	278,957	375,194	263,571	45	-15,386
	PRIOR:		94,985		115,660		20,675
	TOTAL:	375,149	373,942	375,194	379,231	45	5,289
Education and training of health care work force							
National Institutes of Health							
Research resources (Education and training of health care wo							
75 0848 0 1 553							
	NEW:	1,102	48	1,109	60	7	12
	PRIOR:		908		1,130		222
	TOTAL:	1,102	956	1,109	1,190	7	234
National Cancer Institute (Education and training of health							
75 0849 0 1 553							
	NEW:	30,838	646	32,290	646	1,452	0
	PRIOR:		23,739		30,552		6,813
	TOTAL:	30,838	24,385	32,290	31,198	1,452	6,813

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA - OUTLAYS
Labor, HHS Subcomm						
National Institute of General Medical Sciences (Education an						
75 0851 0 1 553						
NEW:	59,337	40,225	59,412	44,988	75	4,763
PRIOR:		14,768		15,000		232
TOTAL:	59,337	54,993	59,412	59,988	75	4,995
National Eye Institute (Education and training of health car						
75 0887 0 1 553						
NEW:	5,486	3,996	5,491	4,000	5	4
PRIOR:		705		706		1
TOTAL:	5,486	4,701	5,491	4,706	5	5
MEDICARE						
Medicare						
Health Care Financing Administration						
Federal hospital insurance trust fund						
20 8005 0 7 572						
NEW:	52,928,000	30,974,743	62,160,000	48,999,865	9,232,000	18,025,122
PRIOR:		17,237,161		0		-17,237,161
TOTAL:	52,928,000	48,211,904	62,160,000	48,999,865	9,232,000	787,961
INCOME SECURITY						
General retirement and disability insurance (excluding socia						
Department of Labor						
Employment and Training Administration						
Advances to the unemployment trust fund and other funds (Gen						
16 0327 0 1 601						
NEW:	0	0	116,000	116,000	116,000	116,000
PRIOR:		395,000		0		-395,000
TOTAL:	0	395,000	116,000	116,000	116,000	-279,000
Employment Standards Administration						
Special benefits (General retirement and disability insuranc						
16 1521 0 1 601						
NEW:	4,400	4,400	4,500	4,500	100	100
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	4,400	4,400	4,500	4,500	100	100
Black lung disability trust fund						
20 8144 0 7 601						
NEW:	963,537	970,073	999,000	999,000	35,463	28,927
PRIOR:		927		0		-927
TOTAL:	963,537	971,000	999,000	999,000	35,463	28,000
Other Independent Agencies						
Railroad Retirement Board						
Federal payments to the railroad retirement accounts						
60 0113 0 1 601						
NEW:	2,895,600	2,895,000	3,099,000	3,099,200	203,400	204,200
PRIOR:		0		1,000		1,000
TOTAL:	2,895,600	2,895,000	3,099,000	3,100,200	203,400	205,200
Rail Industry Pension Fund						
60 8011 0 7 601						
NEW:	3,740,600	55,531	4,070,000	20,795	329,400	-34,736
PRIOR:		2,263,494		2,326,230		62,736
TOTAL:	3,740,600	2,319,025	4,070,000	2,347,025	329,400	28,000
Federal employee retirement and disability						
Department of Labor						
Employment Standards Administration						
Special benefits (Federal employee retirement and disability						
16 1521 0 1 602						
NEW:	207,000	206,527	233,000	232,527	26,000	26,000
PRIOR:		473		473		0
TOTAL:	207,000	207,000	233,000	233,000	26,000	26,000
Unemployment compensation						
Employment and Training Administration						
Advances to the unemployment trust fund and other funds (Un						
16 0327 0 1 603						
NEW:	0	0	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
PRIOR:		1,305,000		0		-1,305,000
TOTAL:	0	1,305,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	-1,225,000
Other income security						
Department of Health and Human Services						
Social Security Administration						
Supplemental security income program						
75 0406 0 1 609						
NEW:	9,309,000	9,309,000	9,913,000	9,913,000	604,000	604,000
PRIOR:		348,000		28,000		-320,000
TOTAL:	9,309,000	9,657,000	9,913,000	9,941,000	604,000	284,000
Assistance payments program						
75 0412 0 1 609						
NEW:	8,517,000	8,517,000	8,773,000	8,773,000	256,000	256,000
PRIOR:		80,000		0		-80,000
TOTAL:	8,517,000	8,597,000	8,773,000	8,773,000	256,000	176,000

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Labor, HHS Subcomm	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	OUTLAYS
SOCIAL SECURITY						
SOCIAL SECURITY						
Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund						
20 8006 0 7 650						
NEW:	177,976,000	172,091,865	191,169,000	181,681,586	13,193,000	9,589,721
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	177,976,000	172,091,865	191,169,000	181,681,586	13,193,000	9,589,721
Federal disability insurance trust fund						
20 8007 0 7 650						
NEW:	20,373,000	19,586,689	20,586,000	20,258,000	213,000	671,311
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	20,373,000	19,586,689	20,586,000	20,258,000	213,000	671,311
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. LA Labor, HHS Subcomm						
NEW:	300,501,544	267,251,671	326,011,901	298,392,089	25,510,357	31,140,418
PRIOR:		23,384,237		2,919,722		-20,464,515
TOTAL:	300,501,544	290,635,908	326,011,901	301,311,811	25,510,357	10,675,903

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Legislative Branch Subcomm	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	OUTLAYS
COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT						
Other advancement of commerce						
Legislative Branch						
Library of Congress						
Copyright Office: Salaries and expenses						
03 0102 0 1 376						
NEW:	11,102	10,159	12,081	11,054	979	895
PRIOR:		940		943		3
TOTAL:	11,102	11,099	12,081	11,997	979	898
Other Legislative Branch Agencies						
Copyright Royalty Tribunal: Salaries and expenses						
09 0310 0 1 376						
NEW:	217	211	227	221	10	10
PRIOR:		6		6		0
TOTAL:	217	217	227	227	10	10
EDUCATION, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT, AND SOCIAL SERVICES						
Research and general education aids						
Library of Congress						
Salaries and expenses						
03 0101 0 1 503						
NEW:	133,192	111,237	142,307	123,729	9,115	12,492
PRIOR:		24,578		21,926		-2,652
TOTAL:	133,192	135,815	142,307	145,655	9,115	9,840
Books for the blind and physically handicapped: Salaries and						
03 0141 0 1 503						
NEW:	36,592	19,972	38,402	18,351	1,810	-1,621
PRIOR:		20,109		18,426		-1,683
TOTAL:	36,592	40,081	38,402	36,777	1,810	-3,304
Furniture and furnishings						
03 0146 0 1 503						
NEW:	1,673	887	5,915	3,135	4,242	2,248
PRIOR:		804		786		-18
TOTAL:	1,673	1,691	5,915	3,921	4,242	2,230
GENERAL GOVERNMENT						
Legislative functions						
Senate						
Compensation of Members, Senate						
00 0100 0 1 801						
NEW:	8,856	8,856	8,976	8,976	120	120
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	8,856	8,856	8,976	8,976	120	120
Salaries, officers and employees						
00 0110 0 1 801						
NEW:	165,642	155,703	174,162	163,712	8,520	8,009
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	165,642	155,703	174,162	163,712	8,520	8,009
Secretary of the Senate						
00 0126 0 1 801						
NEW:	711	661	760	707	49	46
PRIOR:		0		50		50
TOTAL:	711	661	760	757	49	96
Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate						
00 0127 0 1 801						
NEW:	42,057	39,172	43,989	40,910	1,932	1,738
PRIOR:		0		2,885		2,885
TOTAL:	42,057	39,172	43,989	43,795	1,932	4,623

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MARKOR)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Legislative Branch Subcomm	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Inquiries and investigations 00 0128 0 1 801						
NEW:	51,498	46,213	53,916	47,985	2,418	1,772
PRIOR:		914		961		47
TOTAL:	51,498	47,127	53,916	48,946	2,418	1,819
Stationery (revolving fund) 00 0140 0 1 801						
NEW:	12	12	13	13	1	1
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	12	12	13	13	1	1
Joint Items Capitol Guide Service 00 0170 0 1 801						
NEW:	810	689	954	811	144	122
PRIOR:		75		79		4
TOTAL:	810	764	954	890	144	126
Senate Office of Senate Legal Counsel 00 0171 0 1 801						
NEW:	565	513	575	522	10	9
PRIOR:		50		52		2
TOTAL:	565	563	575	574	10	11
Joint Items Joint Committee on Printing 00 0180 0 1 801						
NEW:	909	782	945	812	36	30
PRIOR:		85		127		42
TOTAL:	909	867	945	939	36	72
Joint Economic Committee 00 0181 0 1 801						
NEW:	2,569	2,055	2,680	2,144	111	89
PRIOR:		488		514		26
TOTAL:	2,569	2,543	2,680	2,658	111	115
Senate Senate policy committees 00 0182 0 1 801						
NEW:	1,898	1,898	1,981	1,981	83	83
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	1,898	1,898	1,981	1,981	83	83
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate 00 0185 0 1 801						
NEW:	1,400	1,244	1,590	1,414	190	170
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	1,400	1,244	1,590	1,414	190	170
House of Representatives Compensation of Members and related administrative expenses 00 0200 0 1 801						
NEW:	36,410	34,762	37,633	35,940	1,223	1,178
PRIOR:		1,449		1,648		199
TOTAL:	36,410	36,211	37,633	37,588	1,223	1,377
House leadership offices 00 0408 0 1 801						
NEW:	3,240	2,476	3,357	2,565	117	89
PRIOR:		696		764		68
TOTAL:	3,240	3,172	3,357	3,329	117	157
Salaries, officers and employees 00 0410 0 1 801						
NEW:	47,077	45,146	48,981	46,973	1,904	1,827
PRIOR:		1,676		1,931		255
TOTAL:	47,077	46,822	48,981	48,904	1,904	2,082
Members' clerk hire 00 0415 0 1 801						
NEW:	164,126	161,664	169,641	167,096	5,515	5,432
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	164,126	161,664	169,641	167,096	5,515	5,432
Committee employees 00 0416 0 1 801						
NEW:	40,607	39,095	44,325	42,552	3,718	3,457
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	40,607	39,095	44,325	42,552	3,718	3,457
Committee on Appropriations (Studies and Investigations) 00 0418 0 1 801						
NEW:	4,315	4,142	4,500	4,320	185	178
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	4,315	4,142	4,500	4,320	185	178

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Legislative Branch Subcomm	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Joint Items						
Office of the Attending Physician						
00 0425 0 1 801						
NEW:	1,007	971	1,078	1,039	71	68
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	1,007	971	1,078	1,039	71	68
House of Representatives						
Special and select committees						
00 0433 0 1 801						
NEW:	45,667	43,840	46,960	45,082	1,293	1,242
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	45,667	43,840	46,960	45,082	1,293	1,242
Allowances and expenses						
00 0438 0 1 801						
NEW:	128,640	113,932	137,058	120,611	8,418	6,679
PRIOR:		12,389		14,708		2,319
TOTAL:	128,640	126,321	137,058	135,319	8,418	8,998
Joint Items						
Joint Committee on Taxation						
00 0460 0 1 801						
NEW:	3,605	2,387	3,897	2,580	292	193
PRIOR:		856		1,218		362
TOTAL:	3,605	3,243	3,897	3,798	292	555
General expenses, Capitol police						
00 0476 0 1 801						
NEW:	1,471	1,250	1,670	1,420	199	170
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	1,471	1,250	1,670	1,420	199	170
Official mail costs						
00 0825 0 1 801						
NEW:	85,797	60,539	144,458	95,114	58,661	34,575
PRIOR:		25,258		49,344		24,026
TOTAL:	85,797	85,797	144,458	144,458	58,661	58,661
Architect of the Capitol						
Office of the Architect of the Capitol: Salaries						
01 0100 0 1 801						
NEW:	5,137	4,777	5,675	5,170	538	393
PRIOR:		179		360		181
TOTAL:	5,137	4,956	5,675	5,530	538	574
Capitol buildings						
01 0105 0 1 801						
NEW:	11,544	9,897	12,621	10,816	1,077	919
PRIOR:		3,252		1,647		-1,605
TOTAL:	11,544	13,149	12,621	12,463	1,077	-686
Capitol grounds						
01 0108 0 1 801						
NEW:	2,796	2,460	3,364	2,964	568	504
PRIOR:		1,455		336		-1,119
TOTAL:	2,796	3,915	3,364	3,300	568	-615
Senate office buildings						
01 0123 0 1 801						
NEW:	19,241	13,661	23,598	16,755	4,357	3,094
PRIOR:		7,535		13,416		5,881
TOTAL:	19,241	21,196	23,598	30,171	4,357	8,975
House office buildings						
01 0127 0 1 801						
NEW:	22,750	20,339	41,323	36,943	18,573	16,604
PRIOR:		2,325		2,411		86
TOTAL:	22,750	22,664	41,323	39,354	18,573	16,690
Capitol Power Plant						
01 0133 0 1 801						
NEW:	22,920	17,112	25,375	18,955	2,455	1,843
PRIOR:		6,645		5,808		-837
TOTAL:	22,920	23,757	25,375	24,763	2,455	1,006
Structural and mechanical care, Library buildings and ground						
01 0155 0 1 801						
NEW:	5,709	5,258	7,380	6,797	1,671	1,539
PRIOR:		5,569		16,399		10,830
TOTAL:	5,709	10,827	7,380	23,196	1,671	12,369

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR4QR)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Legislative Branch Subcomm	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Library of Congress						
Congressional Research Service: Salaries and expenses 03 0127 0 1 801						
NEW:	39,833	37,324	43,292	40,565	3,459	3,241
PRIOR:		2,344		2,507		163
TOTAL:	39,833	39,668	43,292	43,072	3,459	3,404
Government Printing Office						
Printing and binding 04 0202 0 1 801						
NEW:	13,200	7,392	14,500	8,120	1,300	728
PRIOR:		3,665		5,808		2,143
TOTAL:	13,200	11,057	14,500	13,928	1,300	2,871
General Accounting Office						
Salaries and expenses 05 0107 0 1 801						
NEW:	295,825	271,031	339,639	311,109	43,814	40,078
PRIOR:		16,257		24,794		8,537
TOTAL:	295,825	287,288	339,639	335,903	43,814	48,615
Congressional Budget Office						
Salaries and expenses 08 0100 0 1 801						
NEW:	17,418	14,857	18,455	15,742	1,037	885
PRIOR:		2,405		2,561		156
TOTAL:	17,418	17,262	18,455	18,303	1,037	1,041
Other Legislative Branch Agencies						
Botanic Garden: Salaries and expenses 09 0200 0 1 801						
NEW:	2,044	1,923	2,197	2,067	153	144
PRIOR:		122		121		-1
TOTAL:	2,044	2,045	2,197	2,188	153	143
Office of Technology Assessment: Salaries and expenses						
09 0700 0 1 801						
NEW:	15,549	13,683	17,000	14,960	1,451	1,277
PRIOR:		1,767		1,866		99
TOTAL:	15,549	15,450	17,000	16,826	1,451	1,376
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. LB	Legislative Branch Subcomm					
NEW:	1,495,631	1,330,182	1,687,450	1,482,732	191,819	152,550
PRIOR:		143,893		194,402		50,509
TOTAL:	1,495,631	1,474,075	1,687,450	1,677,134	191,819	203,059

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Military Constr Subcomm	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
NATIONAL DEFENSE						
Department of Defense--Military						
Department of Defense--Military						
Family Housing						
Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps 17 0703 0 1 051						
NEW:	657,789	323,000	722,500	317,658	64,711	-5,342
PRIOR:		261,000		367,413		106,413
TOTAL:	657,789	584,000	722,500	685,071	64,711	101,071
Military Construction						
Military construction, Navy 17 1205 0 1 051						
NEW:	1,534,592	226,000	2,085,200	375,000	550,608	149,000
PRIOR:		801,000		1,061,000		260,000
TOTAL:	1,534,592	1,027,000	2,085,200	1,436,000	550,608	409,000
Family Housing						
Family housing, Army 21 0702 0 1 051						
NEW:	1,328,378	820,000	1,610,700	791,594	282,322	-28,406
PRIOR:		346,000		489,462		143,462
TOTAL:	1,328,378	1,166,000	1,610,700	1,281,056	282,322	115,056
Military Construction						
Military construction, Army 21 2050 0 1 051						
NEW:	1,593,137	235,000	2,020,900	323,000	427,763	88,000
PRIOR:		812,000		1,075,000		263,000
TOTAL:	1,593,137	1,047,000	2,020,900	1,398,000	427,763	351,000
Military construction, Army National Guard						
21 2085 0 1 051						
NEW:	98,603	6,000	102,100	6,000	3,497	0
PRIOR:		58,000		97,000		39,000
TOTAL:	98,603	64,000	102,100	103,000	3,497	39,000

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
PG3

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Military Constr Subcomm						
Military construction, Army Reserve 21 2086 0 1 051						
NEW:	69,306	3,000	70,700	4,000	1,394	1,000
PRIOR:		30,000		46,000		16,000
TOTAL:	69,306	33,000	70,700	50,000	1,394	17,000
Family Housing Family housing, Air Force 57 0704 0 1 051						
NEW:	884,111	447,000	929,400	415,227	45,289	-31,773
PRIOR:		286,000		402,606		116,606
TOTAL:	884,111	733,000	929,400	817,833	45,289	84,833
Military Construction Military construction, Air Force 57 3300 0 1 051						
NEW:	1,572,655	179,000	2,082,000	250,000	509,345	71,000
PRIOR:		1,160,000		1,357,000		197,000
TOTAL:	1,572,655	1,339,000	2,082,000	1,607,000	509,345	268,000
Military construction, Air National Guard 57 3830 0 1 051						
NEW:	111,200	6,000	137,200	8,000	26,000	2,000
PRIOR:		84,000		127,000		43,000
TOTAL:	111,200	90,000	137,200	135,000	26,000	45,000
Military construction, Defense agencies 97 0500 0 1 051						
NEW:	302,198	24,000	309,600	25,000	7,402	1,000
PRIOR:		244,000		252,000		8,000
TOTAL:	302,198	268,000	309,600	277,000	7,402	9,000
Family Housing Family housing, Defense agencies 97 0706 0 1 051						
NEW:	17,437	10,000	20,300	13,195	2,863	3,195
PRIOR:		5,000		7,039		2,039
TOTAL:	17,437	15,000	20,300	20,234	2,863	5,234
Military Construction Defense facilities replacement 97 0811 0 1 051						
NEW:	0	0	33,000	4,500	33,000	4,500
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	0	0	33,000	4,500	33,000	4,500
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. MC Military Constr Subcomm						
NEW:	8,169,406	2,279,000	10,123,600	2,533,174	1,954,194	254,174
PRIOR:		4,087,000		5,281,520		1,194,520
TOTAL:	8,169,406	6,366,000	10,123,600	7,814,694	1,954,194	1,448,694

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Transportation Subcomm						
TRANSPORTATION Ground transportation Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration Federal-aid highways (trust fund) 20 8102 0 7 401						
NEW:	14,838,423	2,063,000	15,211,096	2,305,000	372,673	242,000
PRIOR:		10,587,000		11,495,000		908,000
TOTAL:	14,838,423	12,650,000	15,211,096	13,800,000	372,673	1,150,000
Other Independent Agencies Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Interest payments 46 0300 0 1 401						
NEW:	46,176	46,176	51,664	51,664	5,488	5,488
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	46,176	46,176	51,664	51,664	5,488	5,488
Department of Transportation National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Operations and research 69 0650 0 1 401						
NEW:	57,752	37,576	57,757	38,606	5	1,030
PRIOR:		26,917		28,064		1,147
TOTAL:	57,752	64,493	57,757	66,670	5	2,177
Motor Carrier Safety, NHTSA 69 0654 0 1 401						
NEW:	0	0	13,639	12,357	13,639	12,357
PRIOR:		0		1,282		1,282
TOTAL:	0	0	13,639	13,639	13,639	13,639

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Transportation Subcomm	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1 BA	COL1 OUTLAYS
Federal Railroad Administration						
Railroad safety						
69 0702 0 1 401						
NEW:	25,921	19,405	27,267	20,450	1,346	1,045
PRIOR:		7,241		11,404		4,163
TOTAL:	25,921	26,646	27,267	31,854	1,346	5,208
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration						
Trust fund share of operations and research						
69 8016 0 7 401						
NEW:	23,422	11,669	30,455	13,323	7,032	1,654
PRIOR:		9,000		8,242		-758
TOTAL:	23,423	20,669	30,455	21,565	7,032	896
Motor carrier safety grants						
69 8067 0 7 401						
NEW:	0	0	14,000	12,600	14,000	12,600
PRIOR:		0		1,400		1,400
TOTAL:	0	0	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000
Urban Mass Transportation Administration						
Formula capital grants						
69 8099 0 7 401						
NEW:	0	0	1,100,000	47,000	1,100,000	47,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	0	0	1,100,000	47,000	1,100,000	47,000
Air transportation						
Federal Aviation Administration						
Trust fund share of FAA operations						
69 8104 0 7 402						
NEW:	1,110,000	976,800	2,043,471	1,798,254	933,471	821,454
PRIOR:		0		88,800		88,800
TOTAL:	1,110,000	976,800	2,043,471	1,887,054	933,471	910,254
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and airway trust fund)						
69 8106 0 7 402						
NEW:	987,000	184,075	1,017,000	202,383	30,000	18,308
PRIOR:		613,000		669,950		56,950
TOTAL:	987,000	797,075	1,017,000	872,333	30,000	75,258
Water transportation						
Coast Guard						
Operating expenses						
69 0201 0 1 403						
NEW:	1,735,573	1,410,337	1,767,101	1,440,745	31,528	30,408
PRIOR:		257,392		275,287		17,895
TOTAL:	1,735,573	1,667,729	1,767,101	1,716,032	31,528	48,303
Retired pay - Coast Guard						
69 0241 0 1 403						
NEW:	330,800	299,043	340,500	306,727	9,700	7,684
PRIOR:		11,629		31,757		20,128
TOTAL:	330,800	310,672	340,500	338,484	9,700	27,812
Reserve training						
69 0242 0 1 403						
NEW:	58,392	50,508	61,502	53,261	3,110	2,753
PRIOR:		7,347		7,852		505
TOTAL:	58,392	57,855	61,502	61,113	3,110	3,258
Research, development, test, and evaluation						
69 0243 0 1 403						
NEW:	22,865	7,593	23,000	7,728	135	135
PRIOR:		14,565		15,198		633
TOTAL:	22,865	22,158	23,000	22,926	135	768
Boat safety						
69 8149 0 7 403						
NEW:	13,625	13,625	28,625	28,625	15,000	15,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	13,625	13,625	28,625	28,625	15,000	15,000
Other Independent Agencies						
Panama Canal Commission						
Operations and facilities						
95 5190 0 2 403						
NEW:	429,846	378,922	446,784	389,149	16,938	10,227
PRIOR:		74,098		57,010		-17,088
TOTAL:	429,846	453,020	446,784	446,159	16,938	-6,861

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R.)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM,FUNC,SFUN,TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Transportation Subcomm	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Other transportation Department of Transportation Office of the Secretary Salaries and expenses 69 0102 0 1 407						
NEW:	50,000	45,800	50,695	46,437	695	637
PRIOR:		3,032		4,200		1,168
TOTAL:	50,000	48,832	50,695	50,637	695	1,805
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. TR Transportation Subcomm						
NEW:	19,729,796	5,544,529	22,284,556	6,774,309	2,554,760	1,229,780
PRIOR:		11,611,221		12,695,446		1,084,225
TOTAL:	19,729,796	17,155,750	22,284,556	19,469,755	2,554,760	2,314,005

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Treas-Postal Serv Subcomm	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
NATIONAL DEFENSE Defense-related activities General Services Administration Federal Property Resources Activities Operating expenses, federal property resources service (Defe 47 0533 0 1 054						
NEW:	27,864	20,029	29,334	25,989	1,470	5,960
PRIOR:		7,546		3,150		-4,396
TOTAL:	27,864	27,575	29,334	29,139	1,470	1,564
EDUCATION, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT, AND SOCIAL SERVICES Other labor services Other Independent Agencies Committee for Purchase from the Blind and other Severely Handicapped Salaries and expenses 95 2000 0 1 505						
NEW:	710	581	730	581	20	0
PRIOR:		128		129		1
TOTAL:	710	709	730	710	20	1
HEALTH Health care services Office of Personnel Management Office of Personnel Management Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits 24 0206 0 1 551						
NEW:	1,341,553	1,198,070	1,606,165	1,447,509	264,612	249,439
PRIOR:		275,707		180,078		-95,629
TOTAL:	1,341,553	1,473,777	1,606,165	1,627,587	264,612	153,810
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE Federal law enforcement activities Department of the Treasury United States Customs Service Operation and maintenance, air interdiction program 20 0604 0 1 751						
NEW:	44,425	11,106	60,425	15,106	16,000	4,000
PRIOR:		20,000		21,106		1,106
TOTAL:	44,425	31,106	60,425	36,212	16,000	5,106
Federal litigative and judicial activities Legislative Branch United States Tax Court Salaries and expenses 23 0100 0 1 752						
NEW:	22,344	20,624	24,556	22,665	2,212	2,041
PRIOR:		1,185		1,720		535
TOTAL:	22,344	21,809	24,556	24,385	2,212	2,576
GENERAL GOVERNMENT Executive direction and management Executive Office of the President Office of Management and Budget Salaries and expenses 11 0300 0 1 802						
NEW:	38,500	34,226	40,041	35,775	1,541	1,549
PRIOR:		4,115		4,274		159
TOTAL:	38,500	38,341	40,041	40,049	1,541	1,708
National Security Council Salaries and expenses 11 2000 0 1 802						
NEW:	4,605	3,601	4,627	3,618	22	17
PRIOR:		980		1,004		24
TOTAL:	4,605	4,581	4,627	4,622	22	41

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Treas-Postal Serv Subcomm						
General Services Administration						
General Activities						
Allowances and office staff for former Presidents						
47 0105 0 1 802						
NEW:	1,151	1,053	1,208	1,107	57	54
PRIOR:		97		98		1
TOTAL:	1,151	1,150	1,208	1,205	57	55
Central fiscal operations						
Department of the Treasury						
Office of the Secretary						
Salaries and expenses						
20 0101 0 1 803						
NEW:	55,505	46,660	76,716	64,595	21,211	17,935
PRIOR:		10,443		8,845		-1,598
TOTAL:	55,505	57,103	76,716	73,440	21,211	16,337
Internal Revenue Service						
Processing tax returns						
20 0912 0 1 803						
NEW:	981,676	736,062	998,241	748,681	16,565	12,619
PRIOR:		189,441		208,281		18,840
TOTAL:	981,676	925,503	998,241	956,962	16,565	31,459
Examinations and appeals						
20 0913 0 1 803						
NEW:	1,355,547	1,274,118	1,375,302	1,292,784	19,755	18,666
PRIOR:		77,281		81,429		4,148
TOTAL:	1,355,547	1,351,399	1,375,302	1,374,213	19,755	22,814
Financial Management Service						
Salaries and expenses						
20 1801 0 1 803						
NEW:	241,622	218,022	248,121	223,309	6,499	5,227
PRIOR:		24,337		23,799		-538
TOTAL:	241,622	242,359	248,121	247,108	6,499	4,745
United States Customs Service						
Customs forfeiture fund						
20 5693 0 2 803						
NEW:	6,000	6,000	8,000	8,000	2,000	2,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	6,000	6,000	8,000	8,000	2,000	2,000
General property and records management						
General Services Administration						
Personal Property Activities						
Personal property, operating expenses						
47 0116 0 1 804						
NEW:	160,700	147,040	164,257	150,295	3,557	3,255
PRIOR:		13,338		13,660		322
TOTAL:	160,700	160,378	164,257	163,955	3,557	3,577
Central personnel management						
Office of Personnel Management						
Office of Personnel Management						
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund						
24 0200 0 1 805						
NEW:	15,616,833	15,616,833	15,962,808	15,962,808	345,975	345,975
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	15,616,833	15,616,833	15,962,808	15,962,808	345,975	345,975
Other Independent Agencies						
Merit Systems Protection Board						
Office of the Special Counsel						
41 0101 0 1 805						
NEW:	4,583	4,212	4,594	4,222	11	10
PRIOR:		357		371		14
TOTAL:	4,583	4,569	4,594	4,593	11	24
Other Independent Agencies						
Federal Labor Relations Authority						
Salaries and expenses						
54 0100 0 1 805						
NEW:	17,197	15,477	17,490	15,741	293	264
PRIOR:		1,677		1,720		43
TOTAL:	17,197	17,154	17,490	17,461	293	307
Other general government						
Department of the Treasury						
United States Customs Service						
Customs services at small airports						
20 5694 0 2 806						
NEW:	42	42	75	0	33	-42
PRIOR:		0		75		75
TOTAL:	42	42	75	75	33	33
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. TY Treas-Postal Serv Subcomm						
NEW:	19,920,857	19,353,756	20,622,690	20,022,785	701,833	669,029
PRIOR:		626,632		549,739		-76,893
TOTAL:	19,920,857	19,980,388	20,622,690	20,572,524	701,833	592,136

