

that we could do tomorrow or do the next day. There ought to be hearings. We ought to find out about the role of the State and the Federal Government in terms of the enforcement.

The fact is, enforcement by the States on MEWA's has worked well. It has reduced significantly the instances of fraud and abuse. I would be quite interested in listening to those on the floor of the Senate try to persuade the Senate why that is a good idea, to go back to a time when States were not providing oversight and regulations to protect working families.

So we saw those two elements dropped. I think, as I say, I would have hoped they could have been dropped and we could have debated them at another time. They were dropped. But I find it very difficult to be convinced that these were major elements of a major proposal that were given up in order to try to reach common ground with the Senate—when the Senator from Kansas understands very well that what she has fashioned and what has been supported here was really a unique, special, targeted effort to deal with the preexisting conditions and portability, which is really a new way of trying to come to grips with the health care needs of many of our citizens.

At the same time, as was pointed out, another area where I think there is broad agreement in terms of considering in parallel mental illness as well as other physical illness was completely set aside. That would have been new ground that was being broken. But that, for the financial cost, was really too much. I regret it. I am personally convinced, as we have seen with many insurance companies, that those companies that have effective mental health as well as physical health programs actually see a reduction in the outlays for the physical conditions because of the programs that they have there that are available in mental health. Actually, it is going to save money over a period of time.

We have not been able to make that case in a convincing way, although I am, frankly, convinced. I know Senator WELLSTONE is convinced as well. But we have the basis of a very strong indication from a number of the insurance companies. But we are too late in the session to have been able really to consider that. I regret it.

So I thought it made a good deal of sense that we have some kind of test of the MSA's, and we had advanced three different proposals. The White House had advanced proposals. Those were effectively dismissed. Then there were proposals that were discussed last week by Republican leadership and then further refined over the course of the weekend.

So there is where we are. One of the features I mentioned to the Senator from Kansas is that the evaluation for all these programs is going to be as a result of the chairman of the Finance Committee and the chairman of the

Ways and Means Committee naming the committee that is going to do the evaluation. I think that was sort of a nonstarter, but there may be Members who would differ with that. If we are going to get the kind of clear evaluation which is needed, and which has been outlined, in fairness, by the Senator from Kansas, the types of things that should be considered are a review by an independent body to give reports. That would be very, very important.

Another item in the proposal is, with the acceptance of the deductibility for small business only going up to 80 percent, here you have 100 percent in MSA's, so you have a skewed condition just to get started with any kind of comparison. We phase in the 80 percent up to the year 2000. They would go into an MSA immediately in terms of 100 percent. So you are obviously skewing this in terms of what is included in the other parts of the legislation.

These are the kinds of things which I think people who would have a chance to review these issues and get into matters could address. But the most basic and fundamental part of it is putting in place an untested and untried program in which many of those groups that have looked at it, in all fairness, have felt it would be particularly threatening. To whom? To our seniors, to working families, to children for prevention, and consumers generally.

Those who are supporting it primarily have been those—I know there are individual Members, and I respect their views—but, frankly, the outside interests that have been talked about have been the particular companies who have been involved in these programs that have been involved in some of the greatest abuses of the health care system.

So I think when you have the Joint Tax Committee talking about the cost, if we get to 1 million people, it will cost \$3 billion over a 10-year period. Here we are talking, at the outside, 40 million people. It raises some questions about what the cost would be. When you have the Urban Institute talking about what would happen in terms of adverse selection and moving from \$1,500 to \$2,500 in deductibility—this goes all the way to \$5,000—I think you can say there is certainly some reasonable kind of questions about who would become involved in this program, whether it would be, as many of us believe, the wealthiest and healthiest individuals.

When you have the refusal of the insurance companies that are involved in this process making available to the Academy of Actuaries the kinds of numbers—not the proprietary information—but just the numbers in terms of markets and getting some kind of fair evaluation of what is happening in the industry and not only the particular golden door industry, but others involved in it, being turned down on that issue raises questions. There have been CBO studies, as well. I referred to those at other times, and I will not take the time to do so now.

So, Mr. President, this issue is not going to go away. We will have it, and we will be required to address it. I am personally convinced that we will be successful in passing the core legislation in this Congress, because it is not going to go away. It is too powerful. There are too many families that will be affected by it. We may have some rocky roads and bumps along the way until we get there, but I think this issue is too important for families to give way on it.

I know I and others and I know Senator KASSEBAUM is still strongly committed to achieving the objectives. We will just have to work this process through.

But I thank the Senator very much, and I look forward to continuing to work very closely with her.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I know there are others who want to address the Senate. I want to speak to the Senate on two issues, briefly: the first being where we are on the budget proposal for education.

There have been a number of representations about where we are going with current funding, how we are going along with the continued baseline expenditures, that we are going to see a continuing commitment in the area of education.

I want to review for the Senate very briefly, because I see other colleagues on the floor who wish to address the Senate, where we are in the area of education funding and why this budget proposal continues to run contrary to what I believe is the fundamental commitment of this Nation, which should be in the area of education.