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

SENATE APPROPRIATION COMMITTEE TO	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE COL2 - COL1	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS
NEW:	674,963,440	508,817,869	752,644,198	566,050,677	77,680,758	57,232,808
PRIOR:		122,522,285		120,377,414		-2,144,871
TOTAL:	674,963,440	631,340,154	752,644,198	686,428,091	77,680,758	55,087,937

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Unassigned to Committee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE COL2 - COL1	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
Foreign economic and financial assistance
Department of Transportation
Offsetting Receipts
Advances & Deposits, Dept. of Transportation
69 9990 8 7 151

NEW:	-8,771	-8,771	-8,000	-8,000	771	771
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-8,771	-8,771	-8,000	-8,000	771	771

Conduct of foreign affairs
Funds Appropriated to the President
Offsetting Receipts
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement Fund
11 9990 8 7 153

NEW:	-41,864	-41,864	-35,562	-35,562	6,302	6,302
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-41,864	-41,864	-35,562	-35,562	6,302	6,302

Department of State
Offsetting Receipts
International center federal payment
19 9990 8 1 153

NEW:	-4,420	-4,420	-945	-945	3,475	3,475
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-4,420	-4,420	-945	-945	3,475	3,475

Payment to Foreign Service Retirement Fund
19 9990 8 7 153

NEW:	-342,137	-342,137	-251,774	-251,774	90,363	90,363
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-342,137	-342,137	-251,774	-251,774	90,363	90,363

International financial programs
Funds Appropriated to the President
Military Sales Programs
Foreign Military Sales Trust Fund (Receipts)
11 9990 8 7 155

NEW:	-12,100,000	-12,100,000	-12,000,000	-12,000,000	100,000	100,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-12,100,000	-12,100,000	-12,000,000	-12,000,000	100,000	100,000

ENERGY
Energy supply
Department of Energy
Offsetting Receipts
Sale of minerals and mineral products
89 9990 8 1 271

NEW:	-1,156,139	-1,156,139	-1,142,209	-1,142,209	13,930	13,930
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-1,156,139	-1,156,139	-1,142,209	-1,142,209	13,930	13,930

Energy-Advances for Cooperative Work
89 9990 8 7 271

NEW:	-133,171	-133,171	-120,948	-120,948	12,223	12,223
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-133,171	-133,171	-120,948	-120,948	12,223	12,223

Nuclear waste disposal fund, Energy
89 9992 8 1 271

NEW:	-1,549,400	-1,549,400	-375,770	-375,770	1,173,630	1,173,630
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-1,549,400	-1,549,400	-375,770	-375,770	1,173,630	1,173,630

Alaska Power Administration
89 9994 8 1 271

NEW:	-7,674	-7,674	-5,975	-5,975	1,699	1,699
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-7,674	-7,674	-5,975	-5,975	1,699	1,699

Falcon Dam
89 9999 8 1 271

NEW:	-39	-39	-32	-32	7	7
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-39	-39	-32	-32	7	7

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Unassigned to Committee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE COL2 - COL1	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS
MATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT						
Conservation and land management						
Department of the Interior						
Department of the Interior						
Interior Timber						
14 9992 8 1 302						
NEW:	-138,262	-138,262	-37,183	-37,183	101,079	101,079
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-138,262	-138,262	-37,183	-37,183	101,079	101,079
Department of Defense--Civil						
Forest and Wildlife Conservation, Military Reservations						
Reserve Account, Forest Products Program, Army						
21 9990 8 2 302						
NEW:	-1,393	-1,393	-610	-610	783	783
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-1,393	-1,393	-610	-610	783	783
Pollution control and abatement						
Environmental Protection Agency						
Offsetting Receipts						
Hazardous substance/Pollution fund						
68 9990 8 7 304						
NEW:	-44,000	-44,000	0	0	44,000	44,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-44,000	-44,000	0	0	44,000	44,000
TRANSPORTATION						
Ground transportation						
Department of Transportation						
Offsetting Receipts						
Offsetting receipts						
69 9990 8 7 401						
NEW:	-884	-884	-643	-643	241	241
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-884	-884	-643	-643	241	241
COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT						
Area and regional development						
Other Independent Agencies						
Appalachian Regional Commission						
Appalachian Regional Comm.						
46 9990 8 7 452						
NEW:	-1,850	-1,850	0	0	1,850	1,850
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-1,850	-1,850	0	0	1,850	1,850
Appalachian Regional Commission						
46 9991 8 7 452						
MEDICARE						
Medicare						
Department of Health and Human Services						
Department of Health and Human Services						
Offsetting Receipts						
20 9990 8 7 572						
NEW:	-19,263,000	-19,263,000	-19,249,000	-19,249,000	14,000	14,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-19,263,000	-19,263,000	-19,249,000	-19,249,000	14,000	14,000
INCOME SECURITY						
General retirement and disability insurance (excluding social security)						
Department of Labor						
Offsetting Receipts						
Offsetting receipt, advances to UI and other trust funds						
20 9990 8 7 601						
NEW:	-395,000	-395,000	-116,000	-116,000	279,000	279,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-395,000	-395,000	-116,000	-116,000	279,000	279,000
Department of the Treasury						
Offsetting Receipts						
Interest Payments on advances to Railroad Retirement						
20 9995 8 7 601						
NEW:	-222,000	-222,000	-199,000	-199,000	23,000	23,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-222,000	-222,000	-199,000	-199,000	23,000	23,000
Unemployment compensation						
Department of Labor						
Offsetting Receipts						
Repayments of loans, extended unemployment comp.						
16 9990 8 1 603						
NEW:	-4,870,000	-4,870,000	-4,650,000	-4,650,000	220,000	220,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-4,870,000	-4,870,000	-4,650,000	-4,650,000	220,000	220,000
Unemployment trust fund, repayable advances						
20 9990 8 7 603						
NEW:	-1,512,000	-1,512,000	-327,000	-327,000	1,185,000	1,185,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-1,512,000	-1,512,000	-327,000	-327,000	1,185,000	1,185,000

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Unassigned to Committee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Other Independent Agencies						
Railroad Retirement Board						
Offsetting Receipts						
60 9990 8 7 603						
NEW:	-93,900	-93,900	-70,000	-70,000	23,900	23,900
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-93,900	-93,900	-70,000	-70,000	23,900	23,900
SOCIAL SECURITY						
SOCIAL SECURITY						
Department of Health and Human Services						
Social Security Administration						
Interest payments to DI						
75 9993 8 7 650						
NEW:	-364,000	-364,000	-166,000	-166,000	198,000	198,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-364,000	-364,000	-166,000	-166,000	198,000	198,000
Interest payments to HI						
75 9994 8 7 650						
NEW:	-1,207,000	-1,207,000	-797,000	-797,000	410,000	410,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-1,207,000	-1,207,000	-797,000	-797,000	410,000	410,000
VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES						
Income security for veterans						
Veterans Administration						
Offsetting Receipts						
NSLI Fund, Payments from General and Special Funds						
36 9992 8 7 701						
NEW:	-1,775	-1,775	-1,739	-1,739	36	36
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-1,775	-1,775	-1,739	-1,739	36	36
Veterans education, training, and rehabilitation						
Deductions from Military Pay						
36 9991 8 7 702						
NEW:	-167,000	-167,000	-101,800	-101,800	65,200	65,200
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-167,000	-167,000	-101,800	-101,800	65,200	65,200
GENERAL GOVERNMENT						
Central fiscal operations						
Department of the Treasury						
Offsetting Receipts						
Administrative Expenses of the SS Act						
20 9990 8 1 803						
NEW:	-250,000	-250,000	-230,000	-230,000	20,000	20,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-250,000	-250,000	-230,000	-230,000	20,000	20,000
Surplus Income, Coinage Profit Fund and Mint						
20 9991 8 1 803						
NEW:	-153,714	-153,714	-53,752	-53,752	99,962	99,962
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-153,714	-153,714	-53,752	-53,752	99,962	99,962
General property and records management						
General Services Administration						
General Services Administration						
Offsetting Receipts						
47 9990 8 1 804						
NEW:	-112,000	-112,000	-88,000	-88,000	24,000	24,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-112,000	-112,000	-88,000	-88,000	24,000	24,000
Central personnel management						
Office of Personnel Management						
Office of Personnel Management						
Offsetting receipt, payment to Civil Service retirement						
24 9990 8 7 805						
NEW:	-4,407,833	-4,407,833	-4,344,808	-4,344,808	63,025	63,025
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-4,407,833	-4,407,833	-4,344,808	-4,344,808	63,025	63,025
Deductions for offsetting receipts						
Department of the Treasury						
Offsetting Receipts						
Intrabudgetary recoveries from salary reductions						
20 9990 8 1 809						
NEW:	-400	-400	0	0	400	400
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-400	-400	0	0	400	400
GENERAL PURPOSE FISCAL ASSISTANCE						
General revenue sharing						
Payment to general revenue sharing trust fund						
20 9990 8 7 851						
NEW:	-4,566,700	-4,566,700	0	0	4,566,700	4,566,700
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-4,566,700	-4,566,700	0	0	4,566,700	4,566,700

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Unassigned to Committee						
Other general purpose fiscal assistance						
Other Independent Agencies						
District of Columbia						
Subfunction 852 receipts						
20 9990 8 1 852						
NEW:	-107,002	-107,002	-36,314	-36,314	70,688	70,688
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-107,002	-107,002	-36,314	-36,314	70,688	70,688
NET INTEREST						
Other interest						
Legislative Branch						
Library of Congress						
Interest on investments in public debt securities						
03 9990 8 1 908						
NEW:	-5,012	-5,012	-5,008	-5,008	4	4
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-5,012	-5,012	-5,008	-5,008	4	4
Department of Commerce						
Offsetting Receipts						
Subfunction 908 receipts						
13 9990 8 1 908						
NEW:	-5,959	-5,959	-1,160	-1,160	4,799	4,799
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-5,959	-5,959	-1,160	-1,160	4,799	4,799
Department of the Interior						
Offsetting Receipts						
Interest, tribal funds						
14 9990 8 7 908						
NEW:	-74,620	-74,620	-71,320	-71,320	3,300	3,300
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-74,620	-74,620	-71,320	-71,320	3,300	3,300
Department of the Treasury						
Department of the Treasury						
Interest, Upper Colo. River Storage Project						
14 9994 8 1 908						
NEW:	-16,745	-16,745	-16,590	-16,590	155	155
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-16,745	-16,745	-16,590	-16,590	155	155
Offsetting Receipts						
Intragovernmental interest						
20 9992 8 1 908						
NEW:	-4,577,000	-4,577,000	-4,525,000	-4,525,000	52,000	52,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-4,577,000	-4,577,000	-4,525,000	-4,525,000	52,000	52,000
Interest on advances to SBA						
73 9997 8 1 908						
NEW:	-370,000	-370,000	-175,000	-175,000	195,000	195,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-370,000	-370,000	-175,000	-175,000	195,000	195,000
Other Treasury Department						
Interest on loans to individuals and private organizations						
75 9990 8 1 908						
NEW:	-33,803	-33,803	-30,073	-30,073	3,730	3,730
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-33,803	-33,803	-30,073	-30,073	3,730	3,730
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. XX	Unassigned to Committee					
NEW:	-58,308,317	-58,308,317	-49,234,215	-49,234,215	9,074,102	9,074,102
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-58,308,317	-58,308,317	-49,234,215	-49,234,215	9,074,102	9,074,102

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
ENERGY						
Energy supply						
Federal Financing Bank Activities						
Rural electrification and telephone revolving fund						
20 4230 0 3 271						
NEW:	382,000	382,000	474,000	474,000	92,000	92,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	382,000	382,000	474,000	474,000	92,000	92,000
NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT						
Water resources						
Department of Agriculture						
Soil Conservation Service						
Miscellaneous contributed funds (Water resources)						
12 8210 0 7 301						
NEW:	600	201	621	208	21	7
PRIOR:		3,625		399		-3,226
TOTAL:	600	3,826	621	607	21	-3,219

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and						
Conservation and land management						
Forest Service						
Operations and maintenance of quarters						
12 5219 0 2 302						
NEW:	5,300	4,240	5,700	4,560	400	320
PRIOR:		0		1,060		1,060
TOTAL:	5,300	4,240	5,700	5,620	400	1,380
AGRICULTURE						
Farm income stabilization						
Farmers Home Administration						
Agricultural credit insurance fund						
12 4140 0 3 351						
NEW:	1,925,000	2,350,000	2,357,000	1,196,000	432,000	-1,154,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	1,925,000	2,350,000	2,357,000	1,196,000	432,000	-1,154,000
Agricultural research and services						
Food Safety and Inspection Service						
Expenses and refunds, inspection and grading of farm product						
12 8137 0 7 352						
NEW:	848	778	884	811	36	33
PRIOR:		70		70		0
TOTAL:	848	848	884	881	36	33
Agricultural Research Service						
Miscellaneous contributed funds						
12 8214 0 7 352						
NEW:	2,000	1,132	2,084	1,180	84	48
PRIOR:		868		868		0
TOTAL:	2,000	2,000	2,084	2,048	84	48
Statistical Reporting Service						
Miscellaneous contributed funds						
12 8218 0 7 352						
NEW:	275	110	288	115	13	5
PRIOR:		165		165		0
TOTAL:	275	275	288	280	13	5
Economic Research Service						
Miscellaneous contributed funds						
12 8227 0 7 352						
NEW:	54	54	57	57	3	3
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	54	54	57	57	3	3
Office of International Cooperation and Development						
Miscellaneous contributed funds						
12 8232 0 7 352						
NEW:	7,900	5,929	8,256	6,200	356	271
PRIOR:		1,971		1,971		0
TOTAL:	7,900	7,900	8,256	8,171	356	271
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service						
Miscellaneous trust funds						
12 9971 0 7 352						
NEW:	2,878	1,912	2,996	1,989	118	77
PRIOR:		617		966		349
TOTAL:	2,878	2,529	2,996	2,955	118	426
Agricultural Marketing Service						
Miscellaneous trust funds						
12 9972 0 7 352						
NEW:	76,216	54,835	79,387	57,079	3,171	2,244
PRIOR:		20,547		21,381		834
TOTAL:	76,216	75,382	79,387	78,460	3,171	3,078
COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT						
Area and regional development						
Farmers Home Administration						
Rural development insurance fund						
12 4155 0 3 452						
NEW:	560,005	731,000	612,098	648,000	52,093	-83,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	560,005	731,000	612,098	648,000	52,093	-83,000
Rural Electrification Administration						
Rural telephone bank						
12 4231 0 3 452						
NEW:	127,962	88,712	132,204	92,554	4,242	3,842
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	127,962	88,712	132,204	92,554	4,242	3,842
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. 64 Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee						
NEW:	3,091,038	3,620,903	3,675,575	2,482,753	584,537	-1,138,150
PRIOR:		27,863		26,880		-983
TOTAL:	3,091,038	3,648,766	3,675,575	2,509,633	584,537	-1,139,133

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Senate Armed Services Committee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	COL2 - COL1
NATIONAL DEFENSE						
Department of Defense--Military						
Department of Defense--Military						
Trust Funds						
Department of the Navy trust funds						
17 9972 0 7 051						
NEW:	24,420	24,098	25,500	25,500	1,080	1,402
PRIOR:		142		0		-142
TOTAL:	24,420	24,240	25,500	25,500	1,080	1,260
Department of Defense--Military						
Subfunction 051 receipts						
17 9990 8 1 051						
NEW:	-93,600	-93,600	-87,800	-87,800	5,800	5,800
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-93,600	-93,600	-87,800	-87,800	5,800	5,800
Interest on Loans to States						
21 9994 8 1 051						
NEW:	-259,600	-259,600	-214,100	-214,100	45,500	45,500
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-259,600	-259,600	-214,100	-214,100	45,500	45,500
Trust Funds						
Department of the Air Force general gift fund						
57 8928 0 7 051						
NEW:	60	0	100	100	40	100
PRIOR:		50		0		-50
TOTAL:	60	50	100	100	40	50
Department of Defense--Military						
Interest on Loans to Defense Contractors						
57 9993 8 1 051						
NEW:	-235,550	-235,550	-213,000	-213,000	22,550	22,550
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	-235,550	-235,550	-213,000	-213,000	22,550	22,550
Family Housing						
Homeowners assistance fund, Defense						
97 4090 0 3 051						
NEW:	600	0	750	600	150	600
PRIOR:		1,700		0		-1,700
TOTAL:	600	1,700	750	600	150	-1,100
Defense-related activities						
Department of Defense--Civil						
Military Retirement						
Payment to military retirement fund						
97 0040 0 1 054						
NEW:	9,551,300	9,551,300	10,054,100	10,054,100	502,800	502,800
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	9,551,300	9,551,300	10,054,100	10,054,100	502,800	502,800
INCOME SECURITY						
Federal employee retirement and disability						
Military retirement fund						
97 8097 0 7 602						
NEW:	27,693,300	15,834,300	30,546,100	17,653,100	2,852,800	1,818,800
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	27,693,300	15,834,300	30,546,100	17,653,100	2,852,800	1,818,800
VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES						
Veterans education, training, and rehabilitation						
Education Benefits						
Education benefits fund						
97 8098 0 7 702						
NEW:	30,000	0	162,000	0	132,000	0
PRIOR:		0		3,000		3,000
TOTAL:	30,000	0	162,000	3,000	132,000	3,000
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. 66 Senate Armed Services Committee						
NEW:	36,710,930	24,820,948	40,273,650	27,218,500	3,562,720	2,397,552
PRIOR:		1,892		3,000		1,108
TOTAL:	36,710,930	24,822,840	40,273,650	27,221,500	3,562,720	2,398,660

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Senate Banking, Housing and Urban	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	COL2 - COL1
COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT						
Other advancement of commerce						
Department of Housing and Urban Development						
Housing Programs						
Interstate land sales						
86 5270 0 2 376						
NEW:	1,200	1,200	1,246	1,246	46	46
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	1,200	1,200	1,246	1,246	46	46

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R.)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	OUTLAYS
Senate Banking, Housing and Urban						
Manufactured home inspection and monitoring 86 5271 0 2 376						
NEW:	5,952	3,831	6,220	4,006	268	175
PRIOR:		2,121		2,121		0
TOTAL:	5,952	5,952	6,220	6,127	268	175
COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT						
Community development Department of the Treasury Federal Financing Bank Activities Community development grants, FFB (loan guarantee origination) 20 0162 0 1 451						
NEW:	113,000	37,000	116,000	28,000	3,000	-9,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	113,000	37,000	116,000	28,000	3,000	-9,000
Other Independent Agencies						
Federal Emergency Management Agency National insurance development fund 58 4235 0 3 451						
NEW:	10,688	0	18,255	0	7,567	0
PRIOR:		11,086		16,738		5,652
TOTAL:	10,688	11,086	18,255	16,738	7,567	5,652
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. 68 Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee						
NEW:	130,840	42,031	141,721	33,252	10,881	-8,779
PRIOR:		13,207		18,859		5,652
TOTAL:	130,840	55,238	141,721	52,111	10,881	-3,127

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	OUTLAYS
Senate Commerce, Science, and Tran						
COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT Other advancement of commerce Department of Commerce Economic and Statistical Analysis Information products and services 13 8546 0 7 376						
NEW:	31,000	27,515	32,364	28,739	1,364	1,224
PRIOR:		3,485		3,485		0
TOTAL:	31,000	31,000	32,364	32,224	1,364	1,224
GENERAL PURPOSE FISCAL ASSISTANCE Other general purpose fiscal assistance Department of Defense--Civil Corps of Engineers--Civil Permanent appropriations (Other general purpose fiscal assis) 96 9921 0 2 852						
NEW:	5,900	0	6,160	0	260	0
PRIOR:		5,700		5,900		200
TOTAL:	5,900	5,700	6,160	5,900	260	200
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. 72 Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee						
NEW:	36,900	27,515	38,524	28,739	1,624	1,224
PRIOR:		9,185		9,385		200
TOTAL:	36,900	36,700	38,524	38,124	1,624	1,424

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	OUTLAYS
Senate Energy and Natural Resource						
NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT Water resources Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation Reclamation trust funds 14 8070 0 7 301						
NEW:	6,880	5,944	16,041	13,859	9,161	7,915
PRIOR:		2,093		2,986		893
TOTAL:	6,880	8,037	16,041	16,845	9,161	8,808
Recreational resources National Park Service Miscellaneous permanent appropriations 14 9924 0 2 303						
NEW:	1,020	732	1,035	743	15	11
PRIOR:		570		288		-282
TOTAL:	1,020	1,302	1,035	1,031	15	-271
Miscellaneous trust funds 14 9972 0 7 303						
NEW:	16,059	11,165	16,761	11,649	702	424
PRIOR:		2,100		3,541		1,441
TOTAL:	16,059	13,265	16,761	15,190	702	1,925

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Senate Energy and Natural Resource	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
GENERAL PURPOSE FISCAL ASSISTANCE						
Other general purpose fiscal assistance						
Territorial and International Affairs						
Payments to the United States territories, fiscal assistance						
14 0418 0 1 852						
NEW:	62,910	62,910	65,678	65,678	2,768	2,768
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	62,910	62,910	65,678	65,678	2,768	2,768
Bureau of Reclamation						
Colorado River dam fund, Boulder Canyon project						
14 5656 0 2 852						
NEW:	2,100	2,100	31,767	24,293	29,667	22,193
PRIOR:		0		8,457		8,457
TOTAL:	2,100	2,100	31,767	32,750	29,667	30,650
Department of the Treasury						
United States Customs Service						
Miscellaneous permanent appropriations						
20 9922 0 2 852						
NEW:	80,527	76,259	84,005	79,553	3,478	3,294
PRIOR:		4,017		4,268		251
TOTAL:	80,527	80,276	84,005	83,821	3,478	3,545
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. 74 Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee						
NEW:	169,496	159,110	215,287	195,775	45,791	36,665
PRIOR:		8,780		19,540		10,760
TOTAL:	169,496	167,890	215,287	215,315	45,791	47,425

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Senate Environment and Public Work	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT						
Water resources						
Department of Defense--Civil						
Corps of Engineers--Civil						
Rivers and harbors contributed funds						
96 8862 0 7 301						
NEW:	52,000	19,815	291,000	160,344	239,000	140,529
PRIOR:		32,185		32,185		0
TOTAL:	52,000	52,000	291,000	192,529	239,000	140,529
Permanent appropriations (Water resources)						
96 9921 0 2 301						
NEW:	2,100	48	2,193	50	93	2
PRIOR:		2,252		2,052		-200
TOTAL:	2,100	2,300	2,193	2,102	93	-198
Recreational resources						
Department of the Interior						
United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
Operations and maintenance of quarters						
14 5047 0 2 303						
NEW:	20,915	18,824	21,084	18,976	169	152
PRIOR:		0		2,091		2,091
TOTAL:	20,915	18,824	21,084	21,067	169	2,243
Contributed funds						
14 8216 0 7 303						
NEW:	3,838	2,686	4,011	2,808	173	122
PRIOR:		734		1,152		418
TOTAL:	3,838	3,420	4,011	3,960	173	540
Department of Defense--Civil						
Forest and Wildlife Conservation, Military Reservations						
Wildlife conservation						
97 5095 0 2 303						
NEW:	1,650	1,500	1,675	1,523	25	23
PRIOR:		269		148		-121
TOTAL:	1,650	1,769	1,675	1,671	25	-98
COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT						
Community development						
Other Independent Agencies						
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation						
Gifts and donations						
42 8112 0 7 451						
NEW:	0	0	1	1	1	1
PRIOR:		119		0		-119
TOTAL:	0	119	1	1	1	-118
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. 76 Senate Environment and Public Works Committee						
NEW:	80,503	42,873	319,964	183,702	239,461	140,829
PRIOR:		35,559		37,628		2,069
TOTAL:	80,503	78,432	319,964	221,330	239,461	142,898

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR4OR) CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
(UNIFIED BUDGET) IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
P63 SORTED BY: SCOM,FUNC,SFUN,TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Senate Finance Committee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
MEDICARE						
Medicare Department of Health and Human Services Health Care Financing Administration Federal supplementary medical insurance trust fund 20 8004 0 7 572						
NEW:	24,384,000	14,722,076	25,258,000	25,711,000	874,000	10,988,924
PRIOR:		7,818,924		-662,000		-8,480,924
TOTAL:	24,384,000	22,541,000	25,258,000	25,049,000	874,000	2,508,000
INCOME SECURITY						
General retirement and disability insurance (excluding social security) Other Independent Agencies Railroad Retirement Board Railroad social security equivalent benefit account 60 8010 0 7 601						
NEW:	5,761,000	5,303,956	5,896,000	5,589,776	135,000	285,820
PRIOR:		293,000		153,044		-139,956
TOTAL:	5,761,000	5,596,956	5,896,000	5,742,820	135,000	145,864
Federal employee retirement and disability Legislative Branch United States Tax Court Tax Court judges survivors annuity fund 23 8115 0 7 602						
NEW:	251	31	261	30	10	-1
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	251	31	261	30	10	-1
Other income security Department of the Treasury Internal Revenue Service Payment where credit exceeds liability for tax 20 0906 0 1 609						
NEW:	1,116,000	1,116,000	1,322,000	1,322,000	206,000	206,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	1,116,000	1,116,000	1,322,000	1,322,000	206,000	206,000
GENERAL GOVERNMENT						
Central fiscal operations United States Customs Service Refunds, transfers and expenses, unclaimed, abandoned and so on 20 8789 0 7 803						
NEW:	7,322	7,322	7,988	7,988	666	666
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	7,322	7,322	7,988	7,988	666	666
Office of the Secretary Gifts and bequests 20 8790 0 7 803						
NEW:	1,000	1,000	2,000	2,000	1,000	1,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	1,000	1,000	2,000	2,000	1,000	1,000
NET INTEREST						
Interest on the public debt Interest on the Public Debt Interest on the public debt 20 0550 0 1 901						
NEW:	180,931,000	180,931,000	204,416,000	204,416,000	23,485,000	23,485,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	180,931,000	180,931,000	204,416,000	204,416,000	23,485,000	23,485,000
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. 78 Senate Finance Committee						
NEW:	212,200,573	202,081,385	236,902,249	237,048,794	24,701,676	34,967,409
PRIOR:		8,111,924		-508,956		-8,620,880
TOTAL:	212,200,573	210,193,309	236,902,249	236,539,838	24,701,676	26,346,529

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Senate Foreign Relations Committee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS						
Foreign economic and financial assistance Funds Appropriated to the President Peace Corps Peace Corps miscellaneous trust funds 11 9972 0 7 151						
NEW:	550	450	600	600	50	150
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	550	450	600	600	50	150

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Senate Foreign Relations Committee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	OUTLAYS
International financial programs						
Military Sales Programs						
Foreign military sales trust fund						
11 8242 0 7 155						
NEW:	12,834,000	1,515,000	12,978,000	1,586,000	144,000	71,000
PRIOR:		10,385,000		10,414,000		29,000
TOTAL:	12,834,000	11,900,000	12,978,000	12,000,000	144,000	100,000
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. 80 Senate Foreign Relations Committee						
NEW:	12,834,550	1,515,450	12,978,600	1,586,600	144,050	71,150
PRIOR:		10,385,000		10,414,000		29,000
TOTAL:	12,834,550	11,900,450	12,978,600	12,000,600	144,050	100,150

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Senate Governmental Affairs Committee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	OUTLAYS
COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT						
Postal Service						
Other Independent Agencies						
Postal Service						
Postal Service						
18 4020 0 3 372						
NEW:	1,402,824	0	1,787,389	212,591	384,565	212,591
PRIOR:		320,161		965,470		645,309
TOTAL:	1,402,824	320,161	1,787,389	1,178,061	384,565	857,900
INCOME SECURITY						
Federal employee retirement and disability						
Office of Personnel Management						
Office of Personnel Management						
Civil service retirement and disability fund						
24 8135 0 7 602						
NEW:	39,430,000	23,070,000	41,204,000	22,670,204	1,774,000	-379,796
PRIOR:		0		1,197,796		1,197,796
TOTAL:	39,430,000	23,070,000	41,204,000	23,868,000	1,774,000	818,000
GENERAL GOVERNMENT						
General property and records management						
Other Independent Agencies						
National Archives and Records Administration						
National archives gift fund						
88 8127 0 7 804						
NEW:	184	0	335	0	151	0
PRIOR:		370		430		60
TOTAL:	184	370	335	430	151	60
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. 82 Senate Governmental Affairs Committee						
NEW:	40,833,008	23,070,000	42,991,724	22,902,795	2,158,716	-167,205
PRIOR:		320,531		2,163,696		1,843,165
TOTAL:	40,833,008	23,390,531	42,991,724	25,066,491	2,158,716	1,675,960

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Senate Judiciary Committee	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	OUTLAYS
INCOME SECURITY						
Federal employee retirement and disability						
The Judiciary						
Judiciary Trust Funds						
Judicial survivors' annuities fund						
10 8110 0 7 602						
NEW:	14,306	3,801	15,681	3,956	1,375	155
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	14,306	3,801	15,681	3,956	1,375	155
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE						
Criminal justice assistance						
Department of Justice						
Office of Justice Programs						
Crime victims fund						
15 5041 0 2 754						
NEW:	70,000	15,000	100,000	60,000	30,000	45,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	70,000	15,000	100,000	60,000	30,000	45,000
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. 86 Senate Judiciary Committee						
NEW:	84,306	18,801	115,681	63,956	31,375	45,155
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	84,306	18,801	115,681	63,956	31,375	45,155

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MAR40R)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM, FUNC, SFUN, TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Senate Labor and Human Resources C		1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
		BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	COL1
INCOME SECURITY							
General retirement and disability insurance (excluding social Security Administration)							
Department of Labor							
Employment Standards Administration							
Special workers' compensation expenses							
16 9971 0 7 601							
	NEW:	58,000	24,363	68,000	29,363	10,000	5,000
	PRIOR:		28,637		33,637		5,000
	TOTAL:	58,000	53,000	68,000	63,000	10,000	10,000
NET INTEREST							
Other interest							
Department of Education							
Department of Education							
Other interest to promote education of the blind							
91 9990 8 7 908							
	NEW:	-10	-10	0	0	10	10
	PRIOR:		0		0		0
	TOTAL:	-10	-10	0	0	10	10
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. 87	Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee						
	NEW:	57,990	24,353	68,000	29,363	10,010	5,010
	PRIOR:		28,637		33,637		5,000
	TOTAL:	57,990	52,990	68,000	63,000	10,010	10,010

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Senate Rules and Administration Co		1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
		BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	COL1
EDUCATION, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT, AND SOCIAL SERVICES							
Research and general education aids							
Legislative Branch							
Library of Congress							
Gift and trust fund accounts							
03 9971 0 7 503							
	NEW:	7,378	0	7,628	0	250	0
	PRIOR:		7,299		7,830		531
	TOTAL:	7,378	7,299	7,628	7,830	250	531
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. 88	Senate Rules and Administration Committee						
	NEW:	7,378	0	7,628	0	250	0
	PRIOR:		7,299		7,830		531
	TOTAL:	7,378	7,299	7,628	7,830	250	531

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

Senate Veterans Affairs Committee		1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
		BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	COL1
VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES							
Income security for veterans							
Veterans Administration							
Veterans Administration							
National service life insurance fund							
36 8132 0 7 701							
	NEW:	1,248,900	0	1,297,200	0	48,300	0
	PRIOR:		981,600		1,042,700		61,100
	TOTAL:	1,248,900	981,600	1,297,200	1,042,700	48,300	61,100
Other veterans benefits and services							
General post fund, national homes							
36 8180 0 7 705							
	NEW:	14,000	11,458	15,000	12,458	1,000	1,000
	PRIOR:		1,042		1,042		0
	TOTAL:	14,000	12,500	15,000	13,500	1,000	1,000
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. 90	Senate Veterans Affairs Committee						
	NEW:	1,262,900	11,458	1,312,200	12,458	49,300	1,000
	PRIOR:		982,642		1,043,742		61,100
	TOTAL:	1,262,900	994,100	1,312,200	1,056,200	49,300	62,100

CBO/BUDGET ANALYSIS DIV(MARHOR)
(UNIFIED BUDGET)
P63

CBO EST. OF PRES. WHERE BUDGET YEAR DATA
IS GREATER THAN CURRENT YEAR DATA
SORTED BY: SCOM,FUNC,SFUN,TID
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Temporary Select Committee on Indian Affairs						
COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT						
Area and regional development						
Department of the Interior						
Bureau of Indian Affairs						
Miscellaneous permanent appropriations (Area and regional de						
14 9925 0 2 452						
NEW:	39,633	19,817	40,195	20,098	562	281
PRIOR:		22,050		19,785		-2,265
TOTAL:	39,633	41,867	40,195	39,883	562	-1,984
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. 92 Temporary Select Committee on Indian Affairs						
NEW:	39,633	19,817	40,195	20,098	562	281
PRIOR:		22,050		19,785		-2,265
TOTAL:	39,633	41,867	40,195	39,883	562	-1,984

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
Senate Small Business Committee						
COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT						
Other advancement of commerce						
Department of the Treasury						
Federal Financing Bank Activities						
Section 503 Loan Guarantees, FFB						
20 9933 0 3 376						
NEW:	291,000	285,000	304,000	-640,000	13,000	-925,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	291,000	285,000	304,000	-640,000	13,000	-925,000
COMMITTEE TOTAL.. 94 Senate Small Business Committee						
NEW:	291,000	285,000	304,000	-640,000	13,000	-925,000
PRIOR:		0		0		0
TOTAL:	291,000	285,000	304,000	-640,000	13,000	-925,000

(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

UNIFIED BUDGET TOTAL	1985		1986		DIFFERENCE	
	BA	OUTLAYS	BA	OUTLAYS	COL2 - COL1	BA OUTLAYS
UNIFIED BUDGET TOTAL						
NEW:	924,486,168	706,249,196	1,042,794,981	807,983,247	118,308,813	101,734,051
PRIOR:		142,476,854		133,666,440		-8,810,414
TOTAL:	924,486,168	848,726,050	1,042,794,981	941,649,687	118,308,813	92,923,637

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield myself time off the resolution.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote on amendment No. 44 at 6:05 p.m. tonight without intervening debate, motion, appeal, point of order, or other action.

Having made their request, before the Chair rules, I indicates then to the distinguished minority leader if there be no further action on this measure tonight that I would like a short period of time for routine morning business, if there is some, say 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each; then, plan to come in at 9:30 in the morning.

As I understand, there is a special order for the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] in routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes; then, start on Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 at 10 a.m.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will not object. This request has been discussed with Senators on my side, several of them with whom I have personally discussed

it, and with whom the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. CHILES] and I have discussed. So I will not interpose the objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the majority leader? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. I also indicate to my colleagues that this will be the last roll-call vote of the day. I will ask following the vote and the motion to reconsider, and the motion to table, that we have a period for routine morning business not to exceed 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader ask unanimous consent that any Senator who wishes to do so may include in the RECORD prior to the vote a statement as if read?

Mr. DOLE. That is an excellent idea. I have a couple of those.

Mr. President, I make that unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the hour of 6:05 p.m. having arrived, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the

Senator from Kansas, Mr. DOLE. 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. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. EAST] is absent due to illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who wish to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 34 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Abdnor	Gramm	Packwood
Andrews	Grassley	Pressler
Armstrong	Hatch	Quayle
Boschwitz	Hatfield	Roth
Chafee	Hawkins	Rudman
Cochran	Hecht	Simpson
Cohen	Helms	Specter
D'Amato	Helms	Stafford
Danforth	Humphrey	Stevens
Denton	Kassebaum	Symms
Dole	Laxalt	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Tribble
Durenberger	Mattingly	Wallop
Evans	McClure	Warner
Garn	McConnell	Weicker
Goldwater	Murkowski	Wilson
Gorton	Nickles	

NAYS—49

Baucus	Glenn	Melcher
Bentsen	Gore	Metzenbaum
Biden	Harkin	Mitchell
Bingaman	Hart	Moynihan
Boren	Heflin	Nunn
Bradley	Hollings	Pell
Bumpers	Inouye	Proxmire
Burdick	Johnston	Pryor
Byrd	Kasten	Riegle
Chiles	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Cranston	Kerry	Sarbanes
DeConcini	Lautenberg	Sasser
Dixon	Leahy	Simon
Dodd	Levin	Stennis
Eagleton	Long	Zorinsky
Exon	Mathias	
Ford	Matsunaga	

NOT VOTING—1

East

So the amendment (No. 44) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

(The following occurred earlier:)

Mr. BYRD. Will the majority leader yield for a unanimous-consent request concerning another matter which I discussed with him?

Mr. DOLE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

DESIGNATION OF MAY 7, 1985, AS VIETNAM VETERANS RECOGNITION DAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution which I will introduce before the close of business today, which would designate May 7, 1985, as Vietnam Veterans Recognition Day remain at the desk until further disposition hopefully on tomorrow, and that it appear printed in the RECORD following the vote on the matter concerning which Mr. DOLE has now presented a request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the minority leader? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM VETERANS RECOGNITION DAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am introducing a resolution today which is long overdue and is a symbol of my concern that our Nation's Vietnam veterans be afforded the recognition they are due for their patriotic service.

Next Tuesday, May 7, 1985, marks the 10th anniversary of the official end of America's involvement in the conflict in Vietnam. Some 3.4 million American men and women served in the Vietnam theater during that long war—the longest conflict this Nation has been involved in since we gained our independence. More than 57,000 Americans lost their lives there, and an additional 2,400 Americans are still listed as missing in action in Southwest Asia. Some 300,000 were wounded and some 75,000 have incurred perma-

nent physical disabilities as a result of their service. Many more thousands still suffer psychological harm resulting from their experiences in Vietnam.

Regardless of the ultimate verdict of history about U.S. involvement in that war, the service that patriotic Americans performed is deserving of their country's recognition.

Mr. President, the Nation is now beginning to review in a more dispassionate and even-handed manner the history of our involvement in the Vietnam conflict. We are still learning the lessons of that conflict. For too long we have taken the painless road of avoiding that history. It is a healthy sign, I believe, that there has been a recent upsurge in commentary and analysis of our role in Vietnam. If we cannot examine our past, then we will be unable to chart our future with wisdom.

It is, then, appropriate that we now take steps to honor our veterans, and the memory of those who did not return from Vietnam. This resolution would designate next Tuesday, May 7, as "Vietnam Veterans Recognition Day." It is a modest measure, but an essential step in the healing process which is so important for our country.

The text of the joint resolution introduced by Mr. BYRD, for himself, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. EXON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. NUNN, and Mr. HOLLINGS, follows:

S.J. Res. 128

Whereas over 3 million American fighting men and women who served in the Vietnam theatre for over a decade acquitted themselves in the highest traditions of American service personnel;

Whereas more than 57,000 Americans lost their lives there, and an additional 2,400 Americans are still listed as missing in action in Southeast Asia.

Whereas thousands of Vietnam veterans still suffer physically and psychologically from the effects of the war, including many who are permanently disabled;

Whereas regardless of the ultimate verdict of history about United States involvement in that war, the service that patriotic Americans performed in the Vietnam theatre is deserving of continued and reemphasized grateful recognition;

Whereas the nation is now beginning to review in a more dispassionate and even-handed manner the history of our involvement in the Vietnam conflict;

Whereas for too long the nation failed to honor the service of and respond appropriately to the needs of Vietnam veterans and was instead anxious to place the Vietnam experience behind it;

Whereas May 7, 1985 marks the tenth anniversary of the official end of America's involvement in the conflict in Vietnam:

Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That May 7, 1985 is designated "Vietnam Veterans Recognition Day" and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such a day with appropriate activities.

(Conclusion of earlier proceedings.)

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for routine morning business not to extend beyond 15 minutes.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 41

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to send to you the annual report of the National Science Foundation for Fiscal Year 1984. This report describes research supported by the Foundation in the mathematical, physical, biological, social, behavioral, and information sciences; in engineering; and in education in those fields.

Achievements such as the ones described in this report are the basis for much of our Nation's strength—its economic growth, military security, and the overall well-being of our people.

We face challenges in science, engineering, and technology, but I am confident about our ability to meet those challenges. The National Science Foundation has been and will remain a key part of the national effort to keep vital our great capabilities in research and productivity and to stay ahead of world competition through innovation and new discoveries.

RONALD REAGAN,

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 30, 1985.

REPORT ON U.S. GOVERNMENT ACTIONS TO SECURE THE RETURN OF ANY SERVICEMEN STILL HELD CAPTIVE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 42

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Section 1525 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act of 1985, I am submitting the attached report detailing actions taken by the United States Government in pursuit of our national goal of returning any servicemen who may still be held captive in Southeast Asia; the fullest possible accounting of those still missing; and the repatriation of all recoverable remains of those who died serving our Nation.

In doing so, I would like to reemphasize my personal dedication to this great national effort and my confidence that the actions of those involved throughout the Executive branch of Government in the resolution of this issue reflect this same dedication. In this effort, there can be no partisan or parochial views or any special interests, but only the interest of the entire American people to see to it that all of us do our duty toward those who served this Nation so well in time of war and their families who look to us to help secure the answers they so rightfully seek and deserve.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 30, 1985.

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-980. A communication from the chairman of the National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education transmitting, pursuant to law, the ninth annual report of the Council on Bilingual Education in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-981. A communication from the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education transmitting, pursuant to law, the Council's 1984 annual report; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-982. A communication from the Executive Director of the Intergovernmental Advisory Council on Education transmitting, pursuant to law, the Council's 1984 annual report; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-983. A communication from the presiding officer of the Advisory Council on Education Statistics transmitting, pursuant to law, the Council's 1984 annual report; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-984. A communication from the chairman of the National Advisory Council on Continuing Education transmitting, pursuant to law, the Council's 1984 annual report; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-985. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Education transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1984 Department of Education annual report; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-986. A communication from the Under Secretary of Labor transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on experimental projects under the Older Americans Act; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-987. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Education transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1984 annual report of the Asbestos Hazards School Safety Task Force; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-988. A communication from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise eligibility for VA medical care; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

EC-989. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Overview and Perspectives on the Food Stamp Program"; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-990. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Examination of the Panama Canal Commission's Financial Statements for the Years Ended September 30, 1983 and 1982"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-991. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the Treasury transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing appropriations for the U.S. Mint for fiscal years 1986 and 1987; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-992. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the Treasury transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize printing the back side of U.S. currency by a method other than the intaglio process; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-993. A communication from the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on certain transactions involving exports to Mexico; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-994. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Saltonstall-Kennedy Fund Act to allow expenditure of funds for marine fishery resource programs; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-995. A communication from the Secretary General of the U.S. Olympic Committee transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1984 Olympic Committee financial statement; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-996. A communication from the Acting Deputy Associate Director of the Minerals Management Service transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on 33 proposed refunds of excess royalty payments to certain corporations; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-997. A communication from the Acting Deputy Associate Director of the Minerals Management Service transmitting,

pursuant to law, a report on five proposed refunds of excess royalty payments to certain corporations; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-998. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1984 report on Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing and Production; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-999. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to collect on loans under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Trade Act of 1974; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1000. A communication from the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to conform the Federal income tax treatment of rail industry pensions to that of private pensions; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1001. A communication from the Secretary of the Railroad Retirement Board transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the computer matching program for VA Compensation and Railroad Retirement and Survivor Benefit Records; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1002. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Office of Personnel Management Activities under the Civil Service Reform Act, fiscal year 1984; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1003. A communication from the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase compensation of attorneys providing representation under the Criminal Justice Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1004. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1005. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on three violations of law involving expenditure of funds in excess of those appropriated or in advance of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1006. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on three violations of law involving overobligation of appropriated funds; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1007. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on four violations of law involving the overobligation of appropriated funds; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1008. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend certain expiring authorizations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1009. A communication from the Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on activities under the Right to Financial Privacy Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1010. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve cost recovery for Federal Aviation Administration programs; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1011. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1984 Maritime Administration annual report; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1012. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction in the San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1013. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Personnel Management transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make permanent the method for converting established annual rates of pay for Federal employees into hourly, daily, and biweekly pay rates; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1014. A communication from the Acting Archivist of the United States transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit domestic dissemination of USIA records; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1015. A communication from the Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on applications for court orders to permit interception of wire or oral communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1016. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the Treasury transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Customs Service for fiscal years 1986 and 1987; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1017. A communication from the Secretary of Education transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on final funding priorities for handicapped special studies program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1018. A communication from the Secretary of Education transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on final regulations for certain education programs; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1031. A bill to provide for the continuous assessment of critical trends and alternative futures; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DANFORTH:

S. 1032. A bill to establish a commission to study amusement ride safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. PRESSLER):

S. 1033. A bill to amend the Emergency Veterans' Job Training Act of 1983 to establish a veterans' career development and training program; to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Veterans' Computerized Job Bank Program, to enhance readjustment appointments of veterans to po-

sitions of employment in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRESSLER:

S.J. Res. 126. Joint resolution to condemn Bulgarian brutality toward their Turkish minority; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DANFORTH (for himself, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. SIMON):

S.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution to grant the consent of Congress to certain additional powers conferred upon the bi-State development agency by the State of Missouri and Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. EXON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. NUNN, and Mr. HOLLINGS):

S.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to designate May 7, 1985 as "Vietnam Veterans Recognition Day"; ordered held at the desk.

By Mr. NUNN (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. BOREN):

S.J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to promote internal reconciliation within Nicaragua, on the basis of democratic principles, in furtherance of a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Central America; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. MOYNIHAN):

S. Res. 151. Resolution to express the sense of the Senate regarding the Bonn Economic Summit; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress regarding Americans missing in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1031. A bill to provide for the continuous assessment of critical trends and alternative futures; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

CRITICAL TRENDS ASSESSMENT ACT

● Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill that would get the Federal Government to do something it rarely does in depth—consider the future.

We often lurch from one crisis to another. Meanwhile, new problems bubble beneath the surface for years and we barely recognize them in our preoccupation with the present day's crisis. Then, suddenly, they burst forth, whether it's Social Security funding, energy supplies and prices, or trade imbalances.

For example, we thought for years that the Earth contained inexhaustible resources and could cope with whatever abuses we heaped on it and into it. We have since discovered the enormous quantity of toxic wastes oozing into our water supplies. We

learned about soil erosion and later about finite fossil fuel resources.

Our Nation's energy picture was wrenched first by lower supplies, then by higher prices. Demand eventually dropped and we were sent reeling by having to pay for power plants we no longer needed.

As baby boomers matured and entered the working world, school enrollment dropped and schools closed in their wake. Now, the baby boomers are having children of their own and we find a shortage of elementary school teachers that we could have anticipated but didn't.

One year we infused money into the Nation's railway system. Another year we debated ending our rail subsidy by shutting down the system.

And these four examples are only the tip of the iceberg.

Sometimes when we try to glimpse into the future we get more confused than when we started. Computer models in executive agencies often develop conclusions that are widely inconsistent with one another. Deregulation, understaffing and the Paperwork Reduction Act have taken their toll, reducing the quality of Federal data available on some issues.

Our shortsightedness does not necessarily result from the fact that we aren't doing enough studies or collecting enough information. From the Census Bureau to the Social Security Administration, the Federal Government often seems awash in statistics.

But what are we doing with them? How are we, as elected leaders, assessing today the critical trends that tomorrow will become crises and the day after require our immediate response?

It is precisely because we are often so institutionally shortsighted that I am today introducing legislation that would provide for the continuous assessment of critical trends and alternative futures. It is similar to a bill I introduced while in the House 2 years ago. Unfortunately, that bill did not move very quickly, but that is unusual for efforts of this kind.

Shortly after this century began, in fact, President Theodore Roosevelt created a national commission to study the future of the country's natural resources. The group met with congressional opposition to government by commission and eventually wilted.

The Critical Trends Assessment Act would not constitute government by commission. The office it would create would not usurp powers from any Federal agency. It would not be a method to invoke centralized planning into the Federal Government. I invite you to study the bill carefully. The word "planning" never appears. And the office would not be, I hope, the sole source for thinking about the future.

I envision it as a coordinator, an investigator, a facilitator for those of us in

government and in the public at large who believe that present-day trends deserve more than seat-of-the-pants reactions. I see the office as a mechanism to encourage useful debate among people in the Federal Government as well as in the private sector, focusing our attention beyond immediate concerns, making us better prepared for the future.

Specifically, the bill would establish within the Executive Office of the President an Office of Critical Trends Analysis, with a \$5 million annual budget. The office would be authorized to advise the President "of the potential effect of Government policies on critical trends and alternative futures."

The office would produce, every 4 years, an "Executive Branch Report on Critical Trends and Alternative Futures." The Joint Economic Committee of Congress would produce a similar report, with its own findings, every 2 years.

Both reports would be expected to identify and analyze critical trends and alternative futures for the next 20 years in light of economic, technological, political, environmental, demographic and social causes and consequences. They would analyze these trends based on current conditions, evaluate current Government policies and consider any alternative approaches.

An Advisory Commission on Critical Trends Analysis would be created with Executive, congressional and private sector representation. The advisory Commission would assist the office and promote public discussion of critical trends.

I have seen the value of getting Congress to look into the future. About 2 years ago the Congressional Clearinghouse on the Future, which I chaired, published a "Future Agenda" as seen by committees and subcommittees of the House. This was a valuable exercise in getting the committees to focus beyond day-to-day concerns and look at long-term trends.

We know that land fueled the agricultural revolution and capital fueled the industrial revolution. There is growing awareness that information is fueling our present revolution. But what are we doing with it? We are gathering data, we are making studies and we are shoving it all aside so we can handle the crises of the present day.

I think Congress and the White House can show more foresight than that.

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

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

S. 1031

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Critical Trends Assessment Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) while the Government has available to it enormous information resources, there is a need to supplement existing capabilities to provide a systematic and comprehensive use of that information to guide policymakers concerning critical trends and alternative futures;

(2) these information resources can and should be made publicly available in a form suitable for use by the public and private sectors of the United States economy;

(3) therefore, it is necessary to establish mechanisms to evaluate available information, to focus attention on areas in which information is inadequate, and to identify and analyze critical trends and alternative futures based upon the best available information.

SEC. 3. FUNCTIONS OF THE OFFICE OF CRITICAL TRENDS ANALYSIS.

(a) There is established in the Executive Office of the President the Office of Critical Trends Analysis (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Office"). The Director and Deputy Director of the Office shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) The Office shall be responsible for—

(1) the preparation of the executive branch report as required by section 4;

(2) the review and analysis of Government policies as required by section 5; and

(3) the organization and utilization of the Advisory Commission as required by section 6.

(c) The President shall authorize the Office to utilize the information, property, facilities, services, and personnel of each department and agency in the executive branch to the extent necessary in carrying out such functions. In addition, the Director is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of employees of the Office.

(d) There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1986 and each of the succeeding fiscal years for the purpose of carrying out section 3 through 6 of this Act.

SEC. 4. PREPARATION OF REPORT.

(a) Not later than the end of 1990 and each fourth year thereafter, the Office shall prepare for publication and Executive Branch Report on Critical Trends and Alternative Futures. The report shall contain—

(1) an identification and analysis, of critical trends and alternative futures for the ensuing twenty-year period;

(2) a description of the relationship of such trends and alternative futures to the economic, technological, political, environmental, demographic, and social causes and consequences;

(3) an analysis of such trends and alternative futures with respect to present and future problem areas and potential future opportunities;

(4) an evaluation of the effects of existing and alternative Government policies on such trends; and

(5) an identification of the information and a discussion of the analysis upon which conclusions in the report are based.

(b) Such reports shall be based upon information obtained from sources outside the

Federal Government and upon information obtained from Federal departments and agencies.

(c) Prior to the publication of the report required by this section, the Director of the Office shall make a draft copy of such report available to interested persons for the purposes of review and comment. Any significant comments received from interested persons or a summary thereof shall be included as an appendix to the published report.

(d) The President shall submit such report, together with his comments or recommendations thereon, to each House of the Congress and such report shall be made available within the Government and to the public as a public document.

(e) The Office shall also publish such interim reports as it considers necessary and appropriate.

SEC. 5. REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF GOVERNMENT POLICIES.

The Office shall be responsible for advising the President of the potential effects of Government policies on critical trends and alternative futures. The Office shall—

(1) analyze available information to identify present policies and policy options for the United States in a relation to critical trends and alternative futures;

(2) review Federal laws, regulations, programs, and other activities of the Federal Government to determine their long-term effects;

(3) prepare reports for the President as necessary and appropriate;

(4) insure that the Federal departments, agencies, and establishments with responsibilities in the area of policy under consideration are provided an opportunity to comment on the potential effects of Government policies on critical trends and alternative futures;

(5) consider the comments of such Federal departments, agencies, and establishments in performing its functions under this section; and

(6) include the official comments of such Federal departments, agencies, and establishments in any reports provided to the President by the Office under the authority of this section.

SEC. 6. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CRITICAL TRENDS ANALYSIS.

(a) The Office shall be responsible for the establishment of the Advisory Commission on Critical Trends Analysis.

(b) The Advisory Commission shall—

(1) provide advice to the Office with respect to its operations; and

(2) promote the public discussion and public awareness of critical trends and the use of analyses of such trends to create alternative futures.

(c) The Advisory Commission shall be composed of nineteen members, as follows:

(1) Five members of the Advisory Commission shall be the heads of Federal agencies designated by the President.

(2) Three members of the Advisory Commission shall be Members of the Senate, appointed by the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate, acting jointly, at least one of whom shall be a member of the minority party.

(3) Three members of the Advisory Commission shall be Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, at least one of whom shall be a member of the minority party who is appointed in consultation with the leader of the minority party.

(4) Eight members of the Advisory Commission shall be individuals appointed by the President from among individuals who—

(A) are representative of business, labor, academic institutions, community organizations, and other private institutions and organizations; and

(B) have background and experience which has provided such individuals with knowledge concerning long-range data collection and analysis or the management of large enterprises, or with other experience relevant for membership on the Advisory Commission.

(d) Members of the Advisory Commission shall be appointed for a term of three years, except that—

(1) the term of office of the members first appointed under subsection (c)(1) shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, two at the end of one year, two at the end of two years, and one at the end of three years;

(2) the term of members first appointed under subsection (c)(2) shall expire, as designated by the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate at the time of appointment, one at the end of one year, one at the end of two years, and one at the end of three years;

(3) members appointed under subsection (c)(3) shall be appointed for a term of two years, and the term of members first appointed under such subsection shall expire, as determined by the Speaker of the House of Representatives at the time of appointment, one at the end of one year, and two at the end of two years; and

(4) the term of members first appointed under subsection (c)(4) shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three at the end of one year, two at the end of two years, and three at the end of three years.

No individual may be appointed to serve more than two terms on the Advisory Commission.

(e) The Advisory Commission shall elect one of its members as Chair of the Advisory Commission.

(f) Any vacancy in the Advisory Commission shall not affect its power to function. A vacancy in the Advisory Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 7. PREPARATION OF CONGRESSIONAL REPORT.

(a) Not later than the end of 1989 and each second year thereafter, the Joint Economic Committee shall prepare for publication a Legislative Branch Report on Critical Trends and Alternative Futures.

(b) The legislative branch report shall examine the information and methods of analysis used in preparation of the executive branch report.

(c) The legislative branch report may include a response to the contents and conclusions of the executive branch report.

(d) The legislative branch report may contain—

(1) an identification and analysis of critical trends and alternative futures for the ensuing twenty-year period;

(2) a description of the relationship of such trends and alternative futures to the economic, technological, political, environmental, demographic, and social causes and consequences;

(3) an analysis of such trends and alternative futures with respect to present and future problem areas and potential future opportunities;

(4) an evaluation of the effects of existing and alternative Government policies on such trends; and

(5) an identification of the information and a discussion of the analysis upon which conclusions in the report are based.

(e) Such reports shall be based upon information obtained from sources outside the Federal Government and upon information obtained from Federal departments and agencies.

(f) The Congressional Budget Office, the General Accounting Office, the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress, the Office of Technology Assessment, the Congressional Clearinghouse on the Future, and other entities within the legislative branch shall make available such information as may be required for the purpose of carrying out this section.

(g) Upon approval by the committee, such report shall be submitted to each House of the Congress and shall be made available within the Government and to the public as a public document. ●

By Mr. DANFORTH:

S. 1032. A bill to establish a commission to study amusement ride safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

AMUSEMENT RIDE SAFETY COMMISSION ACT

● Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the Amusement Ride Safety Commission Act.

Although there is disagreement as to the extent to which amusement ride safety is a matter for Federal regulation and as to which agencies should be involved, there is no dispute about the need for ride safety. Nearly 200 million people a year frequent amusement parks in this country and they deserve assurance that the industry adheres to the highest possible safety standards and that amusement ride safety is effectively maintained.

The legislation I am introducing today is intended to provide this assurance. It is patterned after legislation introduced in the House by Congressman HENRY HYDE. This measure would establish a temporary Commission to examine the present status of amusement ride regulation at the local, State, and Federal level, to study and review industry safety standards, and to assess the need for and potential effectiveness of any Federal involvement in amusement ride safety.

During an 18-month period, this Commission would conduct a comprehensive investigation of the scope and adequacy of safety measures employed to protect the public from unreasonable risks of injury from amusement rides. The Commission would be given the authority to hold hearings and to subpoena witnesses. Interested parties also would be given the authority to submit their views. At the end of this 18-month period, the Commission would present a final report on its findings and recommendations to the President and Congress.

The Commission would be composed of five members: The Director of the National Bureau of Standards, who would be the chairman, the Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, who would be the vice chairman, and three others to be appointed by the President. The three Presidential appointees are to be a State official who administers an amusement ride safety program, an industry safety expert, and a representative of consumer groups.

In the past, I have questioned the resources and expertise of the Consumer Product Safety Commission to investigate accidents at fixed-site amusement parks, and last year I introduced a bill to give the National Bureau of Standards authority to investigate serious accidents at fixed-site amusement parks at the request of State or local authorities.

While I remain convinced that the CPSC is not the appropriate agency to investigate such accidents and that safety at mixed-site amusement parks is primarily a matter for State and local regulation, I believe that a study by a National Commission involving both Federal and State officials seems an appropriate way to address this question, no matter what one's point of view may be. It is a reasonable way to accomplish a common goal—greater safety for all our citizens.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I request that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1032

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Amusement Ride Safety Commission Act".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) the occurrence of amusement ride accidents in recent years has prompted inquiry into the necessity and desirability of Federal legislation to regulate the amusement ride industry;

(2) the regulation of such rides has traditionally been the responsibility of State and local governments and of the amusement ride industry;

(3) it is uncertain whether any Federal agency has sufficient resources or expertise to regulate the amusement ride industry;

(4) Federal involvement in the inspection and regulation of amusement rides could be costly and inefficient;

(5) voluntary comprehensive ride safety standards have been promulgated by the American Society of Testing and Materials and such standards should be evaluated by the Federal Government; and

(6) a temporary Commission to review the scope and adequacy of safety regulations and standards in the amusement ride industry could clarify the need, or lack of need, for Federal legislation regarding amusement ride safety.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) There is established a National Commission on Amusement Ride Safety (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of five members as follows:

(1) the Director of the National Bureau of Standards, who shall be chairman of the Commission;

(2) the Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission (or the Chairman's designee), who shall be vice chairman of the Commission; and

(3) three members to be appointed by the President as follows:

(A) one from among State officials who administer State amusement ride safety inspection programs;

(B) one from among professionals in the amusement ride industry who have education, training, or experience in amusement ride safety matters; and

(C) one from among persons who represent consumers.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers.

(d) Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 4. (a)(1) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive investigation of the scope and adequacy of safety measures employed to protect the public from unreasonable risks of injury from amusement rides. Such investigation shall include a review of—

(A) Federal, State, and local laws regulating the amusement ride industry;

(B) existing voluntary comprehensive amusement ride safety standards; and

(C) self-regulation mechanisms within such industry.

(2) Such investigation shall determine for each law, standard, and self-regulation mechanism reviewed under paragraph (1)(A) through (C) of this subsection—

(A) the scope of its coverage;

(B) the effectiveness of any available sanctions or enforcement mechanisms; and

(C) the adequacy of powers to investigate violations.

In addition, the investigation shall determine the uniformity of application and quality of enforcement of the reviewed laws, standards, and self-enforcement mechanisms.

(b) As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Committee shall publish in the Federal Register an announcement of the investigation described in subsection (a) of this section, and shall afford an opportunity for any interested persons to submit views on the subject of the investigation.

(c) The Committee may transmit to the President and to the Congress such interim reports as it considers advisable, and shall transmit its final report to the President and to the Congress not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act. The final report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission with respect to the adequacy of existing amusement ride safety standards and regulations, together with such recommendations for legislative, administrative, or other action as it considers appropriate.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 5. (a) The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and

places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers appropriate. The Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it. In holding such hearings, the Commission, upon a vote of a quorum of its members, may—

(1) order any corporation, business, or individual to submit, within a reasonable period, such reports or answers to questions as the Commission may request, in such form and such manner as the Commission may prescribe;

(2) require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relevant to the execution of its duties; and

(3) order any person to give testimony by deposition to any person designated by the Commission to administer oaths and to take such deposition.

(b) The Commission shall publish notice of any proposed hearing in the Federal Register and shall afford a reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present relevant testimony and data.

(c)(1) If a person issued a subpoena under subsection (a)(2) of this section refuses to obey such subpoena or is guilty of contumacy, any court of the United States within the judicial district within which the hearing is conducted or within the judicial district within such person is found or resides or transacts business may (upon application of the Commission) order such person to appear before the Commission to produce evidence or to give testimony relating to the matter under investigation. Any failure to obey such order to the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(2) Subpoenas of the Commission shall be served in the manner provided for subpoenas of a district court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the district courts of the United States.

(d) The Commission may pay witnesses the same fees and travel expenses as are paid in like circumstances in the courts of the United States.

(e) The Commission may request from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Federal Government any information it considers necessary to carry out its functions under this Act. Each such department, agency, or independent instrumentality shall cooperate with the Commission and, to the extent permitted by law, shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(f) The Commission may delegate any of its functions to individual members of the Commission.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS; REIMBURSEMENT OF TRAVEL EXPENSES

Sec. 6. (a) Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation.

(b) While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service.

ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 7. (a) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of a staff director who shall be paid an amount not to exceed the minimum rate of basic pay payable for level GS-15 of the General Schedule pursuant to section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The head of any Federal agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of its personnel to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties under this Act.

(c) The Commission shall cease to exist upon submitting its final report required under section 4(c) of this Act. ●

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. PRESSLER):

S. 1033. A bill to amend the Emergency Veterans' Job Training Act of 1983 to establish a veterans' career development and training program; to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a veterans' computerized job bank program, to enhance readjustment appointments of veterans to positions of employment in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

VETERANS' CAREER DEVELOPMENT TRAINING AND JOB BANK ACT

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator PRESSLER, I am proud to introduce the Veterans' Career Development Training and Job Bank Act of 1985, which amends and extends the Emergency Veterans' Training Act of 1983.

On this day, 10 years after the fall of Saigon, it is especially important that we remember the veterans who served their country in the Vietnam war and who in part as a result of that service have never been able to reintegrate themselves completely in American society since their return.

Thankfully, most Vietnam veterans have finally "come home" in the fullest sense, holding down jobs they are satisfied with, putting down roots, establishing families. But for a significant minority of veterans, their return to the United States has never been accompanied by full integration in U.S. society. According to a recent poll by ABC and the Washington Post, this group makes up about 10 percent of all Vietnam-era veterans, and about 15 percent of those veterans who saw heavy combat. It is these veterans that this act seeks to help.

The GI bill helped many of these veterans receive an education. But too often the education the veterans of Vietnam received never paved the way for the kind of jobs that led to making it in America, to the kind of work that makes up a career. And there were many reasons for this.

One of the most unfortunate was that for a long time, veterans were actually discriminated against in American society, rejected by those who did not want to even think about the Vietnam war or its veterans.

To those historic reasons, another has been added—our changing national economy, where traditional manufacturing jobs have often been replaced by service jobs. Indeed, some of the best jobs we will have in the future may well be in the high-tech in-

dustries of this country. As we have seen in Massachusetts, these jobs can create a vibrant economy.

What this act does is help those veterans who are still unemployed or underemployed 10 years after the end of the Vietnam war by providing training for careers in the private sector—not low-paying, menial, or make-work jobs. The bill does this by providing critical economic support for the training process, making training economically feasible for employers who need trained employees, but who ordinarily might not be able to devote the resources to training them.

The act is designed to make it easier for Vietnam and Korean-era veterans to find good jobs by establishing a state-of-the-art job bank, using national data bases and the most sophisticated computer networks now available. This data bank, while initially available only to veterans, could demonstrate the capabilities of a nationwide job bank for an even broader group of clients down the road.

The companion legislation that is being filed by Senator PRESSLER today, which I am proud to cosponsor, is also important. These bills will make it possible for those veterans who need mental health outpatient services to receive them from the Veterans' Administration, and direct that the Federal Government undertake a comprehensive review of health problems which especially affect veterans who served in Indochina. Such a review, including the study of the post-traumatic stress disorder that has caused so much anguish to some veterans and their families, is one step in developing a national plan for the treatment of PTSD, a plan which is urgently needed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this legislation and the accompanying text be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1033

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Career Development Training and Job Bank Act of 1985."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Emergency Veterans' Job Training Act of 1983 (97 Stat. 443; 29 U.S.C. 1721 note) is amended by striking out "Emergency Veterans' Job Training Act of 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "Veterans' Career Development and Training Act."

(b) Section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"PURPOSES

"SEC. 2. The purposes of this Act are—

"(1) to address the problem of severe and continuing unemployment, underemployment, and career displacement among veterans by providing incentives to employers to hire and train certain unemployed or underemployed wartime veterans for stable and

permanent careers that require significant training and to prepare the veterans for career advancement;

"(2) to provide an opportunity for such veterans to attain or regain their full employment potential and to increase their earned income and economic self-sufficiency;

"(3) to substantially improve the quality of opportunities accorded veterans by Federal Government employment, training, and placement programs;

"(4) to meet the manpower and training requirements of the growing national economy and the requirements of industries for a work force having new technological skills, enhanced productivity, and stability;

"(5) to reduce the need to furnish unemployment compensation and social support services to veterans and to alleviate the social and economic consequences of unemployment and underemployment of such veterans; and

"(6) to increase tax revenues by promoting higher earnings of veterans through retraining the veterans for and placing the veterans in jobs in careers at income levels commensurate with income levels in the careers from which such veterans have been displaced or with income levels the veterans should reasonably have attained considering their civilian or military work experience, education, and training."

(c) Subsection (a)(1) of section 5 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) To be eligible for participation in a job training program under this Act, a veteran must be a Korean conflict or Vietnam-era veteran—

"(A) whose employment has been terminated or who has been laid off from employment or has received a notice of termination or layoff from employment, who is eligible for or has exhausted his or her entitlement to unemployment compensation, and who is unlikely to return to work in the same industry or occupation in which the veteran worked before the termination or layoff;

"(B) whose employment has been terminated, or who has received a notice of termination of employment, as a result of any permanent closure of a manufacturing or other production facility;

"(C) who is unemployed and has limited opportunities, by reason of age or otherwise, for employment or for reemployment in the occupation in which the veteran formerly worked or a similar occupation in the area in which such veteran resides;

"(D) who is underemployed and has a service-connected disability;

"(E) who served in the Indochina theater of operations and is underemployed and whose personal income is below the lower living standard income level determined annually by the Secretary of Labor (adjusted for regional, metropolitan, urban, age, and rural differences and for the veteran's status and family status); or

"(F) whose income and employment status, based on guidelines established by the Administrator in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment, is significantly below the level that would reasonably be expected of such veteran based on the veteran's education, age, training, vocational rehabilitation, or military or civilian work experience."

(d) Section 14 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"COUNSELING AND OTHER ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 14. (a) The Administrator and the Secretary may, upon request, provide employment counseling services to any veteran

eligible to participate under this Act in order to assist such veteran in selecting a suitable program of job training under this Act.

"(b) A disabled veteran who is eligible to participate under this Act shall be entitled to receive services and assistance set out in section 1504 of title 38, United States Code.

"(c) A veteran who is not disabled and is eligible to participate under this Act shall be entitled to receive counseling services under section 1663 of title 38, United States Code.

"(d) The Administrator shall provide such resources and personnel as are necessary and appropriate to carry out the counseling assessment and job matching functions under the veterans' job bank and job matching program authorized under section 2010A of such title."

(e) Section 16 of such Act is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting "\$75,000,000 for fiscal year 1986, and \$100,000,000, for each of fiscal years 1987 and 1988" after "and 1985";

(2) in the second sentence, by striking out "1987" and inserting in lieu thereof "1989"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof of the following: "Not more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 1986 pursuant to an authorization in this section and not more than 5 percent of the funds appropriated for fiscal years 1987 and 1988 pursuant to an authorization in this section may be used by the Administrator to provide counseling, job matching, or supportive services, or to pay outreach or necessary and appropriate administrative expenses directly relating to the implementation of this Act."

(f) Section 17 of the Emergency Veterans' Job Training Act of 1983 is amended by striking out "1985" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1987".

Sec. 3. (a)(1) Chapter 41 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2010A. Veterans' job bank and job matching program

"(a) The Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment is authorized to establish and carry out, in consultation with the Administrator, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Education, and such public, private, and nonprofit organizations, associations, and employers as the Assistant Secretary considers appropriate, a nationwide computerized job bank and job matching program. The information contained in a job bank established under such program shall be organized by region, by State, and by locality.

"(b) In carrying out a job bank and job matching program established under subsection (a) of this section, the Assistant Secretary shall use electronic data processing and telecommunications systems to the maximum extent practicable—

"(A) to identify job vacancies and the location of—

"(i) unemployed or underemployed veterans,

"(ii) members of reserve components of the Armed Forces, and

"(iii) individuals recently discharged or released from service in the Armed Forces, who are available to fill those vacancies;

"(B) to provide an expeditious means for matching the qualifications of those individuals with employer requirements and job opportunities; and

"(C) to refer and place such individuals in jobs.

"(c)(1) A job bank established under subsection (a) of this section shall include a current list of all suitable job vacancies with Federal Government contractors and subcontractors of Federal Government contractors and shall indicate which contractors and subcontractors are subject to the affirmative action requirements of section 2012(a) of this title.

"(2) The job bank may include—

"(A) an occupational information file;

"(B) occupational projections of the numbers and types of jobs available, organized on regional, State, local, and other appropriate bases;

"(C) labor supply information organized by occupation;

"(D) data bases correlating military occupational specialities with comparable civilian occupations and training programs;

"(E) a data base of employers, the primary occupations they employ, and related information; and

"(F) a data base of post-secondary vocational and professional training programs and of colleges and the instructional programs offered by the colleges.

"(3) The Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment should design the job bank to permit employers to post employment and training opportunities directly to the job bank."

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"2010A. Veterans' job bank and job matching program."

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 not more than \$4,000,000 to develop and carry out the veterans' job bank and job matching program established under section 2010A of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

VETERAN'S READJUSTMENT APPOINTMENTS TO POSITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

SEC. 4. (a) Section 2014(b)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "GS-9" in clause (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "GS-11"; and

(2) by striking out "who is" in clause (C) and all that follows in that clause through "line of duty."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to appointments made after September 30, 1985.

THE PROBLEM OF VIETNAM VETERANS READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

In December of 1983 unemployment among Vietnam era veterans reached its highest point in history (890,000). Sometime within the last twelve months 1 in 4 Vietnam veterans (1.5 million-2 million) was without employment. Vietnam era veterans unemployment and underemployment represents unique and very serious problems confronting the labor force. Vietnam era veteran underemployment and cyclical unemployment is so significant that it is a valid leading indicator of the nation's economy. In good economic times veterans unemployment is 20 percent lower than comparably aged non-veterans. During recessions veterans' unemployment rises to 20 percent above non-veterans. Veterans unemployment begins to increase 3 months before non-veterans as the economy enters a recession and begins to decrease 2 months before non-veterans as the economy enters a recovery. This trend has held steady for more

than a decade. It indicates serious instability in the veterans' career situations and a cycle of underemployment the results in unemployment during periods of economic downturn.

The American workforce is undergoing a period of fundamental restructuring from manufacturing to service-related jobs. This change has resulted in the permanent loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs held by veterans that have been part of the economy for thirty years. Neither veterans readjustment programs nor public employment and training programs anticipated, let alone addressed the loss of millions of working class jobs, and the need to train and retrain workers for careers of the future.

America faced a similar challenge 40 years ago with the prospect of having to integrate 15 million World War II veterans into the civilian workforce. The response to that challenge was one of the most significant pieces of social and manpower development legislation in history the World War II GI Bill. The WW II GI Bill provided education, training and employment assistance to nearly 7 million veterans phasing them into the economy with the skills necessary to facilitate the greatest economic and technological growth in America's history. The WW II GI Bill revolutionized higher education, expanding college level training programs by 300% between 1945 and 1950, and made a college education possible for almost every middle class family after 1950.

What the WW II GI Bill did for the demand for higher education after WW II, the Vietnam era GI Bill should have done for the demand for trade, technical, vocational and professional skills in today's high tech and rapidly changing labor market.

Unfortunately, the Vietnam war veteran never benefitted from the far-sighted wisdom and planning that went into the development of the WW II GI Bill. For many Vietnam era and disabled veterans, Vietnam era GI Bill benefits were neither relevant to their readjustment or rehabilitation needs nor to the skill demands of today's labor market.

The Vietnam era GI Bill was originally enacted in 1966 as the "Cold War GI Bill" after a strong lobbying campaign by higher education associations. The intent of the new GI Bill was not to address the readjustment and rehabilitation needs of 9 million veterans who would serve during the Vietnam era but rather to offset substantial declines in college enrollments brought by expiration of Korean War GI Bill benefits. The Cold War GI Bill was designed to induce 4 million "Cold War Veterans" who served between 1955 and 1964 to enter college by paying \$100 a month.

The assistance for returning Vietnam veterans was flawed in many aspects since the GI Bill was designed to induce college enrollment rather than facilitate readjustment, while the GI Bill was reasonably adequate for single veterans or veterans with significant supplemental financial resources seeking a college education at a low cost public school, it was substantially limited in its assistance to others. The Vietnam era GI Bill discriminated against:

1. Veterans in States without low cost public colleges or community colleges;
2. Veterans desiring training at private colleges and universities;
3. Veterans requiring high-cost short-term trade, technical, vocational or professional training;
4. Veterans separated during the height of the Vietnam war (1966 to 1972);

5. Veterans with wives and families to support.

The WW II GI Bill paid both tuition expenses at almost every public or private college or trade, technical or professional institution in the nation and paid an equal monthly living allowance. The Vietnam era GI Bill paid only a single monthly allowance out of which the veteran had to pay both educational expenses and living expenses. The greater the cost of the veteran's tuition and educational expenses, the less he or she had to live on. This, in effect, priced veterans without supplemental financial resources out of many schools or induced them to pursue training at inexpensive schools that were ill suited to their readjustment needs.

Veterans with families to support (the majority of Vietnam veterans) needed an average of \$250 (\$450 in 1984 dollars) a month in additional income to supplement their GI Bill benefits whereas a single veteran at a low cost school could often afford to live on his or her benefits alone. Private colleges and trade, technical, vocational and professional training programs often had tuitions of \$1500 to \$3000, exceeding the annual GI Bill allowance, and leaving the veteran with no money for living expenses.

The GI Bill made matters worse for veterans needing trade, technical, vocational or professional training by requiring over 20 hours of classroom participation in those institutions for full-time benefits as compared to only 12 hours a week in a college level classroom to qualify for full time benefits. Many veterans unable to acquire technical, vocational, training at public institutions fell prey to unscrupulous profit making schools and correspondence courses. Some training programs, "Approved for Veterans Benefits" were more interested in getting GI Bill dollars from the veteran than in providing quality training to the veteran. Hundreds of millions of dollars were lost to training programs that did not provide adequate training, or opportunities for employment upon completion.

In addition to inadequate benefits many Vietnam veterans who were separated at the height of the war met with hostility on college campuses by anti-war students, and met with discrimination in employment by employers who were prejudiced by sensationalist portrayals of the readjustment problems of Vietnam veterans.

It was not until 1974 that a concerted effort was made to restructure the "Cold War GI Bill" as an effective and relevant readjustment program for hundreds of thousands of needy Vietnam era veterans who were unable to effectively use their earned readjustment entitlements. Comprehensive legislation was introduced in both the House and Senate to provide tuition assistance and accelerated entitlement.

Congressman Lester Wolff, a principal sponsor of the reform efforts, told Congress: "Outdated and shortsighted provisions of the present GI Bill hit hardest at the great majority of Vietnam veterans who are either married with family responsibilities who are seeking blue collar jobs but need technical training.

"As a result of misplaced emphasis on undergraduate college training at the expense of vocational and technical training, the GI Bill is unwittingly a major factor in the lives of a quarter of a million vets now out of work.

"It is simply absurd to continue our increasingly misplaced emphasis in turning out liberal arts graduates with limited job

potential when we know from the Department of Labor that 60 percent of our Nation's future job opportunities will come in service and new technology blue collar fields."

A National Survey of Veterans conducted by the Veterans' Administration in 1979 found that only 35.3 percent of the veterans who received college training under the GI Bill were able to put that training to substantial use in the first job they received after training. Another 8% were able to put their training to some use.

Billions of dollars were spent on college level training and hundreds of thousands of veterans were misled into believing that a college degree would automatically lead to a professional career. Neither the Federal Government (especially the VA) nor the educational establishment faced up to the implications of the job gap or the fate of their graduates.

After 1972 with the end of the war and graduation of most of the baby boom generation colleges began again to face declining enrollments.

In an effort to attract as students the same Vietnam era veterans that many colleges had actively scorned in the late 60s and early 70s public colleges, especially community and junior colleges aggressively pursued veterans. Many public institutions are funded by their states or communities based upon the number of full time equivalents (FTEs) they have enrolled. The more students they recruited the more money the schools received.

Often veterans were enticed into community colleges primarily on the incentive of obtaining their GI Bill benefits check rather than for clear and relevant educational or vocational objectives. Rarely was appropriate career counseling, assessment or guidance given veterans that would have insured that their education and training would have led to an appropriate career upon completion.

Too often veterans pursued a liberal arts education because liberal arts programs enabled them to use their benefits for the longest periods of time and had the most liberal entrance and grading policies. The vast majority of Vietnam era veterans were high school graduates (80%). However the majority came from working class backgrounds and often lacked college preparatory backgrounds especially in math and science to pursue engineering, computer science careers, or other majors where there is a demand for recently graduated students.

Many college-educated veterans found themselves now, (having lost the fight for college level careers with the more affluent and educated peers), competing for menial working class jobs that required a minimum of education, and often against young high school graduates. Having families to support and a strong work ethic, these veterans took what ever job they could find.

Many public employment, training and placement programs have contributed to the veteran's cycle of menial jobs, structural underemployment and cyclical unemployment. Previously and currently almost all national employment, training and placement programs which include veterans (CETA Comprehensive Employment and Training Act), its successor JTPA (Job Training Partnerships Act), and TJTC (Targeted Jobs Tax Credit) have as their primary objective the achievement of worthwhile social goals. These programs have been restricted by law to addressing the needs of less than 10 percent of potential

workforce. Their focus is upon the socially and economically disadvantaged; persons under the age of 24; those whose combined family income does not exceed 70 percent of the lower living standard and: "those who have limited English language proficiency, or are displaced homemakers, school drop-outs, teenage parents, handicapped, offenders, alcoholics, or addicts."

The intent of these programs is to take persons with limited or no work experience, limited or no jobs skills, with the aforementioned handicaps and introduce them to the workforce at an entry level.

The social and economic level of the employment obtained through public programs is below the social and economic status the majority of veterans (or their families had acquired) before entering the service, let alone after. What is a significant opportunity for upward mobility for the vast majority of clients served by social goal programs is an equally significant probability for downward mobility for most Vietnam era, disabled or recently separated veterans.

According to the Census Bureau and the Veterans Administration the median family income in 1981 for veterans aged 35-39 was \$29,850. In families where the veteran was sole wage earner, income was \$26,980. Only 15% of all Vietnam era veterans had family incomes of less than \$15,000 in 1981, and only 6% had family incomes of less than \$10,000.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics only about 30% of persons experiencing unemployment in a given year have annual family incomes of less than \$10,000 (primarily single parents); 30 percent have annual family incomes between \$10,000 and \$20,000. And 40% of the families with at least one member unemployed in a given year have family incomes in excess of \$20,000.

The vast majority of unemployed and underemployed veterans will never fall to the social or economic level where an appropriate resolution to their employment, training and placement problems would be provided through JTPA. However, Vietnam era veterans are among the most likely of any significant group in the labor force to experience the greatest income loss as a consequence of long-term unemployment and job displacement.

THE VETERANS CAREER DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING AND JOB BANK ACT OF 1985

This legislation will extend and enhance the Emergency Veterans Job Training Act of 1983, create a computerized Veterans National Job Bank and enhance counseling, assessment, outreach and supportive services, and improve Veterans Readjustment Authority Appointments.

The legislation is in many ways similar to H.R. 1408 approved by the House Veterans Affairs Education, Training, and Employment Subcommittee on April 3, 1985.

The purpose of the Veterans Career Development and Training Act of 1985 S. is "to address the problem of severe and continuing unemployment, underemployment and career displacement among veterans by providing, in the form of payments to defray the cost of training, incentives to employers to hire and train for stable and permanent positions that involve significant training, certain wartime veterans who have been unemployed or underemployed and have little prospect of finding gainful employment or realizing the full employment potential and economic self-sufficiency without the assistance accorded under this Act.

The legislation authorizes appropriations of \$75,000,000 in fiscal year 1986 and \$100

million in fiscal years 1987 and 1988. The authorization level of \$75 million for fiscal year 1986 is one-half of the \$150 million which was authorized but not appropriated under the Emergency Veterans Job Training Act of 1983.

An appropriation of \$75 million would have the veterans readjustment benefit outlays for fiscal year 1986, \$81 million less than outlays for veterans readjustment benefits in fiscal year 1985 and \$417 million less than outlays for veterans readjustment benefits in fiscal year 1984.

The primary objective of the Veterans Career Development and Training Act of 1985 is the development and training for permanent and stable careers. Employment, training and placement initiatives must enable Vietnam era and Korean war veterans to realize their full employment and training potential commensurate with their abilities, aspirations and the income needs of their families.

These objectives cannot be achieved if veterans are served in the context of JTPA social welfare programs that offer only entry level training and wages (\$9,800) below the poverty level for the average veteran and only one half the median income of the average veteran (\$22,000). Careers which pay \$17,000 to \$25,000 a year (or enable veterans to attain that level in a year or two) are the appropriate goal for veteran employment training and placement programs to attain. This legislation will provide a viable mechanism to fundamentally restructure veterans employment training and placement initiatives.

There are only three major structural changes made to the Emergency Veterans Job Training Act. One is the expansion of the eligibility criteria. The second is the mandate for an effective counseling assessment and supportive service system. Third is the creation of a National Veterans Job Bank.

EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

The eligibility criteria for the "Veterans Career Development and Training Act" incorporate the same eligibility criteria for displaced workers authorized by Title II—Employment and Training Assistance for Dislocated Workers under the Job Training Partnership Act.

The new eligibility criteria for participation under the Veterans Career Development and Training Act are that a veteran must be a Korean conflict or a Vietnam era veteran who:

(A) has been terminated or laid off or who has received a notice of termination or lay-off from employment, is eligible for or has exhausted his or her entitlement to unemployment compensation, and is unlikely to return to his or her previous industry or occupation;

(B) has been terminated, or who has received a notice of termination of employment, as a result of any permanent closure of a plant or facility;

(C) is unemployed and has limited opportunities for employment or reemployment in the same or similar occupation in the area in which such veteran resides, including any older veteran who may have substantial barriers to employment by reason of age;

In addition to the eligibility criteria adopted from the Job Training Partnership Act Dislocated Worker program, the Veterans Career Development and Training Act provides special eligibility provisions for underemployed service connected disabled vet-

erans and veterans who served in the Indochina theater of operations—two groups that have the greatest employment and underemployment problems. The Act authorizes eligibility in the case of:

(D) an underemployed veteran with a service connected disability or an underemployed veteran who served in the Indochina theater of operations and whose personal income is below the "lower living standard income level" (established by the Department of Labor), or

(E) a disabled or Vietnam theater veteran whose income and employment status under guidelines determined by the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans Employment and the Administrator is significantly below the level that would reasonably be expected of such veteran based upon the individual's education, age, training, vocational rehabilitation, and/or previous military or civilian work experience, and that such underemployed veteran's participation under Development and Training Act is determined to be necessary for the veteran to attain his or her employment potential.

Hundreds of thousands of Vietnam theater and disabled veterans who pursued college level or trade technical, vocational training under their GI bill benefits have been unable to attain employment commensurate with their training and career potential. Billions of dollars of GI Bill training will go to waste unless these underemployed veterans are able to participate in a Career Development and Training program with an employer. With this training, whether to develop new skills, complete or enhance previous GI Bill training, they can establish more productive and stable employment, often for the first time in their chosen career field. The revenue enhancements as well as the increased productivity, self-esteem, economic self-sufficiency will in the long run more than compensate for initial outlays for these veterans. Underemployed veterans are often the best prospects for success in career training programs. They have demonstrated their commitment to hold employment over those who may have motivational and other problems which have contributed to their long term unemployment. Veterans with serious social welfare or service connected problems would be better served by JTPA or VA Vocational Rehabilitation programs.

COUNSELING

The Veterans Career Development, Training and Job Bank Act of 1985 authorizes a much more extensive effort on the part of the Veterans Administration and the Department of Labor to provide critically needed counseling, assessment, supportive services, job matching and follow-up during training. The accompanying documentation establishes that the VA and DOL have extensive authority to provide such services or contract for them. The legislation authorizes 10% of the appropriations for the program in 1986 (\$7.5 Million) may be used by the Administrator to provide counseling, job matching, supportive services, outreach and/or necessary and appropriate administrative expenses directly related to the implementation of the Act.

VETERANS JOB BANK

The Veterans Job Bank is the most critical component of restructuring Veteran employment training placement and job matching programs. It has the capability of revolutionizing employment and training and accessing to millions of employers and training and job opportunities previously unreached by federal programs.

The system will be available in 4 or 5 months. It is currently under development by Partnerships Data Net utilizing the computer facilities and resources of CompuServe of Columbus Ohio (the nation's largest public access interactive computer network system).

The Job bank will maintain lists of available veterans, job and training vacancies, and provide an expeditious means of matching the qualifications of veterans with employer requirements and job opportunities.

The Veterans Job Bank Program will have the capability of:

1. Assessing a veteran by education, past work experience, military training and experience, and/or aptitude tests, and matching that veteran to an appropriate occupation(s) out of 12,375 occupations defined in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles.

2. Matching specific occupations to industries and specific employers that would employ those occupations. The system will have information supplied by Dun and Bradstreet on 5 million employers.

3. Matching more than 8000 Military Occupational Specialties to over 1000 civilian occupations and identifying specific employers that would employ those occupations.

4. Enhancing active and reserve Armed Forces recruiting efforts by providing tangible civilian employment opportunities for reservists and veterans based upon the military training and experience.

5. Identify industries and individuals critical to mobilization and improve placement and training of persons in those industries.

6. Develop good career opportunities in the large segments of the private sector traditionally not accessed by federal employment and training programs.

VETERANS READJUSTMENT AUTHORITY

The legislation would permit veterans eligible for veterans readjustment appointments the authority to enter Federal Service at a GS-11 rather than the current GS-9 level and removes the restriction barring veterans with more than 14 years of education from participating in VRA. This will enable many disabled and Vietnam veterans with substantial education, training, and work experience to enter the Federal government at levels commensurate with their potential. Previously VRA was restricted to GS-5 or below jobs thus restraining most applicants to menial employment opportunities such as custodians, security guards, messengers, and elevator operators. Priority will be given to service connected disabled veterans over non service connected by the legislation.

The effective date of the legislation will be September 30, 1985.

By Mr. PRESSLER:

S.J. Res. 126. Joint resolution to condemn Bulgarian brutality toward their Turkish minority; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BULGARIAN DISCRIMINATION AGAINST TURKISH MINORITY

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, today I am introducing a joint resolution which condemns the Bulgarian Government's treatment of its Turkish minority. A similar joint resolution is being introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative SILJANDER.

Citizens of Turkish descent comprise 8.6 percent of the Bulgarian popula-

tion, or approximately 1 million people. They and their ancestors have lived there since the 14th century and are the largest minority present in that country.

Today, massive human rights violations are being perpetrated against the Turks by Bulgarian authorities. There is currently a nationwide campaign underway to force the Turkish minority to change their names to Bulgarian ones. Coercion and physical intimidation are commonplace. Systematic delays and denials of government service, blocking of bank accounts, dismissal from jobs, and the murder of Turks by the Bulgarian militia are the order of the day. In addition, the right to practice the Islamic religion has been severely restricted.

All this is happening despite the People's Republic of Bulgaria status as a signatory to numerous international agreements which specifically prohibit discrimination against minority citizens. Among these are the 1947 Paris Peace Treaty, the U.N. Declaration on Human Rights, and the Helsinki Declaration of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Mr. President, these human rights atrocities should not and cannot be tolerated. The joint resolution before us would put the Senate on record as condemning these practices, as well as calling on the President to use appropriate diplomatic means to express U.S. opposition to the discrimination against Turkish Bulgarians. I urge our distinguished colleagues to join me in this humanitarian cause by supporting this measure.

By Mr. NUNN (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. BOREN):

S.J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to promote internal reconciliation within Nicaragua, on the basis of democratic principles, in furtherance of a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Central American; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROMOTING INTERNAL RECONCILIATION IN NICARAGUA

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, last week, the Senate passed, but the House rejected, a proposal to provide humanitarian aid to the democratic resistance in Nicaragua. I believe it was a mistake to have rejected such aid.

It passed the Senate, but by a narrow vote, 53 to 46. Prior to the vote, I made a speech in which I suggested that the President seek a compromise approach which moved the diplomatic and economic option to the front burner and the military option to the back burner.

The purpose of my proposal was to develop a sustainable policy that enjoyed the support of the Congress and the American people. A number of other Members of Congress made simi-

lar suggestions. Regretfully, no such compromise was reached, and, as a result, our policy toward Central America is in disarray.

However, in listening to the debate last week, I was struck that most Senators agreed on what our policy objectives in Central America ought to be. No one likes the Sandinistas. They have betrayed their revolution. All Senators seemed to agree that we should support democracy in Nicaragua and the rest of Central America, that Nicaragua cannot become a base for the Soviet Union or Cuba or their surrogates, that the Sandinistas must not threaten or subvert their neighbors, and that they should live up to the promises they made to the OAS in 1979 to adopt a pluralistic, representative government.

The problem is how we should accomplish these objectives. That is where the failure is. The administration has yet to produce a policy which enjoys sufficient support of the American people and the Congress to make it sustainable. Today, a joint resolution which is sponsored by Senators BENTSEN, BOREN, JOHNSTON and myself that can help develop such a policy. If this is adopted, it will permit the President to conduct a foreign policy with the knowledge that it enjoys sufficient support in the Congress and the American people. It could be easily carried forward into fiscal year 1986, thus avoiding another floor fight in a few weeks.

Let me turn to my proposal.

Aid to the Contras must be only part of a regionwide strategy to deal with the challenges we face.

No one should have any doubt about those challenges. We face the struggle between brave men and women fighting for democracy and a better life on one side and, on the other side, the enemies of freedom both of the left and right. And no one should have any doubt about where American stands in that conflict. We stand with the forces of democracy.

We have stood with the democratic center in El Salvador and in Nicaragua, we must stand with the democratic resistance. There has been much rhetoric about the Contras. The President has suggested that they are just like our Founding Fathers. Others regard them as right-wing terrorists. I believe the President overstates the case, but the facts are that genuine democrats, men like Arturo Cruz, who were imprisoned by Somoza and were early supporters of the Sandinistas, now believe that the Contras offer the true path of democracy. Because men like Cruz are the leaders of the Contras, it is our obligation to help them.

In my judgment, we must design a policy that continues pressure on the Sandinistas but moves American promotion of military action to the back burner.

Our policy must avoid the "Lebanon syndrome" in which the President and Congress established arbitrary and unrealistic time limits to complex foreign policy goals.

The American people must believe that all avenues of diplomatic, economic, political pressure have been exhausted if there is to be any lasting support for military-related options. That is not the case today. Right or wrong, the American people perceive that the military option through the Contras has been on the front burner and is the President's course of first resort.

The challenge is to move the military option to the back burner but keep it on the stove.

The proposal we are introducing today would achieve these objectives.

Let me explain the principal elements of this joint resolution.

First, it releases the \$14 million fenced last year, but limits use of those funds only for humanitarian assistance which is defined as food, clothing, medicine, and other humanitarian assistance. It does not include any weapons, weapons systems or ammunition.

Second, it urges the President to vigorously pursue diplomatic and economic steps including negotiations to implement the Contadora objectives, and to develop trade and economic measures to pressure the Government of Nicaragua, including an embargo carried out by the United States and our allies. The President is also urged to suspend military maneuvers in Honduras and off Nicaragua's coast if the Government of Nicaragua agrees to a cease-fire, opens a dialog with the democratic resistance and suspends the state of emergency. Finally, the President is urged to call upon the democratic resistance to remove from their ranks any individuals who have engaged in serious human rights abuses, and the President is urged to resume the bilateral discussions between the United States and the Government of Nicaragua.

Third, the President is required to report to Congress every 90 days and, fourth, if he determines that negotiations based on the Contadora principles or the other economic and diplomatic steps have failed to resolve the conflict, the President may return to Congress to request additional assistance for the resistance forces. Expedited procedures are set out for the consideration of that request.

This resolution incorporates elements from the major proposals that were considered last week, including the resolution favored by the administration, the one advanced by Senator BYRD on behalf of several democrats and the recommended economic sanctions suggested by Senator BENTSEN and myself. Finally, it does not include the language of Senate Joint Resolu-

tion 106—to which many Senators objected—that would have authorized "supporting, directly or indirectly, military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua."

I am hopeful, therefore, that this resolution will enjoy broad bipartisan support.

This approach is a regional approach. All parties are required to do certain things. The Sandinistas are required to do only what they have already promised to do. The democratic resistance is obligated to insure that it is a truly democratic movement by purging from their ranks individuals who are responsible for human rights abuses. The United States must pursue bilateral negotiations with the Sandinistas and be prepared to suspend maneuvers if the Sandinistas take the steps that I have mentioned.

This approach calls the Sandinistas' hand. They say they are democratic. I say OK, let them prove it. This humanitarian aid will sustain the democratic resistance; it will keep the flame of liberty and hope alive.

Moreover, humanitarian aid instead of military aid should facilitate negotiations both within the Contadora framework and between the United States and the Sandinistas. Humanitarian aid will also serve as an indication of good faith on the part of the United States that we favor a negotiated settlement rather than a military overthrow. Finally, it permits the aid to be used as a lever to pursue our objectives.

This resolution puts military aid in the background but leaves the military option open. If the President concludes that the economic and diplomatic paths fail he may come back to Congress and request additional assistance. If he has made a good faith effort to exhaust these courses and if the Sandinistas do not modify their behavior, then the President's request for additional assistance will meet a very different reception in the Congress.

Mr. President, this resolution is designed to develop a long-term course, one that can enjoy broad bipartisan support and provide the President the basis to conduct a coherent, sustainable foreign policy. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

S.J. RES. 129

Whereas the Organization of American States on June 23, 1979, called for the installation of a democratic government in Nicaragua; and

Whereas the Sandinista government of Nicaragua committed itself to a system of democracy, justice and social progress in a program transmitted to the Secretary Gen-

eral of the Organization of American States on July 12, 1979, and reaffirmed that commitment by subscribing to the Contadora Document of Objectives of September 9, 1983, which calls for respect for human rights, democratic systems of government and national reconciliation, as integral aspects of a peaceful solution to the conflict in Central America; and

Whereas the Sandinista government of Nicaragua, in disregard of these commitments, has embarked upon policies of alignment with the Soviet Union and Cuba, support for the subversion of the governments of neighboring countries, a massive military buildup and the suppression of human rights and denial of effective opportunities for popular participation in the decision making process; and

Whereas these policies, which threaten the stability of the region, have led to deep divisions within Nicaragua society, including armed resistance to the Sandinista government; and

Whereas the Nicaraguan bishops on April 22, 1984 called for a dialogue among all Nicaraguans, and reiterated that call on March 22, 1985, in expressing their willingness to mediate in such a dialogue; and

Whereas a broadly based group of democratic resistance leaders on March 1, 1985, proposed a dialogue with the Sandinista government under the mediation of the Nicaraguan Bishops Conference and offered a ceasefire; and

Whereas, the President has expressed his intention to reopen bilateral talks with the Government of Nicaragua; and

Whereas the United States is one of the largest trading partners of Nicaragua; and

Whereas Congress believes that the United States should undertake a full faith effort to use economic and diplomatic pressure on the Sandinistas and that military solutions should be considered only as a last resort; and

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the prohibitions, conditions and limitations contained in section 8066 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-473), and in section 801 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1985 (Public Law 98-618) shall cease to apply upon enactment of this joint resolution, subject to the provisions of Section 2.

SECTION 2. The \$14,000,000 made available by the enactment of this joint resolution may be obligated only for humanitarian assistance. The President shall provide for independent monitoring of the use of such funds by the National Security Council. Nothing herein shall be deemed to impair in any way the oversight powers of the Congress.

SECTION 3. Be it further resolved the President of the United States is urged—

(a) to vigorously pursue the use of diplomatic and economic steps to resolve the conflict in Nicaragua, including negotiations to:

1. implement the Contadora Document of Objectives of September 8, 1983, and, at the same time,

2. develop trade and economic measures in close consultation and cooperation with other nations which will encourage the Government of Nicaragua to take the necessary steps to resolve the conflict, including:

(i) a total boycott and embargo of United States trade with Nicaragua;

(ii) a call upon the Organization of American States or the other states of Central America, or both, to institute a total trade boycott and embargo of Nicaragua;

(iii) a call upon the other countries of the free world not to trade with Nicaragua.

(b) to suspend military maneuvers in Honduras and off Nicaragua's coast if the Government of Nicaragua agrees: to a cease fire, to open a dialogue with the democratic resistance, and to suspend the state of emergency.

(c) to call upon the democratic resistance in Nicaragua to remove from their ranks any individuals who have engaged in serious human rights abuses.

(d) to resume bilateral discussions with the Government of Nicaragua with a view to encouraging—

1. a church-mediated dialogue between the Government of Nicaragua and the democratic resistance, in support of internal reconciliation as called for by the Contadora Document of Objectives; and

2. a comprehensive, verifiable agreement among the nations of Central America, based on the Contadora Document of Objectives.

SECTION 4. The President shall submit a report to the Congress every 90 days on any activity carried out under this resolution. Such report shall include a report on the progress of efforts to reach a negotiated settlement as set forth in section 3, a detailed accounting of the disbursement of humanitarian assistance, and steps taken by the democratic resistance as described in section 3.c.

SECTION 5. As used in this resolution, the term humanitarian assistance means the provision of food, clothing, medicine, and other humanitarian assistance. It does not include any weapons, weapons systems, ammunition, or any other equipment or material which can be used to inflict serious bodily harm or death.

SECTION 6. At any point after the enactment of this resolution, if the President determines that negotiations based on the Contadora principles of September 9, 1983 have failed to produce an agreement, or if other trade and economic measures have failed to resolve the conflict, the President may request the Congress to authorize additional assistance for the democratic resistance, in such amount and of such a nature as he deems appropriate. The President's request shall include a detailed statement as to why the negotiations or other measures have failed to resolve the conflict in the region.

SECTION 7. (a) A joint resolution which is introduced within 3 calendar days after the Congress receives a Presidential request described in Section 6 and which, if enacted, would grant the President the authority to take any or all of the actions described in Section 6 shall be considered in accordance with procedures contained in Section 8066 of Public Law 98-473: Provided, however, that—

(i) References in that Section to the Committee on Appropriations of each House shall be deemed to be references to the appropriate committee or committees of each House; and

(ii) Amendments to the joint resolution are in order.

(b) This Section is enacted by Congress as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a resolution described in subsection (a), and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(c) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as related to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

● Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, a week ago today, the Members of this body considered a program designed to convince the Sandinistas to live up to promises made when they assumed power in 1979. The Senate voted in favor of this program, expressing its clear, collective opinion that activities of the Government of Nicaragua are not in the best interests of the other countries of Central America and are a threat to the peace of the region and the long-term security of this hemisphere.

The resolution that the Senate adopted that night was conditioned upon promises made by the President of the United States in a letter to the majority leader of this body. Some Members argued that more than a letter should be required on this issue, that indeed we needed a definite, limited, and statutory provision. The resolution that I join in introducing today with my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] is designed to allay those fears and to indicate to the Government of Nicaragua that we are still quite concerned about their actions and that we will not ignore what is happening so close to our own borders.

It is ironic to consider what happened shortly after the Congress took action on the President's request for humanitarian aid for the Contras. Hardly had the voices died out in this Chamber than Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega announced that he was on his way to Moscow to request some \$200 million in direct economic assistance from the Soviet Union.

This is simply additional evidence that the Sandinistas are not the "non-aligned" group that they pretend and profess to be. This only confirms what they have stated in the past: that they are dedicated Marxist-Leninists and that left to their own devices they will consolidate their power in Nicaragua and become another Soviet satellite in the Western Hemisphere.

I believe that we, in the Congress, need to take another look at this issue, and this joint resolution represents an opportunity for this new look. This joint resolution represents a comprehensive approach to the problems posed for us by the behavior of the Government of Nicaragua. It includes the trade sanctions which I proposed in a separate resolution, and it includes humanitarian assistance to enable the democratic resistance forces in Nicaragua to continue their struggle on behalf of the pluralistic society promised by the 1979 revolution. This resolution lets the Sandinistas know that we will continue to apply

pressure on them until they decide to live up to the promises of their own revolution.

Ignoring the issue of Nicaragua will not make it go away. The Sandinistas have not shown any disposition to reduce the level of their military buildup nor to stop supporting the regional insurgencies that are attempting to overthrow their neighbors nor to send home the Soviet bloc and Cuba military advisers who are so much in evidence in Managua. They are only going to change their behavior when they become convinced that it is in their best interests to do so. This joint resolution is a step in that direction. ●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 5

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] was added as a cosponsor of S. 5, a bill to require the executive branch to enforce applicable equal employment opportunity laws and directives so as to promote pay equity by eliminating wage-setting practices which discriminate on the basis of sex, race, ethnicity, age, or disability and result in discriminatory wage differentials.

S. 361

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTEN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 361, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make permanent the deduction for charitable contributions by nonitemizers.

S. 408

At the request of Mr. WEICKER, the name of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 408, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide program levels, salary and expense levels, and authorizations for the Small Business Administration's programs for fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988, and for other purposes.

S. 415

At the request of Mr. WEICKER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 415, a bill to amend the Education of the Handicapped Act to authorize the award of reasonable attorneys' fees to certain prevailing parties, and to clarify the effect of the Education of the Handicapped Act on rights, procedures, and remedies under other laws relating to the prohibition of discrimination.

S. 434

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 434, a bill to extend the authorization of the Robert A. Taft Institute Assistance Act.

S. 625

At the request of Mrs. HAWKINS, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 625, a bill to include the offenses relating to sexual exploitation of children under the provisions of RICO and authorize civil suits on behalf of victims of child pornography and prostitution.

S. 680

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 680, a bill to achieve the objectives of the Multi-Fiber Arrangement and to promote the economic recovery of the U.S. textile and apparel industry and its workers.

S. 725

At the request of Mr. BENTSEN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 725, a bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Endangered Species Act of 1973 during fiscal years 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990.

S. 729

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ARMSTRONG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 729, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make permanent the rules relating to imputed interest and assumption of loans, and for other purposes.

S. 765

At the request of Mr. KASTEN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] were added as cosponsors of S. 765, a bill to provide for coordinated management and rehabilitation of the Great Lakes and for other purposes.

S. 885

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 885, a bill to establish a moratorium during the fiscal years 1985 and 1986 on the testing of anti-satellite weapons against objects in space.

S. 908

At the request of Mr. McCONNELL, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] was added as a cosponsor of S. 908, a bill to provide market expansion and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and for other purposes.

S. 965

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DeCONCINI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 965, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to remove an inequity in the Veterans' Administration program to provide assistance to certain disabled veterans in acquiring specially adapted residences.

S. 978

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. GARN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 978, a bill to designate the building known as the Federal Building in Salt Lake City, Utah as the "Wallace F. Bennett Federal Building."

S. 1005

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1005, a bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to modify the provisions of such act prescribing the minimum wages to be paid laborers, mechanics, and helpers employed on public construction projects, and for other purposes.

S. 1018

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1018, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to clarify the meaning of the term "guard" for the purpose of permitting certain labor organizations to be certified by the National Labor Relations Board as representatives of employees other than plant guards.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 46

At the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA, the names of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 46, joint resolution relating to NASA and cooperative Mars exploration.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 78

At the request of Mr. SYMMS, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 78, joint resolution to provide for the designation of June 10 through 16, as "National Scleroderma Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 83

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 83, joint resolution designating the week beginning on May 5, 1985, as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 87

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 87, joint resolution to provide for the designation of July 19, 1985, as "National POW/MIA Recognition Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 92

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the names of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 92, joint resolution to designate October 1985 as

"National Foster Grandparents Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 107

At the request of Mrs. HAWKINS, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 107, joint resolution to designate the month of May, 1985 as "Older Americans Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 116

At the request of Mr. BYRD, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 116, joint resolution to assure the cost of living adjustments for Social Security recipients.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 118

At the request of Mrs. HAWKINS, the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. DENTON] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 118, joint resolution to designate May 25, 1985, as "Missing Children Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 123

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and the Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 123, joint resolution to designate Dr. Jonas Salk Day.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 124

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 124, joint resolution to designate "National Day of Peace."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 125

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ZORINSKY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 125, joint resolution designating the week of June 23, 1985, through June 29, 1985, as "Helen Keller Deaf-Blind Awareness Week."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 20

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that payments by the Veterans' Administration to veterans as compensation for service-connected disabilities should remain exempt from Federal income taxation.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 28

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 28, concurrent resolution expressing the

sense of the Congress that May 18, 1985, should be commemorated as the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Head Start Program and reaffirming congressional support for the Head Start Program.

SENATE RESOLUTION 130

At the request of Mr. Wallop, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 130, resolution relative to the Sport Fish Restoration Trust Fund.

SENATE RESOLUTION 134

At the request of Mr. Byrd, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 134, resolution to assure the cost of living adjustments for Social Security recipients.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 46—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING AMERICANS MISSING IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. ANDREWS submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 46

Whereas the President has declared the issue of 2,483 Americans missing and unaccounted for in Indochina a matter of highest national priority and has initiated high level dialogue on this issue with the Governments of the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas the Congress, on a bipartisan basis, fully supports these initiatives to determine the fate of Americans still missing in Indochina and realizes that the fullest possible accounting can only be achieved with the cooperation of the Indochinese governments; and

Whereas the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam has pledged to accelerate efforts to cooperate with the United States Government in resolving this humanitarian issue, separate from other issues dividing our two countries, and the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic has taken some positive actions to assist the United States Government in resolving the status of missing Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should—

(1) ensure that officials of the United States Government consciously and fully carry out his pledge of highest national priority to resolve the issue of 2,483 Americans still missing and unaccounted for in Indochina;

(2) work for the immediate release of any Americans who may still be held captive in Indochina and for the immediate return of all American servicemen and civilians who have died in Southeast Asia whose remains have not been returned; and

(3) make every effort to secure the further cooperation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in resolving this humanitarian issue of fundamental importance.

SEC. 2. The Congress calls on the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to fulfill their pledge to accelerate cooperation with the United States in achieving the fullest possible accounting for Americans missing or unaccounted for in Indochina.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I speak today as sponsor of a concurrent resolution regarding Americans still missing and unaccounted for in Southeast Asia. Today is particularly significant in the life of the Nation, because it marks the 10th anniversary of the U.S. departure from Saigon. The truth is, Mr. President, the United States really did not depart Vietnam because, as we are all aware, there are nearly 2,500 Americans still missing and unaccounted for in Indochina. President Reagan has assigned the highest national priority to the effort to obtain the fullest possible accounting of these missing Americans and he has pledged his full resources for this report.

Mr. President, my concurrent resolution simply reaffirms the President's commitment to our POW/MIA's and reinforces congressional priorities for our POW/MIA's; namely, to bring home any Americans who remain in captivity; to have the fullest possible accounting of the missing; and to return the remains of those who died in Indochina home to us in the United States.

Mr. President, in 1984, six North Dakota servicemen listed as POW/MIA's in Southeast Asia were honored with a special congressional medal presented to their families at Grand Forks Air Force Base. All of those still unaccounted for in Southeast Asia deserve far more than medals. For they are true American heroes who have performed above and beyond the call of duty for their country. Mr. President, they are the giants in whose shadow all Americans stand.

Mr. President, the State Department has indicated that Vietnam and Laos have agreed to cooperate in accounting for the missing in their countries. We applaud that pledge of cooperation. But we also recognize how painfully slow that process will be. Therefore, the United States must continue to press Vietnam and Laos to proceed with all deliberate speed with their accounting. This concurrent resolution urges them to do just that.

Mr. President, our great American poet Carl Sandburg wrote that "Valor is a gift. Those having it never know for sure whether they have it till the test comes." The test has come for almost 2,500 Americans. And if indeed valor is a gift, it is one that has been given to all Americans by these brave individuals.

We have not forgotten their ongoing sacrifice and we will never forget our debt to them.

SENATE RESOLUTION 151—REGARDING THE BONN ECONOMIC SUMMIT

Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. MOYNIHAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 151

Whereas the President's Council of Economic Advisers has reported that the real rate of exchange of the dollar increased by almost 60 percent between 1980 and 1984;

Whereas the Congressional Budget Office and the President's Council of Economic Advisers have stated that the large budget deficit has been a major cause of the high interest rates which they report have been a major cause of this increase in the real rate of exchange of the dollar;

Whereas this overvaluation of the dollar acts as a tax on American exports and a subsidy for foreign imports;

Whereas this overvaluation has resulted in the loss of an estimated two million American jobs since 1980—approximately 1.5 million of them in the manufacturing sector;

Whereas America's traditional strength in agricultural exports has been seriously eroded by the overvaluation of the dollar, with the result that the President's Council of Economic Advisers estimates that American agricultural exports have declined by about \$8.5 billion from the levels of three years ago;

Whereas currency misalignments, including the overvaluation of the dollar, have led to major competitive dislocations in the United States and world economies and have increased trade tensions between the United States and its trading partners; and

Whereas those critical currency issues have been largely ignored in the Administration's approach to international discussions of economic and trade policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that a decrease in the Federal deficit is a necessary but not a sufficient condition to bring down the value of the dollar and that the President should at the Bonn Summit initiate a preliminary discussion on the problem of currency misalignments, exchange rate volatility, and possible cooperative approaches to these problems.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

FIRST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

DOLE (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 44

Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GARN, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HECHT, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MATTINGLY, Mr. McCLURE, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. ROTH, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. WALLOP, and Mr. WARNER), proposed an amendment to amendment No. 43 proposed by them

to the instructions to recommit the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988 and revising the congressional budget for the fiscal year 1985, as follows:

In the pending amendment, do the following:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

On page 2, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$736,200,000,000".

On page 2, line 9, strike the figure and insert "\$793,600,000,000".

On page 2, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$866,300,000,000".

On page 2, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$955,900,000,000".

On page 2, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 2, line 15, strike the figure and insert "\$900,000,000".

On page 2, line 16, strike the figure and insert "\$2,000,000,000".

On page 2, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$3,400,000,000".

On page 2, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$44,800,000,000".

On page 2, line 22, strike the figure and insert "\$51,000,000,000".

On page 2, line 23, strike the figure and insert "\$56,100,000,000".

On page 2, line 24, strike the figure and insert "\$61,300,000,000".

On page 3, line 5, strike the figure and insert "\$186,200,000,000".

On page 3, line 6, strike the figure and insert "\$200,700,000,000".

On page 3, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$216,900,000,000".

On page 3, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$248,300,000,000".

On page 3, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$1,055,600,000,000".

On page 3, line 12, strike the figure and insert "\$1,076,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 13, strike the figure and insert "\$1,139,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$1,216,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$949,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 18, strike the figure and insert "\$969,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$1,013,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 20, strike the figure and insert "\$1,055,700,000,000".

On page 3, line 24, strike the figure and insert "\$212,900,000,000".

On page 3, line 25, strike the figure and insert "\$175,400,000,000".

On page 4, line 1, strike the figure and insert "\$146,800,000,000".

On page 4, line 2, strike the figure and insert "\$99,800,000,000".

On page 4, line 5, strike the figure and insert "\$1,849,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 6, strike the figure and insert "\$2,088,000,000".

On page 4, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$2,316,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$2,529,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$25,500,000,000".

On page 4, line 12, strike the figure and insert "\$238,700,000,000".

On page 4, line 13, strike the figure and insert "\$228,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$213,100,000,000".

On page 4, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$52,900,000,000".

On page 4, line 23, strike the figure and insert "\$69,200,000,000".

On page 4, line 25, strike the figure and insert "\$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 3, strike the figure and insert "\$30,000,000,000".

On page 5, line 5, strike the figure and insert "\$74,500,000,000".

On page 5, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$27,400,000,000".

On page 5, line 12, strike the figure and insert "\$74,400,000,000".

On page 5, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$25,600,000,000".

On page 5, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$79,000,000,000".

On page 5, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$68,200,000,000".

On page 6, line 6, strike the figure and insert "\$292,600,000,000".

On page 6, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$252,000,000,000".

On page 6, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 6, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 6, line 12, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 6, line 15, strike the figure and insert "\$312,800,000,000".

On page 6, line 16, strike the figure and insert "\$276,100,000,000".

On page 6, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 6, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 6, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 6, line 24, strike the figure and insert "\$334,900,000,000".

On page 6, line 25, strike the figure and insert "\$298,400,000,000".

On page 7, line 1, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 7, line 3, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 7, line 5, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 7, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$359,600,000,000".

On page 7, line 9, strike the figure and insert "\$321,400,000,000".

On page 7, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 7, line 12, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 7, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 7, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$25,300,000,000".

On page 7, line 18, strike the figure and insert "\$18,000,000,000".

On page 7, line 20, strike the figure and insert "\$11,500,000,000".

On page 7, line 22, strike the figure and insert "\$10,300,000,000".

On page 7, line 24, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 8, line 1, strike the figure and insert "\$21,000,000,000".

On page 8, line 2, strike the figure and insert "\$17,800,000,000".

On page 8, line 4, strike the figure and insert "\$8,200,000,000".

On page 8, line 6, strike the figure and insert "\$12,300,000,000".

On page 8, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 35, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 35, line 23, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 36, line 2, strike the figure and insert "\$37,800,000,000".

On page 36, line 3, strike the figure and insert "\$37,800,000,000".

On page 36, line 4, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 36, line 6, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 36, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 36, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$41,100,000,000".

On page 36, line 12, strike the figure and insert "\$41,100,000,000".

On page 36, line 13, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 36, line 15, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 36, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 36, line 19, strike the date and insert "June 30, 1985".

On page 37, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "\$3,899,000,000".

On page 37, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "\$4,610,000,000".

On page 37, line 12, strike the figure and insert "\$3,773,000,000".

On page 37, line 13, strike the figure and insert "\$6,540,000,000".

On page 37, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "\$4,258,000,000".

On page 37, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "\$10,326,000,000".

On page 37, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "\$0".

On page 37, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "\$376,000,000".

On page 37, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 37, line 22, strike the figure and insert "\$894,000,000".

On page 37, line 23, strike the first figure and insert "\$0".

On page 37, line 23, strike the second figure and insert "\$1,424,000,000".

On page 38, line 10, strike the first figure and insert "\$10,122,000,000".

On page 38, line 10, strike the second figure and insert "\$4,213,000,000".

On page 38, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$11,353,000,000".

On page 38, line 12, strike the figure and insert "\$7,416,000,000".

On page 38, line 13, strike the figure and insert "\$12,509,000,000".

On page 38, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$9,566,000,000".

On page 38, line 24, strike the first figure and insert "\$2,622,000,000".

On page 38, line 24, strike the second figure and insert "\$2,216,000,000".

On page 38, line 25, strike the figure and insert "\$1,416,000,000".

On page 39, line 1, strike the figure and insert "\$1,077,000,000".

On page 39, line 2, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,633,000,000".

On page 39, line 2, strike the second figure and insert "\$1,368,000,000".

On page 39, line 13, strike the first figure and insert "\$2,962,000,000".

On page 39, line 13, strike the second figure and insert "\$2,253,000,000".

On page 39, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$2,723,000,000".

On page 39, line 15, strike the figure and insert "\$2,579,000,000".

On page 39, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "\$2,720,000,000".

On page 39, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "\$2,814,000,000".

On page 40, line 2, strike the first figure and insert "\$719,000,000".

On page 40, line 2, strike the second figure and insert "\$306,000,000".

On page 40, line 3, strike the figure and insert "\$1,208,000,000".

On page 40, line 4, strike the figure and insert "\$1,451,000,000".

On page 40, line 5, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,720,000,000".

On page 40, line 5, strike the second figure and insert "\$2,112,000,000".

On page 40, line 15, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 40, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "\$8,117,000,000".

On page 40, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "\$0".

On page 40, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$18,934,000,000".

On page 40, line 18, strike the first figure and insert "\$0".

On page 40, line 18, strike the second figure and insert "\$28,137,000,000".

On page 41, line 3, strike the figure and insert "\$192,000,000".

On page 41, line 4, strike the figure and insert "\$47,000,000".

On page 41, line 5, strike the first figure and insert "\$275,000,000".

On page 41, line 5, strike the second figure and insert "\$109,000,000".

On page 41, line 6, strike the figure and insert "\$282,000,000".

On page 41, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$140,000,000".

On page 41, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "\$375,000,000".

On page 41, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "\$0".

On page 41, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$3,101,000,000".

On page 41, line 18, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,325,000,000".

On page 41, line 18, strike the second figure and insert "\$0".

On page 41, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$7,332,000,000".

On page 41, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,370,000,000".

On page 41, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "\$0".

On page 41, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$9,097,000,000".

On page 42, line 6, strike the first figure and insert "\$3,404,000,000".

On page 42, line 6, strike the second figure and insert "\$1,299,000,000".

On page 42, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$3,826,000,000".

On page 42, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$3,446,000,000".

On page 42, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "\$4,291,000,000".

On page 42, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "\$4,231,000,000".

On page 42, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$882,000,000".

On page 42, line 20, strike the figure and insert "\$1,258,000,000".

On page 42, line 21, strike the first figure and insert "\$2,034,000,000".

On page 42, line 21, strike the second figure and insert "\$2,101,000,000".

On page 42, line 22, strike the figure and insert "\$2,594,000,000".

On page 42, line 23, strike the figure and insert "\$2,275,000,000".

On page 43, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$858,000,000".

On page 43, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$791,000,000".

On page 43, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,332,000,000".

On page 43, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "\$1,496,000,000".

On page 43, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$1,725,000,000".

On page 43, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$1,987,000,000".

On page 43, line 20, strike the figure and insert "\$192,000,000".

On page 43, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$87,000,000".

On page 43, line 22, strike the first figure and insert "\$201,000,000".

On page 43, line 22, strike the second figure and insert "\$151,000,000".

On page 43, line 23, strike the figure and insert "\$211,000,000".

On page 43, line 24, strike the figure and insert "\$181,000,000".

On page 44, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$3,899,000,000".

On page 44, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$4,610,000,000".

On page 44, line 12, strike the first figure and insert "\$3,773,000,000".

On page 44, line 12, strike the second figure and insert "\$6,540,000,000".

On page 44, line 13, strike the figure and insert "\$4,258,000,000".

On page 44, line 14, strike the figure and insert "\$10,326,000,000".

On page 44, line 19, strike the first figure and insert "\$0".

On page 44, line 19, strike the second figure and insert "\$376,000,000".

On page 44, line 20, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 44, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$894,000,000".

On page 44, line 22, strike the first figure and insert "\$0".

On page 44, line 22, strike the second figure and insert "\$1,424,000,000".

On page 45, line 8, strike the first figure and insert "\$9,159,000,000".

On page 45, line 8, strike the second figure and insert "\$4,028,000,000".

On page 45, line 9, strike the figure and insert "\$9,730,000,000".

On page 45, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$6,870,000,000".

On page 45, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "\$10,379,000,000".

On page 45, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "\$8,550,000,000".

On page 45, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$2,838,000,000".

On page 45, line 22, strike the figure and insert "\$1,316,000,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike the first figure and insert "\$3,183,000,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike the second figure and insert "\$3,202,000,000".

On page 45, line 24, strike the figure and insert "\$3,549,000,000".

On page 45, line 25, strike the figure and insert "\$3,865,000,000".

On page 46, line 9, strike the figure and insert "\$5,188,000,000".

On page 46, line 10, strike the figure and insert "\$8,187,000,000".

On page 46, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "\$3,871,000,000".

On page 46, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "\$10,159,000,000".

On page 46, line 12, strike the figure and insert "\$3,958,000,000".

On page 46, line 13, strike the figure and insert "\$13,539,000,000".

On page 46, line 23, strike the figure and insert "\$192,000,000".

On page 46, line 24, strike the figure and insert "\$47,000,000".

On page 46, line 25, strike the first figure and insert "\$275,000,000".

On page 46, line 25, strike the second figure and insert "\$109,000,000".

On page 47, line 1, strike the figure and insert "\$282,000,000".

On page 47, line 2, strike the figure and insert "\$140,000,000".

On page 47, line 11, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 47, line 12, strike the first figure and insert "\$64,000,000".

On page 47, line 12, strike the second figure and insert "\$0".

On page 47, line 13, strike the figure and insert "\$3,699,000,000".

On page 47, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "\$0".

On page 47, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "\$5,203,000,000".

On page 47, line 25, strike the first figure and insert "\$540,000,000".

On page 47, line 25, strike the second figure and insert "\$292,000,000".

On page 48, line 1, strike the figure and insert "\$559,000,000".

On page 48, line 2, strike the figure and insert "\$402,000,000".

On page 48, line 3, strike the first figure and insert "\$634,000,000".

On page 48, line 3, strike the second figure and insert "\$526,000,000".

On page 48, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "\$401,000,000".

On page 48, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "\$379,000,000".

On page 48, line 15, strike the figure and insert "\$293,000,000".

On page 48, line 16, strike the figure and insert "\$352,000,000".

On page 48, line 17, strike the first figure and insert "\$394,000,000".

On page 48, line 17, strike the second figure and insert "\$450,000,000".

On page 49, line 2, strike the figure and insert "\$375,000,000".

On page 49, line 3, strike the first figure and insert "\$0".

On page 49, line 3, strike the second figure and insert "\$3,037,000,000".

On page 49, line 4, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,325,000,000".

On page 49, line 4, strike the second figure and insert "\$0".

On page 49, line 5, strike the figure and insert "\$7,183,000,000".

On page 49, line 6, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,370,000,000".

On page 49, line 6, strike the second figure and insert "\$0".

On page 49, line 7, strike the figure and insert "\$8,850,000,000".

On page 49, line 17, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,895,000,000".

On page 49, line 17, strike the second figure and insert "\$469,000,000".

On page 49, line 18, strike the figure and insert "\$3,091,000,000".

On page 49, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$1,950,000,000".

On page 49, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "\$4,170,000,000".

On page 49, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "\$3,161,000,000".

On page 50, line 5, strike the figure and insert "\$882,000,000".

On page 50, line 6, strike the figure and insert "\$1,258,000,000".

On page 50, line 7, strike the first figure and insert "\$2,034,000,000".

On page 50, line 7, strike the second figure and insert "\$2,101,000,000".

On page 50, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$2,594,000,000".

On page 50, line 9, strike the figure and insert "\$2,275,000,000".

On page 50, line 18, strike the figure and insert "\$858,000,000".

On page 50, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$791,000,000".

On page 50, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "\$1,332,000,000".

On page 50, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "\$1,496,000,000".

On page 50, line 21, strike the figure and insert "\$1,725,000,000".

On page 50, line 22, strike the figure and insert "\$1,987,000,000".

On page 51, line 6, strike the figure and insert "\$0".

On page 51, line 7, strike the first figure and insert "\$7,600,000,000".

On page 51, line 7, strike the second figure and insert "\$0".

On page 51, line 8, strike the figure and insert "\$14,456,000,000".

On page 51, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "\$0".

On page 51, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "\$21,809,000,000".

On page 51, line 17, strike the figure and insert "\$313,500,000,000".

On page 51, line 19, strike the figure and insert "\$335,600,000,000".

On page 51, line 20, strike the figure and insert "\$360,400,000,000".

On page 52, line 1, strike the figure and insert "\$136,700,000,000".

On page 52, line 3, strike the figure and insert "\$138,200,000,000".

On page 52, line 4, strike the figure and insert "\$143,100,000,000".

On page 54, line 20, strike the figure and insert "\$8".

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 21, 1985]

GORBACHEV WARMS UP TO MORE TALKS

(By Dan Rostenkowski)

The first signs of spring were appearing in Moscow as Soviet General Secretary Mikhail S. Gorbachev met with the congressional delegation I was a part of.

"The ice has started to move," he said, referring more to the relationship between our two countries than the weather. He spent nearly four hours developing this theme. By the time we were done, he'd convinced me that he was trying to encourage a further thaw.

His tone was conversational rather than confrontational. But he didn't waste much time on idle chatter. He had a clear agenda in front of him, with the key points underlined in red, yellow or green ink.

He showed no signs of interest in reforming the Soviet system to help advance the peace process. Instead, he said, each side should mind its internal business and not meddle in the affairs of the other. He doesn't want to change our ways and doesn't think we should try to change theirs. Immigration policy, he said, was one such issue.

Gorbachev suggested that political leaders in both our nations had a common interest in holding down military expenditures, while military men in both lobbied to increase them.

Perhaps, he said, the differences were greater between the military and civilian leaders on each side than between the governments of our two nations.

He was disappointed that President Reagan had rejected his suggestion of a military-spending freeze, but it wasn't threatening. Gorbachev has apparently given a lot of thought to how to deal with our president. He said he's read a study called "America in the Eighties." It was prepared for the president and it's about 600 pages long. I haven't read it yet.

Clearly, he was using us to send a simple message—he wants to talk with Americans more. He encouraged us to ask Americans to listen to what he's saying instead of reflexively rejecting it. Gorbachev said easing international tensions is a priority. He's concluded that the United States and the U.S.S.R. continue to be adversaries in many areas, but that doesn't mean we must be enemies.

America has made a mistake in trying to use economic sanctions to change Soviet behavior, Gorbachev said. Such moves just don't work and may backfire. The American firms involved lose the business. Foreign firms enjoy new opportunities to sell to the Soviets and the Soviets become just that much more determined to go their way with a minimal reliance on the United States.

He didn't directly address the several points of friction in the world like Central America and Afghanistan. Nor did he complain about American actions in other parts of the world.

He did spend quite a bit of time criticizing the Reagan "star wars" proposal, though. At one point he referred to a remark by Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger made in defending the space initiative: "If the Russians create such a defense system, our world would be more dangerous," Gorbachev quoted Weinberger.

"Why is it dangerous if we do it, and not if you do it?" he asked. None of us attempted to answer. We were there to listen and engage in a friendly exchange. No one wanted to pick a fight.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the distinguished leaders of the House of Representatives is a Congressman from Illinois, DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, who has shown a firmness in leadership in the revenue field that I applaud.

He was one of those in Speaker O'NEILL's delegation who met with Soviet General Secretary Mikhail S. Gorbachev.

His observations, which were printed in the Chicago Sun-Times, will be of interest to my colleagues in both the House and the Senate who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The encouraging side of Congressman ROSTENKOWSKI's observations is that Gorbachev was on top of the issues and was an effective communicator. That makes reconciliation more possible, but it also means we have a tough adversary.

Congressman ROSTENKOWSKI's call for more communication between our nations is a sound suggestion. I urge my colleagues to read the article.

Mr. President, I ask that the ROSTENKOWSKI observations be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

What did I learn from our extensive conversation? Did Gorbachev mean everything he said? I don't know. I hope so.

I was convinced that he is a very effective communicator. He has a good grasp of the issues that divide our nations. He has mastered the rhetoric of reconciliation.

I got the feeling he'd like to visit the United States. I think he should. Reagan should probably visit the Soviet Union, too. That way the people of our two nations could make their own decisions about the challenges we face and how we can best respond to them.

Gorbachev called for more communication between our two nations. Based on what I learned in our conversation, that is one Soviet initiative I can endorse without qualification. ●

U.S. REFUGEE POLICY

● Mr. SPECTER. I submit for the RECORD my statement before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy. I also submit for the RECORD the witness list for the hearing on Extended Voluntary Departure Issues on Monday, April 22, 1985, along with my question for INS commissioner Nelson and Assistant Secretary of State Elliot Abrams and accompanying correspondence.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER BEFORE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE POLICY

At the outset, I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding these important hearings at my request. You have an impressive list of witnesses and I commend your efforts to deal with these troubling issues of U.S. refugee policy and procedures, particularly those raised by the arrests in January of some 60 aliens across the country in an effort to crack down on the Sanctuary movement.

I was in Philadelphia on January 14, 1985, when a Guatemalan family—Mr. and Mrs. Morelos and their three-year-old child—were arrested and taken into custody by the Immigration and Naturalization Service as part of this nationwide crackdown.

According to information provided to me, a warrant of arrest was issued for the husband and wife, Mr. and Mrs. Morelos, on grounds of illegal entry. The wife and three-year-old child were then taken into custody. Later, Mr. Morelos surrendered to Immigration and Naturalization authorities when he found out that his wife and children were in custody.

On the facts as presented to me, Mr. Morelos had a valid claim for asylum on the basis of a well-founded fear of persecution based on his prior political activities and expression of political opinions in Guatemala. Mr. Morelos' contention of torture was corroborated by scars which I personally observed on his body.

When I discussed this case with an INS agent in Philadelphia, I was advised that a warrant of arrest was issued because Mr. Morelos had not made an application for asylum.

In my judgment, a law enforcement agency like INS should not issue a warrant of arrest for a person until an investigation discloses a violation of law without a valid defense. As District Attorney of Philadelphia, I made it a stringent rule to inquire as to the surrounding circumstances to find out about potential defenses before obtaining warrants of arrest or taking people into custody.

As a matter of fundamental fairness, it is my opinion that the Government of the United States should not take people into custody unless there is a valid basis for doing so after a thorough investigation including potential defenses. It seems to me that it is not sufficient to justify the INS action on the basis that Mr. Morelos had the burden of filing an application for asylum. He is an alien and does not really understand the intricacies of the law; and, if he did, he could hardly be expected to file such an application considering the fact that virtually no such applications are granted and the filing itself would doubtless activate an enforcement proceeding against him.

The action of the Immigration and Naturalization Service was particularly offensive in taking his wife and child into custody. It is an horrendous experience to be arrested and the three-year-old child who was subjected to the arrest will doubtless bear the scars of the incident for many years, to say nothing of the trauma on the mother.

I have written INS Commissioner Alan Nelson urging a review of INS procedures so that legal proceedings are authorized only where an investigation discloses a violation without a valid defense. If legal proceedings are instituted, a summons rather than a warrant of arrest should be used unless there is a valid reason to believe that the person will flee or that bail is realistically necessary to guarantee the appearance of that individual at the next proceeding. In the case of the Morelos family, there was no such reason to be concerned about flight since the Immigration and Naturalization Service had known of their whereabouts since September 1984. In any event, the posting of the \$3,000 in bail by other parties was hardly any guarantee of the appearance of the Morelos family for the next proceeding so that the justification for the warrant of arrest was not at all well-founded.

As to the filing of asylum petitions, I have urged INS to adopt procedures which maintain confidentiality (*in camera* proceedings) so that foreign governments will not know of the contentions of their nationals so as to avoid reprisals and fear of filing such applications.

Beyond these procedures, I have also written Secretary of State George Shultz, along with Commissioner Nelson, about the applicable policies which, as I understand it, lead to only 0.4 percent of Guatemalan applications for asylum having been granted in 1984 and only 2.5 percent of the applications for asylum from Salvadorans having been granted in 1984. In light of the social unrest in those countries and the activism of many of their citizens, it strikes me as a shockingly low figure to have such a small number of applications for asylum granted.

In both letters, I raised the question whether consideration has been given to halting deportations of Guatemalans through a grant of extended voluntary departure or any other procedure. It seems to me that extended voluntary departure would be appropriate for Guatemalans as it has been applied for those who have fled from other countries with such pervasive social unrest affecting so large a segment of the citizens.

On March 14, 1985, I questioned Elliott Abrams, Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, about this remarkably low approval rate in 1984 for asylum applications filed by Salvadorans and Guatemalans, and whether it could reflect and appropriate application of a fair standard. Mr. Abrams suggested that

a GAO study of the asylum process would be "a good idea" and I have requested just such a study.

I would like to submit for the record copies of my letter to GAO Comptroller General Charles A. Bowsher requesting a study of the standards and procedures applied by INS and the State Department when reviewing asylum applications, as well as copies of my letters to Secretary Shultz and Commissioner Nelson, and their responses.

The civil strife in Central America has displaced thousands of inhabitants. In visits to Central America in May and August of 1983, I witnessed first-hand the breakdown of justice in El Salvador, and when I returned I succeeded in getting the Congress to withhold 30% of our aid to that country until the guardsmen charged with the murder of the four churchwomen were tried. In addition, I have seen to it that \$9 million in aid was earmarked for judicial reform in El Salvador so that the rule of law can begin to replace the reign of terror perpetuated by rampant illegal killings.

I am also deeply troubled by reports coming out of Guatemala of the disappearance of two journalists, both from Pennsylvania, while working on a story in that country, and about the murders of a number of members of the Grupode Apoyo Muto, an association of relatives of "disappeared" Guatemalans.

According to figures compiled by the U.S. Embassy, 622 people have been listed as missing since General Ascar Mejia Victores came to power in August 1983 through a coup d'etat. I understand other western embassies say the number is even higher.

It is essential that we treat the displaced victims of the civil strife in Central America fairly and with compassion. I was an original cosponsor of legislation to halt the deportation of Salvadorans pending a study of the circumstances and condition of displaced Salvadorans in Central America and here in the U.S. I have cosponsored this legislation again in the 99th Congress.

Again, I commend you for holding these much needed hearings, and I appreciate the opportunity to testify and to ask questions of Elliott Abrams, Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, and of Commissioner Alan Nelson of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

HEARING ON EXTENDED VOLUNTARY DEPARTURE ISSUES

WITNESS LIST

1. The Honorable Dennis DeConcini.

First panel

2. The Honorable Elliott Abrams, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs.

3. The Honorable Alan C. Nelson, Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Second panel

4. Michael Myers, Washington Representative, Church World Service.

5. Morton Halperin, Acting Director, American Civil Liberties Union.

Third panel

6. Georges Fauriol, Senior Fellow, Center for Strategic and International Studies.

7. Lynn Bouchev, Chairman, Council for Inter-American Security.

Afternoon panel

1. The Honorable Arlen Specter.

2. The Honorable Alan Nelson, Commissioner, accompanied by Maurice Inman, General Counsel, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

3. The Honorable Elliott Abrams, Assistant Secretary of State.

QUESTION FOR BOTH COMMISSIONER NELSON AND SECRETARY ABRAMS

In my letter of February 1, 1985, I expressed particular concern about the arrest of the Morelos family, including their three-year-old child.

I asked both State and INS to review Mr. Morelos' claim for asylum to determine whether his claim is valid. As I noted in my letter, I personally saw the scars Mr. Morelos said were the result of torture.

I can understand the need for confidentiality with regard to a pending application. Without going into detail, have you reviewed Mr. Morelos' claim, and is it your opinion that it is valid?

If not, can you tell us why not?

2. Also for both witnesses:

Also in my letter, I asked INS and State to work together to develop procedures to ensure the confidentiality of asylum applications and proceedings so that home country governments do not learn who has applied for asylum in the U.S. and has, in most cases, made allegations of abuse by that government, in order to avoid reprisals and the fear of filing such applications.

What is the status of these efforts?

3. For both witnesses:

Another reason refugees from Guatemala and El Salvador are reluctant to apply for asylum is that so few applications are approved.

As I noted in my letter, I am told only 0.4 percent of Guatemalan applications and 2.5 percent of Salvadoran applications were granted in 1984.

Given the civil war in El Salvador, and the general political unrest in that country and in Guatemala, as well as the recent disappearance of two Pennsylvania journalists and murders of members of the Grupo de Apoyo Mutuo, a politically active group pressing the Guatemalan government for information on the disappearances of their loved ones, which seems indicative of the general political turmoil documented by respected outside groups—given this evidence of social unrest and activism, how can you explain these remarkably low approval rates?

If the problem is lack of corroborating evidence—understandably difficult for a refugee who has fled in a hurry and cannot bring in neighbors, etc. as supporting witnesses of persecution threats—have INS and State considered alternative ways of verifying these claims so as to avoid deportation of those who have legitimate asylum claims but lack a signed death threat?

4. For Secretary Abrams

I am concerned about the asylum application review procedures which call for the State Department to review each and every application and render an "advisory opinion."

While foreign policy may appropriately play a role in our overall immigration policy, it should not be a part of our asylum policy, which is based on nonpolitical humanitarian obligations.

What efforts are made, or procedures established, to avoid a desk officer being influenced by foreign policy concerns when making a recommendation on an asylum application?

Do you know of any cases in which the State Department has recommended denial

of an application and INS went ahead and approved that application?

If so, approximately what percentage of State advisory opinions are "overruled" by INS?

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

HON. ALAN C. NELSON,
Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Washington, DC.

DEAR COMMISSIONER NELSON: I am deeply concerned about the policy and procedures involved in the recent arrest of some 60 aliens across the country and particularly about the arrest of a Guatemalan family in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on January 14, 1985.

According to information provided to me, a warrant of arrest was issued for a husband and wife, Mr. and Mrs. Morelos, on grounds of illegal entry. The wife and a three-year-old child were then taken into custody. Later, Mr. Morelos surrendered to Immigration and Naturalization authorities when he found out that his wife and child were in custody.

On the facts as presented to me, Mr. Morelos has a valid claim for asylum on the basis of a well-founded fear of persecution based on his prior political activities and expressions of political opinions in Guatemala. Mr. Morelos' contention of torture was corroborated by scars which I personally observed on his body.

When I discussed this case with an INS agent in Philadelphia, I was advised that a warrant of arrest was issued because Mr. Morelos had not made an application for asylum.

In my judgment, a law enforcement agency like INS should not issue a warrant of arrest for a person until an investigation discloses a violation of law without a valid defense. As District Attorney of Philadelphia, I made it a stringent rule to inquire as to the surrounding circumstances to find out about potential defenses before obtaining warrants of arrest or taking people into custody.

As a matter of fundamental fairness, it is my opinion that the Government of the United States should not take people into custody unless there is a valid basis for doing so after a thorough investigation including potential defenses. It seems to me that it is not sufficient to justify the INS action on the basis that Mr. Morelos had the burden of filing an application for asylum. He is an alien and does not really understand the intricacies of the law; and, if he did, he could hardly be expected to file such an application considering the fact that virtually no such applications are granted and the filing itself would doubtless activate an enforcement proceeding against him.

The action of the Immigration and Naturalization Service was particularly offensive in taking his wife and child into custody. It is an horrendous experience to be arrested and the three-year-old child who was subjected to the arrest will doubtless bear the scars of the incident for many years, to say nothing of the trauma on the mother.

I strongly urge that you as the Director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service review your procedures so that legal proceedings are authorized only where an investigation discloses a violation without a valid defense. If legal proceedings are instituted, a summons rather than a warrant of arrest should be used unless there is a valid reason to believe that the person will flee or

that bail is realistically necessary to guarantee the appearance of that individual at the next proceeding. In the case of the Morelos family, there was no such reason to be concerned about flight since the Immigration and Naturalization Service had known of their whereabouts since September 1984. In any event, the posting of the \$3,000 in bail by other parties was hardly any guarantee of the appearance of the Morelos family for the next proceeding so that the justification for the warrant of arrest was not at all well-founded.

As to the filing of asylum petitions, I urge you to adopt procedures which maintain confidentiality (in camera proceedings) so that foreign governments will not know of the contentions of their nationals so as to avoid reprisals and fear of filing such applications.

Beyond these procedures, I am also troubled by the applicable policies which, as I understand it, lead to only 0.4 percent of Guatemalan applications for asylum having been granted in 1984 and only 2.5 percent of the applications for asylum from Salvadorans having been granted in 1984. In light of the social unrest in those countries and the activism of many of their citizens, it strikes me as a shockingly low figure to have such a small number of applications for asylum granted. I would be interested to know what standards are used and whether Mr. Morelos would have qualified, under existing standards, considering his contentions of torture which were corroborated by his scars.

I would be further interested to know whether consideration has been given to halting deportations of Guatemalans through a grant of extended voluntary departure or any other procedure. It seems to be that extended voluntary departure would be appropriate for Guatemalans as it has been applied for those who have fled from other countries with such pervasive social unrest affecting so large a segment of the citizens.

I would very much appreciate your prompt response to the questions raised in this letter.

Sincerely,

ARLEN SPECTER.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

HON. GEORGE P. SHULTZ,
Secretary, Department of State, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY SHULTZ: I am deeply concerned about the policy and procedures involved in the recent arrest of some 60 aliens across the country and particularly about the arrest of a Guatemalan family in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on January 14, 1985. While the arrests were carried out by Immigration and Naturalization Service, the procedures employed are inexorably intertwined with our immigration policies in which the State Department plays a key role.

According to information provided to me, a warrant of arrest was issued for a husband and wife, Mr. and Mrs. Morelos, on grounds of illegal entry. The wife and a three-year-old child were then taken into custody. Later, Mr. Morelos surrendered to Immigration and Naturalization authorities when he found out that his wife and child were in custody.

On the facts as presented to me, Morelos has a valid claim for asylum on the basis of a well-founded fear of persecution based on

his prior political activities and expressions of political opinions in Guatemala. Mr. Morelos' contention of torture was corroborated by scars which I personally observed on his body.

When I discussed this case with an INS agent in Philadelphia, I was advised that a warrant of arrest was issued because Mr. Morelos has not made an application for asylum.

In my judgment, as I have written INS Commissioner Alan Nelson, a law enforcement agency like INS should not issue a warrant of arrest for a person until an investigation discloses a violation of law without a valid defense. As District Attorney of Philadelphia, I have made it a stringent rule to inquire as to the surrounding circumstances to find out about potential defenses before obtaining warrants of arrest or taking people into custody.

As a matter of fundamental fairness, it is my opinion that the Government of the United States should not take people into custody unless there is a valid basis for doing so after a thorough investigation including potential defenses. It seems to me that it is not sufficient to justify the INS action on the basis that Mr. Morelos had the burden of filing an application for asylum. He is an alien and does not really understand the intricacies of the law; and, if he did, he could hardly be expected to file such an application considering the fact that virtually no such applications are granted and the filing itself would doubtless activate an enforcement proceeding against him.

This is where the States Department's involvement is particularly relevant. I am troubled by the applicable policies which, as I understand it, lead to only 0.4 percent of Guatemalan applications for asylum having been granted in 1984 and only 2.5 percent of the applications for asylum from Salvadorans having been granted in 1984. In light of the social unrest in those countries and the activism of many of their citizens, it strikes me as a shockingly low figure to have such a small number of applications for asylum granted. I would be interested to know what standards are used in the State Department's review of applications and whether Mr. Morelos would have qualified, under existing standards, considering his contentions of torture which were corroborated by his scars.

In addition, I urge you to work with Commissioner Nelson to adopt procedures that maintain the confidentiality of asylum applications (*in camera* proceedings), so that foreign governments will not know of the contentions of their nationals so as to avoid reprisals and fear of filing such applications.

I would be further interested to know whether consideration has been given to halting deportations of Guatemalans through a grant of extended voluntary departure or any other procedure. It seems to me that extended voluntary departure would be appropriate for Guatemalans as it has been applied for those who have fled from other countries with such pervasive social unrest affecting so large a segment of the citizens.

I would very much appreciate your prompt response to the questions raised in this letter.

Sincerely,

ARLEN SPECTER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, March 1, 1985.

HON. ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: Thank you for your letter of February 1, 1985 expressing your deep concern about the arrests of some 60 illegal aliens and in particular about the arrest of a Guatemalan family in Philadelphia, Mr. and Mrs. Morelos and their child.

We note in your letter your belief that Mr. Morelos has a valid claim for asylum based on a well-founded fear of persecution because of his prior political activities and opinions in Guatemala. You also urge us to work with I.N.S. Commissioner Nelson to adopt procedures that maintain the confidentiality of asylum applications.

The Department keeps the contents and its views on asylum applications confidential in order to protect the applicant or his relatives. Attorneys for asylum applicants are particularly insistent upon the need for strict confidentiality, and we must maintain this policy. We are confident that the I.N.S. maintains a similar policy.

With respect to the asylum claim by Mr. Morelos and his family, we will be prepared to review the case when the record and file are sent to us by I.N.S. Philadelphia, in accordance with established procedures in these matters. You may be assured that at such time we will take fully into account your views on the validity of the asylum request. However, since we have not had an opportunity to review the application and any supporting documents, we are not in a position to comment on the merits of the case.

We will continue our careful review of applications for asylum on a case-by-case basis, and monitor developments and conditions in the region. This is not always an easy task. However, the procedures for a considered and just determination of asylum requests for Central Americans are in place, and they are applied by our officers in a compassionate and understanding manner.

Sincerely,

J. EDWARD FOX,
Acting Assistant Secretary,
Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, March 8, 1985.

HON. ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: Thank you for your letter of January 18, 1985 in which you state your deep concern about the arrests of illegal aliens on January 14, 1985. You inquire about asylum procedures, the granting of extended voluntary departure to Guatemalan and Salvadoran aliens in this country, and you refer to the "sanctuary" movement as the target for arrests.

We realize that violence is an enormous problem in Central America, and that many have fled their country to avoid civil strife. There is also a long history of migration to the United States by aliens seeking work. Many try to remain here by applying for asylum or seeking extended voluntary departure (EVD) status, which temporarily suspends deportation.

The reason most often cited for granting EVD to Salvadorans, or any other Central American, is the claim that those who have been deported have suffered persecution on return to their country. However, repeated studies of the treatment and condition of deported Salvadorans have disclosed no such pattern. In the most recent U.S. Embassy survey of about 500 El Salvadoran de-

portees, not a single case of physical abuse or murder was found. Many deportees could not be located because they had given fictitious or incomplete addresses, and some 39 people had already returned illegally to the United States. Despite the problem in locating some deportees, the study simply does not suggest a pattern of targeted persecution of the deported Salvadorans.

In 1983 the Attorney General and the Secretary of State carefully considered the question of EVD status for Central American aliens and determined that such status was not then appropriate. Their views are still valid at this time and I enclose copies of their letters.

In addition, there is a program in place in El Salvador, conducted by the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration (ICM), a highly respected international organization. ICM meets every Salvadoran who has been sent home by the United States, and each is offered resettlement assistance. Each returnee reports to ICM once a month for six months, discussing any difficulties which he or she may have. If any returnees had been harmed or disappeared, it surely would be made known publicly.

Our international commitments do not permit the forced expulsion of a refugee to a country or frontier where persecution is likely to occur. In addition, the Refugee Act of 1980 provides for the granting of asylum status to those who establish a well-founded fear of persecution upon return to their country of nationality for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion. By law, the responsibility for establishing a well-founded fear of persecution rests with each applicant. The Department of State reviews each and every asylum application and renders an advisory opinion on the merits of the application. However, the decision on the asylum request is made by the I.N.S. director concerned who takes into consideration our advisory opinion. Since the decision on the asylum application is a matter for I.N.S., you may wish to consult with that Service to ascertain the statistical data on these cases.

The United States is well aware of its legal and treaty obligations and responsibilities, including the prohibition against the forced expulsion of refugees. We have a long-standing record of support for relief activities on behalf of refugees and a generous resettlement policy. No other country has provided as much assistance, or as many resettlement opportunities, to refugees as the United States.

We cannot concur with the position taken by some churches to harbor or conceal illegal aliens from Central America or elsewhere. Our conduct in this matter should be guided by the rule of law. Since the question of harboring or concealing illegal aliens may involve a breach of federal law, you may also wish to consider requesting the Department of Justice to comment on the implications of the actions.

We will continue our careful review of applications for EVD and asylum on a case-by-case basis, and monitor developments and conditions in the region. This is not always an easy task. However, the procedures for a considered and just determination of EVD and asylum request for Central Americans are in place, and they are applied by our of-

ficers in a compassionate and understanding manner.

Sincerely,

J. EDWARD FOX,

Acting Assistant Secretary,
Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, April 4, 1985.

HON. CHARLES A. BOWSER,
Comptroller General, General Accounting
Office, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BOWSER: I am writing to request a GAO study into the practices and procedures of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Department of State for judging claims for asylum in the United States, especially concerning Central America.

The civil strife in Central America has displaced thousands of inhabitants. In visits to Central America in May and August of 1983, I witnessed first-hand the breakdown of justice in El Salvador, and when I returned I succeeded in getting the Congress to withhold 30% of our aid to that country until the guardsmen charged with the murder of the four churchwomen were tried. In addition, I have seen to it that \$9 million in aid was earmarked for judicial reform in El Salvador so that the rule of law can begin to replace the reign of terror perpetuated by rampant illegal killings.

It is essential that we treat the displaced victims of the civil strife in Central America fairly and with compassion. I was an original cosponsor of legislation to halt the deportation of Salvadorans pending a study of the circumstances and condition of displaced Salvadorans in Central America and here in the U.S. I have cosponsored this legislation again in the 99th Congress.

I am also deeply concerned about the policy and procedures involved in the arrests of some 60 displaced aliens—mostly Salvadorans and Guatemalans—across the country earlier this year in an effort to crack down on the Sanctuary movement, and particularly about the arrest of a Guatemalan family in Philadelphia on January 14, 1985. I have written Secretary of State George Shultz and Immigration and Naturalization Commissioner Alan Nelson complaining about these arrests and the fundamental offensiveness of taking a Guatemalan mother and her three-year-old child into custody, as was done in Philadelphia.

I have also requested Senate hearings on the issues raised by the INS arrests, and Senator Simpson, Chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy, has agreed to schedule such hearings in the near future.

I met with the Guatemalan family arrested in Philadelphia in January—and, on the facts as represented to me, the father, Mr. Morelos, has a valid claim for asylum on the basis of a well-founded fear of persecution based on his prior political activities and expressions of political opinions in Guatemala. Mr. Morelos' contention of torture was corroborated by scars which I personally observed on his body.

I am troubled by the applicable policies which, as I understand it, lead to only 0.4 percent of Guatemalan applications for asylum having been granted in 1984 and only 2.5 percent of the applications for asylum from Salvadorans having been granted in 1984. In light of the social unrest in those countries and the activism of many of their citizens, it strikes me as a shockingly low figure to have such a small number of applications for asylum granted.

On March 14, 1985, I questioned Elliott Abrams, Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, about this remarkably low approval rate in 1984 for asylum applications filed by Salvadorans and Guatemalans, and whether it could reflect an appropriate application of a fair standard. Mr. Abrams suggested that a GAO study of the asylum process would be "a good idea."

I am attaching a list of specific areas the GAO report should cover. This kind of thorough analysis is long overdue.

If you have any questions, please contact me, or have your staff contact Suzanne Spaulding at 224-5863.

I appreciate your prompt consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

ARLEN SPECTER.

AREAS GAO REPORT SHOULD COVER

Specifically, I request that the GAO report include the following information:

1. The standard and criteria being applied by INS in granting claims of asylum;

2. Whether the same standard and criteria is applied across the board to asylum applications regardless of the home country of the applicant; if not, please examine and report the differences and reasons for divergence;

3. Whether the approval rate for asylum applications generally and/or by country varies significantly from one INS district office to another, and the reasons for any such variation;

4. The standard and criteria applied by the State Department in recommending approval or denial of asylum applications;

5. Whether the same standard and criteria is applied by the State Department to all applications, regardless of the home country of the applicant, and is applied in the same manner, e.g., same requirements for corroboration and objective evidence, same criteria for severity of threat, etc., and the nature of and reasons for divergence; and

6. Whether the same procedures are consistently followed within the State Department and the INS, respectively, when considering all asylum applications. If not, describe circumstances under which procedures vary and cite the nature of and reasons for divergence.●

RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

● Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. President, on behalf of Senator THURMOND and myself, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate these seven resolutions unanimously approved by the South Carolina House of Representatives.

The resolutions follow:

H. 2620

Whereas, on Tuesday, March 19, 1985, legislation of significant importance was introduced in the Congress which would limit the growth of textile and apparel imports into the United States; and

Whereas, Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina introduced Senate Bill 680 in the Senate with twenty-five other cosponsors and Representative James T. Broyhill of North Carolina introduced companion House Bill 1562 in the House of Representatives with one hundred twenty-two other co-sponsors, the large number of co-

sponsors being indicative of the strong support for these bills; and

Whereas, this legislation, known as the Textile and Apparel Trade Enforcement Act, would apply to all exporting countries except Canada and the European Economic Community and would:

(1) Limit shipments from the twenty largest textile-producing countries to 1983 levels.

(2) Broaden textile quotas to cover a wider range of textile and apparel imports.

(3) Reallocate some of the existing import share to smaller countries.

(4) Require the federal government to set up a special import-licensing system to police the import limits; and

Whereas, there can be no question that if steps are not taken immediately to set strict limits on textile and apparel imports into this country, the United States will lose its single most important manufacturing industry; and

Whereas, the members of the General Assembly, by this resolution, express their belief that the immediate enactment into law of either Senate Bill 680 or House Bill 1562 is urgently needed, is in the best interest of our country, and is necessary now to prevent the further erosion of one of our basic manufacturing industries. Now Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the members of the General Assembly hereby memorialize the Congress to enact without delay Senate Bill 680 or companion House Bill 1562 which would limit textile and apparel imports into the United States.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator from South Carolina, each member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina, the Senate of the United States, and the House of Representatives of the United States.

H. 2592

Whereas, one and four-tenths percent of the American population, including more than forty thousand South Carolinians, are unable to use conventional printed library materials because of visual or physical handicaps; and

Whereas, print handicapped readers, including some five hundred thousand Americans and eight thousand South Carolinians, depend upon the fifty-six regional libraries which constitute the Library of Congress Network of Libraries for the Blind and Physically Handicapped to provide reading materials for education, information, and recreation; and

Whereas, the federal government and the individual states have traditionally shared in the support of this important library service, with books and periodicals on disk or tape, the machines necessary to read them, and braille books being supplied by the Library of Congress National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped and with staff, housing, and operating costs being supplied by the states; and

Whereas, library service for blind and handicapped readers is dependent on distribution of reading materials and equipment by mail, and the fifty-six regional libraries send more than twenty million items annually through the United States Postal Service; and

Whereas, the Administration's fiscal year 1986 budget proposes to eliminate all postal revenue foregone appropriations (postal subsidies) which would mean the "Free Matter for the Blind" mailing privilege, provided by Congress since 1904, would end as of October 1, 1985; and

Whereas, the states and territories are not financially able to assume on short notice the cost of mailing library materials to handicapped users (more than one hundred fifty thousand dollars a year for South Carolina); and

Whereas, the time and labor involved in individually weighing and canceling each of the twenty million items sent to patrons and then returned to the libraries would be a great addition to the work load of the United States Postal Service as well as that of the individual libraries; and

Whereas, many blind and handicapped readers on limited incomes would not be financially able to pay the return postage, totaling one hundred twenty thousand dollars a year for all readers, and in many instances would not be able to make arrangements for the materials to be returned to the post office for weighing and stamping and would probably be deprived of library service as a result. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the members of the General Assembly request the United States Congress and the present Administration to take the necessary steps to insure that postal revenue foregone appropriations are provided to continue the "Free Matter for the Blind" mailing privilege which makes possible library service for blind and physically handicapped citizens of the United States.

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each member of the South Carolina Congressional Delegation, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the President of the Senate of the United States.

H. 2711

Whereas, South Carolina is a predominantly rural state whose counties have a large percentage of federally-owned lands; and

Whereas, rural South Carolina counties are heavily dependent upon federally-shared revenues to replace the tax base which the federally-owned lands have displaced; and

Whereas, proposed cuts in federally-shared revenues from U.S. Forest Service timber cutting activities would further reduce the revenues which would be distributed to rural areas from the present level of two hundred twenty-five million dollars to sixty million dollars; and

Whereas, the effect of these proposed cuts in federal revenue sharing and in shared revenues from U.S. Forest Service timber cutting activities will have a disastrous effect on South Carolina's state and local governments, possibly resulting in tax increases of more than one hundred percent. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the members of the General Assembly hereby request the President and the Congress to consider the disastrous effects on South Carolina and its rural areas of proposed federal cutbacks in revenue sharing and in shared revenues from U.S. Forest Service timber cutting activities.

Be it further resolved that the President and Congress are urged to continue funding

shared revenues from U.S. Forest Service timber cutting activities at the present level of two hundred twenty-five million in order to prevent drastic tax increases on the state and local level in South Carolina.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator from South Carolina, each member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina, the Senate of the United States, and the House of Representatives of the United States.

H. 2471

Whereas, it is vital that the leaders of this great nation adopt a national strategy of peace that would:

(1) Inspire, focus, and unite the national will and determination to achieve this goal of peace and freedom;

(2) Achieve overall military and technological superiority over the Soviet Union;

(3) Create a strategic defense and a civil defense which would protect United States citizens against nuclear war at least as well as the Soviets defend their citizens;

(4) Accept no arms control agreement which in any way jeopardizes this security of the United States or its allies or locks the United States into a position of military inferiority;

(5) Reestablish effective security and intelligence capabilities;

(6) Pursue positive nonmilitary means to roll back the growth of Communism;

(7) Help our allies and other non-Communist countries defend themselves against Communist aggressions;

(8) Maintain a strong economy and protect our overseas sources of energy and other vital raw materials; and

Whereas, it will take an enormous effort to achieve the adoption of a National Strategy of Peace Through Strength. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the members of the General Assembly memorialize the President and the Congress to take whatever measures that may be appropriate and necessary to adopt a National Strategy of Peace Through Strength.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and each member of the congressional delegation from South Carolina.

H. 2372

Whereas, the federal government in its relations with the states very often requires the states to take certain action by legislation or otherwise by a specified date or risk the loss of federal funds in certain areas; and

Whereas, although in most of these cases the goal to be accomplished through the federally mandated action is worthy, commendable, and necessary, the fact remains that the Constitution of the United States reserves to the states the right to take or not take many of these actions without interference on the part of the federal government; and

Whereas, the members of the South Carolina General Assembly, by this resolution, hereby call on the Congress to cease the above practices which tend to usurp the power reserved to the States under the United States Constitution. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to cease the practice of requiring the States to take certain actions through legislation or otherwise or risk the loss of federal funds because in many cases the federally mandated actions are reserved to the power of the States under the United States Constitution.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each United States Senator from South Carolina, each member of the House of Representatives of Congress from South Carolina, the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States.

H. 2530

Whereas, federal supplemental compensation (FSC) is a program whereby the federal government pays additional unemployment compensation benefits without cost to employers for a period of eight weeks to those people who have exhausted their other federal and state unemployment compensation benefits; and

Whereas, the FSC program was passed in the early 1980's in coordination with another program of federal unemployment compensation known as federal extended benefits; and

Whereas, federal extended benefits is a federal-state program where the employer pays one-half of the benefits and the federal government pays the other half of the benefits but federal law mandates that federal extended benefits stop when insured state unemployment drops below a level of five percent; and

Whereas, South Carolina's present level of insured state unemployment is approximately three and one-third percent which means that no federal extended benefits are now available in this State; and

Whereas, unfortunately the FSC program under the enabling federal legislation is also due to expire at the end of March, 1985; and

Whereas, for the FSC program to expire when federal extended benefits are not now available in South Carolina would be a particularly harsh blow to those citizens of this State who have exhausted their state unemployment compensation benefits; and

Whereas, although the FSC program may need some adjustments in order to be more responsive to economic conditions that actually exist in terms of its triggering mechanism, the General Assembly of South Carolina nevertheless believes that it is in the best interest of the people of South Carolina and the United States for the federal supplemental compensation program to be extended by Congress for at least an additional period of one year with any amendment thereto that the Congress deems appropriate and necessary. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the members of the General Assembly hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to extend the Federal Supplemental Compensation (FSC) program for at least an additional period of one year.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each United States Senator from South Carolina, each member of the House of Representatives of Congress from South Carolina, the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States.

H. 2636

Whereas, the State of South Carolina's economic prosperity is totally linked with the vitality of the agriculture industry; and

Whereas, currently the agriculture industry is in the worst economic slump in recent years because of stresses created by a combination of limited credit, high interest rates, the strong dollar, falling land and equipment values, low prices, and unfair foreign competition; and

Whereas, a single state government can do little to protect its farmers from those conditions because the problems in agriculture exist nationwide; and

Whereas, agricultural policy for the Nation is determined in Washington, D.C. by the administration, the Congress, and the Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas, the nation's farmers have not shared in the benefits of the recovery that some other sectors of the nation's economy have enjoyed; and

Whereas, the agricultural policymakers in the federal government have not developed effective solutions to the problems of limited credit, high interest rates, the strong dollar, falling values, low prices, and unfair foreign competition to effect a recovery in the agriculture industry. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

1. That the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina urges the federal government to take action to relieve the economic stresses that burden this nation's farmers;

2. That Congress take action to mitigate unfair tax consequences resulting from the sale of real and personal property to alleviate agricultural debt;

3. That Congress continue the federal tax credit on ethanol as an octane booster and fuel extender for gasoline;

4. That Congress, in its movement toward a market oriented agriculture system, give protection to the competitive position of the American farmers consistent with that accorded farmers in foreign nations;

5. That Congress recognize that the coordinated USDA and farmer supported boll weevil eradication program is not sufficient to make cotton production profitable unless our American textile industry is given stronger support in its battle against unfair foreign competition;

6. That Congress react to the subsidized exportation of Canadian lumber into this country, resulting in a forty-two percent market share in South Carolina;

7. That Congress continue conservation assistance during these perilous times when farmers are unable to afford such practices alone;

8. That Congress reinstitute voluntary supply management programs in order to reduce the overstock of commodities that drag down to unprofitable levels;

9. That Congress develop and adopt a long term food and agricultural policy that incorporates domestic needs and international market development.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the presiding officers of both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to each member of Congress representing South Carolina.●

RULES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

● Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I am pleased to report to the Senate that the Joint Committee on Printing has

organized for the 99th Congress. For the benefit of my Senate colleagues, I am submitting the committee rules and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

CONTENTS OF RULES

- Rule 1. Committee rules.
- Rule 2. Regular committee meetings.
- Rule 3. Quorum.
- Rule 4. Proxies.
- Rule 5. Open and closed meetings.
- Rule 6. Alternating chairmanship and vice chairmanship by Congresses.
- Rule 7. Parliamentary questions.
- Rule 8. Hearings: Public announcements and witnesses.
- Rule 9. Official hearing record.
- Rule 10. Witnesses for committee hearings.
- Rule 11. Confidential information furnished to the committee.
- Rule 12. Broadcasting of committee hearings.
- Rule 13. Committee reports.
- Rule 14. Confidentiality of committee reports.
- Rule 15. Committee staff.
- Rule 16. Committee chairman.

RULE 1. COMMITTEE RULES

(a) The rules of the Senate and House insofar as they are applicable, shall govern the committee.

(b) The committee's rules shall be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as soon as possible following the committee's organizational meeting in each odd-numbered year.

(c) Where these rules require a vote of the members of the committee, polling of members either in writing or by telephone shall not be permitted to substitute for a vote taken at a committee meeting, unless the ranking minority member assents to waiver of this requirement.

(d) Proposals for amending committee rules shall be sent to all members at least one week before final action is taken thereon, unless the amendment is made by unanimous consent.

RULE 2. REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting date of the committee shall be the second Wednesday of every month when the House and Senate are in session. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered and after appropriate notification is made to the ranking minority member. Additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary or at the request of the majority of the members of the committee.

(b) If the chairman of the Committee is not present at any meeting of the committee, the vice-chairman or ranking member of the majority party on the committee who is present shall preside at the meeting.

RULE 3. QUORUM

(a) Five members of the committee shall constitute a quorum which is required for the purpose of closing meetings, promulgating committee orders, or changing the rules of the committee.

(b) Three members shall constitute a quorum for purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

RULE 4. PROXIES

(a) Written or telegraphic proxies of committee members will be received and recorded on any vote taken by the committee, except at the organization meeting at the

beginning of each Congress or for the purpose of creating a quorum.

(b) Proxies will be allowed on any such votes for the purpose of recording a member's position on a question only when the absentee committee member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that he be recorded.

RULE 5. OPEN AND CLOSED MEETINGS

(a) Each meeting for the transaction of business of the committee shall be open to the public except when the committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public. No such vote shall be required to close a meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(b) No person other than members of the committee, and such congressional staff and other representatives as they may authorize shall be present in any business session which has been closed to the public.

RULE 6. ALTERNATING CHAIRMANSHIP AND VICE CHAIRMANSHIP BY CONGRESSES

(a) The chairmanship and vice chairmanship of the committee shall alternate between the House and the Senate by Congresses. The senior member of the minority party in the House of Congress opposite to that of the chairman shall be the ranking minority member of the committee.

(b) In the event the House and Senate are under different party control, the chairman and vice-chairman shall represent the majority party in their respective Houses. When the chairman and vice-chairman represent different parties, the vice-chairman shall also fulfill the responsibilities of the ranking minority member as prescribed by these rules.

RULE 7. PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Questions as to the order of business and the procedures of the committee shall in the first instance be decided by the chairman, subject always to an appeal to the committee.

RULE 8. HEARINGS: PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS AND WITNESSES

(a) The chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the committee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event the chairman shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The staff director of the committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable all witnesses appearing before the committee shall file advance written statements of their proposed testimony at least 48 hours in advance of their appearance and their oral testimony shall be limited to brief summaries. Limited insertions of additional germane material will be received for the record, subject to the approval of the chairman.

RULE 9. OFFICIAL HEARING RECORD

(a) An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of all committee proceedings and actions. Brief supplemental materials when required to clarify transcript may be inserted in the record subject to the approval of the chairman.

(b) Each member of the committee shall be provided with a copy of the hearings transcript for the purpose of correcting errors of transcription and grammar, and clarifying questions or remarks. If any other person is authorized by a committee member to make his corrections the staff director shall be so notified.

(c) Members who have received unanimous consent to submit written questions to witnesses shall be allowed two days within which to submit these to the staff director for transmission to the witnesses. The record may be held open for a period not to exceed two weeks awaiting the responses by witnesses.

(d) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the committee. Testimony received in closed hearings shall not be released or included in any report without the approval of the committee.

RULE 10. WITNESSES FOR COMMITTEE HEARINGS

(a) Selection of witnesses for committee hearings shall be made by the committee staff under the direction of the chairman. A list of proposed witnesses shall be submitted to the members of the committee for review sufficiently in advance of the hearings to permit suggestions by the committee members to receive appropriate consideration.

(b) The chairman shall provide adequate time for questioning of witnesses by all members, including minority members, and the rule of germaneness shall be enforced in all hearings.

(c) Whenever a hearing is conducted by the committee upon any measure or matter, the minority on the committee shall be entitled, upon unanimous request to the Chairman before the completion of such hearings, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

RULE 11. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION FURNISHED TO THE COMMITTEE

The information contained in any books, papers, or documents furnished to the committee by any individual, partnership, corporation, or other legal entity shall, upon the request of the individual, partnership, corporation, or entity furnishing the same, be maintained in strict confidence by the members and staff of the committee, except that any such information may be released outside of executive session of the committee if the release thereof is effected in a manner which will not reveal the identity of such individual, partnership, corporation, or entity in connection with any pending hearing or as a part of a duly authorized report of the committee if such release is deemed essential to the performance of the functions of the committee and is in the public interest.

RULE 12. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The rule for the broadcasting of committee hearings shall be the same as Rule XI, clause 3 of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 13. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) No committee report shall be made public or transmitted to the Congress without the approval of a majority of the committee except when Congress has adjourned; Provided, that any member of the committee may make a report supplementary to or dissenting from the majority report. Such supplementary or dissenting reports should be as brief as possible.

(b) Factual reports by the committee staff may be printed for distribution to committee members and the public only upon authorization of the chairman either with the approval of a majority of the committee or with the consent of the ranking minority member.

RULE 14. CONFIDENTIALITY OF COMMITTEE REPORTS

No summary of a committee report, prediction of the contents of a report, or statement of conclusions concerning any investigation shall be made by a member of the committee or by any staff member of the committee prior to the issuance of a report of the committee.

RULE 15. COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) The committee shall have a professional and clerical staff; under the supervision of a staff director. Staff operating procedures shall be determined by the staff director, with the approval of the chairman of the committee, and after the notification to the ranking minority member with respect to basic revisions of existing procedures. The staff director under the general supervision of the chairman, is authorized to deal directly with agencies of the Government and with non-Government groups and individuals on behalf of the committee.

(b) The chairman, on behalf of his party's members, shall be entitled to designate not more than two, and the ranking minority member, on behalf of his party's members, shall be entitled to designate not more than two of the following senior staff members: Staff Director, General Counsel, Deputy Staff Director, Assistant Staff Director or Associate General Counsel, and Special Assistant.

(c) All other staff members shall be selected on the basis of their training, experience, and attainments, without regard to race, religion, sex, color, national origin or political affiliations, and shall serve all members of the committee in an objective, non-partisan manner.

RULE 16. COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

The chairman of the committee may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the committee. Specifically, the chairman is authorized, during the interim periods between meetings of the committee, to act on all requests submitted by any executive department, independent agency, temporary or permanent commissions and committees of the Federal Government, the Government Printing Office, and any other Federal entity, pursuant to the requirements of applicable Federal law and regulations.●

THE IMPACT OF PRESIDENT REAGAN'S FISCAL YEAR 1986 BUDGET ON POOR CHILDREN

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, on March 18, 1985, Marian Wright Edelman, president of the Children's Defense Fund, and a leader in the movement to secure the rights of children in poverty, spoke at the Woman's National Democratic Club in an eloquent way about the impact of President Reagan's fiscal year 1986 budget on poor children. With child poverty at the highest rate in 18 years, President Reagan has intentionally or unintentionally targeted poor children and

families for the fifth consecutive year for billions in new budget cuts. This occurs at a time when the cost of lifting every poor American child out of poverty would be less than half of the proposed increase in defense spending in 1986. This occurs at a time when a single working mother with three children and a below-poverty income of \$10,500 paid \$1,186 in taxes, more than Boeing, General Electric, DuPont, Texaco, Mobil, and AT&T together paid in 1983, though earnings of these huge corporations totaled \$13.7 billion in net profits.

No Senator or Representative can turn his or her back on Ms. Edelman's message to the Woman's National Democratic Club and to the American people. I respectfully urge your thoughtful attention to the speech, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The Speech follows:

SPEECH BY MARIAN WRIGHT EDELMAN,
PRESIDENT CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND

President Reagan's Fiscal Year 1986 budget is a moral travesty.

Although more children die each year from poverty than from traffic fatalities and suicide combined—twice more children die from poverty than die from heart disease and cancer combined—for the fifth consecutive year, in the face of the highest child poverty rate in 18 years, President Reagan has targeted poor children and families again for billions in new budget cuts.

Under the Fiscal Year 1986 Reagan budget, children will lose \$5.2 billion. In 1990, children will lose \$37.6 billion in federal support. This is on top of \$10 billion a year in cuts already made in survival programs for children and families since 1980.

If the Reagan budget priorities succeed, by 1990 every American will be spending 19 percent less on poor children and families and 86 percent more on defense.

By Fiscal Year 1990, the military budget will increase by \$344.2 billion or 239 percent, to make American children more secure from external enemies. But American children also need defense against internal enemies of poverty, infant mortality, abuse, and homelessness.

Over a five-year period, more American children die from poverty than the total number of American battle deaths in the Vietnam War. Yet, our national leaders dream about a multi-billion dollar "Star Wars" system to make our defenses impenetrable against enemy missiles. Why can't they dream of a smaller achievable war against child poverty—a war that saves and enhances rather than takes and threatens human life? Every poor American child could be lifted out of poverty in 1986 for less than half of the proposed defense spending increase for that one year alone.

American babies need defense against preventable infant mortality and birth defects. By 1990, 22,000 American babies will die primarily because of low birthweight. We can prevent at least one in eight of these infant deaths and thousands of handicapping contributions simply by providing their mothers prenatal care. For seven percent or 25 days of the defense budget increase next year, every poor mother and baby could be provided Medicaid, and thus prenatal care coverage. Instead, the Reagan budget pro-

poses to cut Medicaid again by \$6 billion over the next three years although 700,000 children have already lost their Medicaid cards since 1980. Currently, 9 million poor children—two out of three—have no regular health insurance coverage. The proposed Medicaid cuts would put an additional 10 million children at risk of losing coverage. How many four-pound babies will it take to balance the federal budget?

American children need defense against preventable diseases. In this Reagan decade we are building 17,000 new nuclear weapons at an estimated cost of \$71 billion. But the new Reagan budget allows for only a single month's stockpile of vaccination serum. As a result, two million fewer children will be immunized for DPT in 1986 than in the previous year.

American children need to be protected against increasing child abuse. An estimated 1.5 million children were reported abused and neglected in 1983, an increase of 200,000 children over the previous year. Yet the Reagan Administration is cutting child abuse programs by 15 percent.

American children need to be protected against the enemy of homelessness. According to a 1984 Department of Housing and Urban Development study, 22 percent of the homeless in shelter, not including runaway shelters, are children under 18. Over 66,000 children are currently living without permanent shelter. But the President's budget seeks to emasculate low-income housing programs, and to rip another \$325 million hole in the tattered survival net of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). AFDC recipients, 66 percent of whom are children, have already been cut by \$1.7 billion since 1980. They receive an average daily benefit of \$3.67.

In addition, the President's budget also proposes to freeze the Title XX Social Services Block Grant at \$2.7 billion, \$200 million below its Fiscal Year 1981 level. Title XX is the major source of direct federal funding for child care. The Fiscal Year 1986 budget also proposes to cut Title XX training funds by \$25 million and consolidate with it the Community Services Block Grant.

While decimating federal programs for needy children and families, the new Reagan budget also ignores the skyrocketing federal tax burden on the working poor while the taxes of the rich have been cut. The amount of federal tax paid by those with incomes below the federal poverty line increased 58 percent from 1980 to 1982 alone.

In 1984, a working single mother with three children and a below-poverty income of \$10,500 paid \$1,186 in taxes, more than Boeing, General Electric, DuPont, Texaco, Mobil, and A T & T altogether paid in 1983, although these huge corporations earned \$13.7 billion in profits.

Peter Grace, the head of W. R. Grace Company, made \$684 million in profits from 1981 to 1983, paid no net federal income tax, received \$12.5 million back from government in negative income taxes through rebates or sales of "excess" tax benefits. If we just raised the Grace Company tax rate to zero, we could pay for nine million of the free school lunches President Reagan and the Congress cut from children. Does the new budget correct this inequity?

The President's budget turns its back on children in need and will push millions more children towards the ragged edge of survival or worse.

WHAT DO WE DO?

A Children's Defense Budget, which you have in your packet, includes the Children's Survival Bill, a blueprint for federal investment in prevention and youth self-sufficiency that restores some of the \$10 billion taken from children and poor families in 1981 and 1982.

The Children's Survival Bill outlines a range of specific steps to give young people skills and employment opportunities to enable them to contribute to rather than depend on the community. It seeks to expand successful programs like Head Start, WIC, child care, maternal and child health programs, and includes modest new demonstration programs to prevent teen pregnancy and school dropouts and to build self-sufficient youth. Tax fairness for the poor and single parent families is a strong priority. To offset the \$14 billion cost of the Bill's provisions, CDF offers \$40 billion in specific deficit reduction proposals.

We would hope that you will work to help enact the bill's provisions.

I would place particular emphasis on some of the key health provisions. Specifically, we must urge Congress to:

Make absolutely no cuts in preventive programs that provide lifesaving services to pregnant women and babies, including Medicaid, Title V. Maternal and Child Health, Community Health Centers and AFDC.

Amend Medicaid immediately to provide coverage for all pregnant women and infants living below federal poverty levels. The \$800 million for Medicaid coverage of pregnant women and infants living below the poverty level is about the cost of three B-1 bombers. President Reagan has asked for production money for 48 of them in the FY 1986 budget alone. Three fewer will not cripple our national defense. Lack of health care will cripple many children.

Amend Medicaid to provide pregnant women with all medically necessary care, including medical care, education and outreach. Too many states are forced to limit services to inadequate levels, and care is not comprehensive enough.

Provide \$200 million in additional funds for WIC which now serves only 1 in 3 eligible women. To do this would cost less than 2 of the 48 MX missiles President Reagan has in his FY 1986 budget.

Add \$77 million for the Title V Maternal and Child Block Grant and Community and Migrant Health Centers. These are the providers of "last resort" or our 9 million uninsured and underinsured children and more than 6 million uninsured pregnant women. The \$77 million is about half what the defense contractors spent on public relations activities in 1983, or the amount we spent to subsidize baseball and hockey tickets for corporate executives.

Add a new \$100 million demonstration program to fund comprehensive school based health clinics for adolescents. This is equivalent to the costs of our military bands.

The total tab all of these minimal short-term recommendations is \$1.3 billion from Fiscal Year 1986, about equal to the taxes we lose on business lunch deductions or 15 days of the defense increase.

In tandem with the federal legislative goals outlined in the CSB, CDF has set two other goals for immediate and long-term action by every element of American society as part of an overall strategy to alleviate child poverty and to strengthen families: The prevention of adolescent pregnancy and the reduction of infant mortality and low

birthweight births which stem from lack of access to prenatal care and poverty. Specifically, we urge:

Testing of a range of community and policymaker strategies designed to prevent teen pregnancy and build youth self-sufficiency. In 1983, 525,000 babies were born to teen mothers, 10,000 to girls 14 and under. Over 300,000 of the teens who give birth annually have not completed high school. 36,000 have not completed the eighth grade. Thirty-one percent of all babies born to teens are paid for by Medicaid at an annual cost of \$200 million. Sixty percent of all AFDC mothers had their first child as a teenager.

Implementation of a massive prenatal care outreach and action campaign to reduce infant mortality, birth defects, and escalating health costs. Babies born to mothers without prenatal care are 3 times more likely to suffer low birthweight, death, and birth defects than those whose mothers received such care. Prenatal care can prevent thousands of infant deaths and defects and save millions of dollars in intensive care. For example, it cost \$600 to provide a pregnant woman with complete prenatal care, including vitamins and nutritional supplements. But it may cost \$20,000 to care for a premature infant just in the first 20 days of life.

Every child and youth needs hope and a sense that positive future options are available to them. Ensuring their stake in the future is at the heart of the new Children's Survival Bill. A detailed summary of the bill included in Chapter 4.

WHAT CAN YOU DO BACK HOME?

Step One: Reflect hard within ourselves, our families and communities, organizations, and religious congregations about the personal beliefs and national ideals we want to see America reflect. We must then try "little by little", in Forty Day's words, to live them and be moved to act in two arenas: In the personal arena through greater service and outreach to those around us who are more needy, and in the political arena to ensure a more just society. One without the other is not enough to transform America.

Step Two: Become informed. Careful homework is necessary if we are to protect children and the poor. You will hear countless arguments from politicians and others who seek to justify unjust budget priorities. We have shown you how to answer them in the budget book.

Step Three: Hold your Senators and Representatives accountable for their votes for or against children and the poor. The budget process drives the nation's priorities at home and abroad. It is our national Rorschach test. How well hungry children in Mississippi and Ethiopia will be fed, whether we will finance just or repressive regimes in Latin America, whether our nuclear arsenal will continue to grow or shrink, are affected significantly by the budget votes your Representatives will cast in your name this year. Let them know where you stand.

Each year, CDF publishes a record of how your Senators and Representatives vote on children and poor families. Please request and study it. So often politicians make flowery general speeches about supporting children while voting against specific children's needs. It is the specific votes that count. Forty-six Senators and 152 Representatives had a voting record of 50 percent or less in support of programs critical to children's well-being in 1984.

Just as it is important to study and monitor the federal budget process, it is equally

important to monitor state and local budget processes on behalf of children. We hope in the future that children's advocates will conduct analyses of every governor's budget and monitor the votes of their state legislators on children.

Step Four: Join CDF's New Children's Action Network and help build stronger grass roots support for children's programs in the Congress. CDF has taken steps to strengthen the legislative voice for children in the 99th Congress through the CDF Action Council, our new lobbying arm. For \$20 a year, you will receive Action Now Alerts, Voting Records, Legislative Analyses, and regular Action Network Updates.

Step Five: Start a local prenatal care campaign or begin a local adolescent pregnancy child watch project. While we must mount an effective legislative voice for children and pursue a positive agenda to build healthy children and self-sufficient youth in the Congress, we must also be taking strong community action to ensure healthy babies through prenatal care and to prevent teen pregnancy. CDF has launched a major new program initiative to prevent teen pregnancy. As part of that effort, we have prepared two publications to help you carry out local action projects: An Adolescent Pregnancy Child Watch Manual and a Comprehensive Prenatal Care Campaign Kit.

Adolescent Pregnancy Child Watch is a project to help local communities learn more about adolescent pregnancy and develop effective action agendas to prevent children from having children. Currently, 41 Child Watch projects are in process in 20 states, in collaboration with the Association of Junior Leagues, the National Council of Negro Women, the March of Dimes, and the National Coalition of 100 Black Women. We would welcome your involvement. Similarly, a comprehensive Prenatal Care Campaign Kit is available to help you begin a prenatal care campaign in your community. It includes data on how your state ranks on teen pregnancy, infant mortality, low birth-weight, prenatal care access, AFDC, and Medicaid participation levels. These two efforts are critical pieces in any effort to prevent and alleviate epidemic child and maternal poverty.

Step Six: Do not be discouraged. Pray and fight hard for children. Although we now face new ideological and budget assaults on children and family programs equal to or greater than those in the first term of the Reagan Administration, how hard and persistently we fight will determine the outcome for poor children. You do not have to have a lot of resources or education to make a difference for children. You can write one letter and get five others to do the same. You can help one hungry or homeless child in your community. The faith to move mountains is the reward of those who have moved little hills. Do not be intimidated by powerful opponents into doing nothing for children. President Eisenhower said in 1958: "What counts is not necessarily the size of the dog in the fight. It's the size of the fight in the dog."

Because children can't vote or lobby, we must fight extra hard. And we must not hesitate to take on those in high places who practice a perverted gospel of taking from poor children to give to the rich and the military. Ronald Reagan is only President. For those of us who take our guidance from a higher source, there is no cause for fear or discouragement. But our prayers will only work if we do.

Step Seven: Aim high. Be confident we can win for children. How blessed we are to

have such a challenging and worthwhile cause to believe in and serve. President Reagan wants to invest over \$3.2 trillion dollars in new weapons of death over this decade of no use to the hungry children of this world. We want to invest \$14 billion in new weapons of life: Education, health care, family support, jobs, and food. President Reagan wants to protect big corporations from federal taxes; we want to protect poor working mothers and fathers. President Reagan is trying to take away school lunches, immunizations, and health care from poor children; we are campaigning for a right to prenatal care so that every baby can have a healthy beginning. Why should we lower our goals or be intimidated by the politics of the moment?

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, the former president of Morehouse College, in Atlanta, Georgia, summed up our mission and message: "It must be borne in mind," Dr. Mays said, "that the tragedy of life doesn't lie in not reaching your goal. The tragedy lies in having no goal to reach. It isn't a calamity to die with dreams unfulfilled, but it is a calamity not to dream. It is not a disaster to be unable to capture your ideal, but it is a disaster to have no ideal to capture. It is not a disgrace not to reach the stars, but it is a disgrace to have no stars to reach for. Not failure, but low aim, is sin."●

NATIONAL ARBOR DAY

● **Mr. HATFIELD.** Mr. President, I would like to ask my colleagues to join in sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 122, introduced by Mr. BRADLEY, which proclaims the last Friday of April each year as "National Arbor Day."

Establishing an annual National Arbor Day will help to reawaken the public's interest in the value of trees, and their contributions to the many aspects of daily life. It will generate publicity reemphasizing the attitude that we need to restore our dwindling tree population. National and uniform recognition of Arbor Day provides a vehicle for promotion of reforms in our outmoded practices to protect and conserve America's trees.

Trees are one of God's most beautiful and useful creations. Not only do they add majesty and grandeur to our Nation's landscape, they provide for a bounty of practical uses as well. Trees help halt soil erosion, offer cooling shade, slow the cold winter wind, and supply food and timber. Though trees are the oldest known life form, new uses are being discovered daily. Attractive high standard flowering trees, for example, are being used in business areas and shopping malls to soften the harsh atmosphere of glass, steel, and concrete.

There are more than 25,000 nurseries in the United States, occupying more than 200,000 acres of land. Over 20,000 different kinds of trees have been identified and there are more than 1,000 different species native to the United States. Our country is home to more than 150 billion trees.

The value of our country's trees is not sufficiently recorded by numbers alone. Trees are the cornerstone of

conservation. They provide one of the key segments in nature's delicate preservation cycle, helping to offset the effects of human pollution. Approximately 78 trees are needed to absorb the carbon dioxide and produce the oxygen needed to maintain balance in the atmosphere for each person in the United States. More than 100,000 trees are needed to cancel the atmospheric pollution created by one commercial jet flying round trip from New York to Los Angeles.

There is a certain spirituality about trees. There are few things more comforting than a walk through a forest. The beauty and splendor of our Nation's trees have inspired some of literature's most moving works. Trees tower over us, outlive us, and in many ways represent the closest link to eternity we have on this Earth. By planting a tree, one can leave a lasting legacy for future generations.

J. Sterling Morton, who founded Arbor Day over a century ago, said, "Other holidays repose upon the past; Arbor Day proposes for the future."

Yet the statistics documenting forest damage continue to grow at a staggering rate the world over. Trees are often leveled in the sacred name of progress. More than 1 million acres of the green and growing are paved with masonry, concrete, and asphalt every year.

These trends only underscore the need to proclaim an annual National Arbor Day. Besides fueling society's interest related to broad conservation purposes, such a day points to the need for all citizens of all ages to maintain and protect portions of our great national forest land. It is a day dedicated to trees, their beauty and usefulness, and their preservation.●

TOWN MEETINGS

● **Mr. LEAHY.** Mr. President, Vermont town meetings serve as a national barometer on major issues, and as an example of an inherent strength of our grassroots democracy.

Recently, Vermont Educational Television [ETV] devoted a program to this unique institution.

On March 7, citizens from all over Vermont traveled to the ETV studio in Winooski to debate, in a town meeting format, the following resolution:

Resolved: Vermonters favor that the United States renounce the option of first use of nuclear weapons.

After a spirited debate, viewers were asked to vote on the resolution by calling the studio. The response was overwhelming; 334 favored the resolution, 72 were against it.

Regardless of whether you agree with the resolution, it is clear that this participatory format has wide audience appeal, and reinforces the spirit of democracy that continues to flour-

ish in Vermont, and, I believe strongly, throughout our Nation.●

VERY SPECIAL ARTS FESTIVAL

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, on May 15, 1985, the Third Annual Very Special Arts Festival will be held in Detroit. This event is designed to allow individuals an opportunity to experience various art forms and to share in personal creative expression. Over 500 handicapped children, their parents, and teachers will gather to enjoy hands on activities in both visual and performing arts at the Community Arts Building of the Michigan State Fair Grounds.

This event culminates months of planning and in-school workshops where both teachers and students have learned creative arts and personal expression from professional artists. The day long festival is sponsored by the Detroit Recreation Department, Detroit Public Schools, Wayne County Intermediate Schools, Archdiocese of Detroit, Michigan Council for the Arts, New Detroit Inc., Michigan Alliance for Arts in Education, Southeast Michigan Arts Forum, Wayne State University, Michigan State Fair, and Young Audiences of Michigan.

The Detroit Very Special Arts Festival is part of a national concept developed by the National Committee on Arts With the Handicapped.

The Michigan project began in 1977 with two intermediate school districts piloting arts programs for the handicapped. Today, there are 26 sites throughout the State with over 18,000 students and 2,500 educators participating.

This year's event will include over 20 professional artists and 50 community volunteers who will operate art station workshops in the areas of music, dance and movement, drama, puppetry, printing, clowning, acrylics, and other visual art forms. In addition, there will be performances by handicapped- and nonhandicapped-art groups, and student art work will be displayed.

Through the arts, both handicapped and nonhandicapped individuals can participate as equals without regard to physical strength and ability, while experiencing the same feelings of satisfaction, creative expression, and self-worth. It is important that we realize the arts are an important part of the fabric of life.

I salute those individuals responsible for making this event a success, providing exceptional learning experiences for all those involved.●

BUDGET RESOLUTION—ORDER OF PROCEDURE TOMORROW

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I indicated to the distinguished minority leader that there would be no further action on this measure tonight. We shall come in at 9:30 a.m. We shall be back on the resolution at 10 o'clock. I guess it is safe to say that the first amendment tomorrow will be on Social Security. There are a number of Members on each side who would like to offer the Social Security amendment. I have been discussing this matter with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] and the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mrs. HAWKINS]. There are a number of amendments on this side. I think it is fair to assume that will be the first amendment offered tomorrow, then we hope to move on to a few other amendments.

I thank all of my colleagues for their patience. Again, I indicate to Members on both sides of the aisle that it is my hope we can complete action on this budget resolution. It does not look like we will be able to do it this week, but if we can, we will stay in late tomorrow night and late on Thursday night. I am aware of a number of concerns about midafternoon Friday and beyond, and perhaps we can address those. I will be visiting with the distinguished minority leader sometime before tomorrow ends, but I would plan tomorrow night to be here quite late because there are a number of amendments. There will be a lot of votes. I hope that Senators will have enough notice now to make arrangements for tomorrow and Thursday well into the evening, say, 10, 11, midnight those 2 nights. There will be no more votes tonight.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, May 1.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, further I ask unanimous consent that after the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, there be a special order in favor of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] for not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

ORDER FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Following the special order for Mr. PROXMIRE, if time permits, I ask unanimous consent that

there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 10 a.m., with statements limited therein to 5 minutes each.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. DOLE. Following routine morning business, I indicate to my colleagues that we will resume consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the budget resolution. I say very earnestly that rollcall votes can be expected throughout the day, and into the evening tomorrow evening, and there is a possibility that rollcall votes could occur before the hour of 12 noon.

RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there being no further business to come before the Senate, I move that we stand in recess, in accordance with the previous order, until 9:30 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 6:34 p.m., the Senate recessed, to reconvene on Wednesday, May 1, 1985, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 30, 1985:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert L. Pugh, of Virginia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania

THE JUDICIARY

Samuel B. Sterrett, of Maryland, to be a judge of the U.S. Tax Court for a term expiring 15 years after he takes office reappointment.

COPYRIGHT ROYALTY TRIBUNAL

Rose Marie Monk, of Texas, to be a commissioner of the Copyright Royalty Tribunal for the term of 7 years from September 27, 1984, vice Thomas C. Brennan, term expired.

POSTAL RATE COMMISSION

Patti Birge Tyson, of Texas, to be a commissioner of the Postal Rate Commission for the term expiring November 22, 1990, vice James H. Duffy, term expired

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. John M. Poindexter, xxx-xx-x. 1110, U.S. Navy.