We can start off with the fact that just spending resources and money does not solve all of our Nation's problems, but it is a pretty clear indication what a nation's priorities are all about. I believe in education and I believe that it is important that we continue to make a strong investment in the area of education and the young people of this country. If the programs are faulty, we should correct them; if programs are successful, we ought to expand them. We ought to be in a period of constant review of many of these programs.

We did have the opportunity in the previous Congress to review a number of the programs—whether it was in the Head Start Program, title I, or Goals 2000—to provide reforms and funding to the local school level—90 percent of the funding went to the local school level that could be used by parents, teachers, the business community to expand education and academic achievement—the School-to-Work Program which was as a result of America's Choice, an excellent report reviewing many of the programs that were taking place in other parts of the world. Three-fourths

of the children who go to high school do not continue on to college. That is an extremely important area for this Nation if we want to both provide the opportunities for the young children of this country and also to ensure that our country is going to be strong in the next century.

And then the Direct Loan Program, the simplification of the efforts for young people. I see my friend and colleague, Senator SIMON, who was such a leader of that program over a period of years.

So we have here, Mr. President, the 1997 education funding in the Republican budget compared to a true freeze. This represents a compilation of all the discretionary education programs, those programs K through 12, and those programs that go on to higher education.

If we go back to 1995, we will see the figure on this chart of about \$39.5 billion. We heard a great deal as we went on into 1996, "Let's get back to 1995," and there is this freeze of current funding. Let us look at what has actually happened over this period of time. The total amount of budget authority in 1995 is \$39.5 billion.

Then under the omnibus appropriations, that figure was reduced to \$38.8. Of course, even \$38.8 billion, \$700 million below fiscal year 1995, was only reached after a long fight to preserve education funding.

It took a lot of shifting of funds to get close to fiscal year 1995 in fiscal year 1996. A good deal of funds that were uncommitted, or not spent, were spent in fiscal year 1996 to make up for the draconian cuts proposed to education—to get as close to the funding level of 1995 as possible. In April, education was finally funded just about \$700 million below fiscal year 1995.

Then we had the budget resolution that was passed based on the so-called freeze at \$36.3 billion. Actually, this freeze does not take into account the addbacks made for fiscal year 1996 alone, and leaves education funding \$3.2 billion below fiscal year 1995.

The Senate budget resolution, with the Domenici amendment, added \$5 billion to discretionary funding—of which \$1.7 billion was earmarked for education—came right back up to \$38 billion, still \$1.5 billion below the 1995 level. Then the bill went to conference and \$500 million more were lost—\$500 million were lost in the conference. They added \$1.2 billion to the original budget resolution, but cut \$500 million from the Senate resolution.

Every time we close the doors of negotiations on education funding, the commitment to young Americans go down. It is only when we are out here on the floor of the U.S. Senate, when we are battling in front of the public, whether it has been on the various votes Members remember—the Snowe-Simon amendments or the Specter-Harkin amendment—that we restore some of the funds. But once you close the office doors and begin to con-

ference funding bills, education is one of the first to get cut.

This is where we are in this resolution, right on our way back down again. The Domenici amendment increases education funding—though leaves it well below current funding—and then \$500 million were cut in conference.

We have to ask ourselves what is happening to the total number of students at this time. The number of students was about 46 million in 1990 and will increase to 54.6 million by the year 2002. The student population is gradually increasing by 7 percent. Even with a freeze at the current funding level, you are falling behind, because you are not dealing with the expansion of the student population and inflation.

Last year alone, it would have meant 100,000 additional teachers just to hold even, 50,000 for the makeup of those numbers of teachers that were being lost, and 50,000 more to take into consideration the expansion of the school population.

That is something we have to understand. The school population for kids in grades K through 12 is gradually increasing by 7 percent, and for college-age youth it is increasing 12 percent. Do you think there is any effort in the budget resolution conference report to take into consideration the expansion of college students or expansion of student population in grades K through 12? Absolutely none, absolutely none. The President has talked about a 33-percent increase in the Pell grants. This proposal would be a \$6.7 billion reduction over the period of time in the Pell grants targeted to the neediest students over there. The list goes on and on.

Mr. President, I speak for those who are committed, as I know many in this body are committed, toward education. It is only fair to point out what this budget does to our commitment to the young people in this country, for the Head Start programs, the title I programs, the math and science programs, the new technology programs to try to provide the best kind of new technology to our students in schools that train our teachers, to the school to work program that tries to bring young people into the private sector to make sure they will get decent jobs, and then actually is phased out over a period of time once those links and once those paths are created.

(Ms. SNOWE assumed the chair.)

Mr. KENNEDY. In the conference report, education is cut by 20 percent in real terms from where we were in 1995. I find that is highly unacceptable. When we had the chance to let the Senate, Republicans and Democrats, vote on these matters, we restored education funding.

I see in the chair the distinguished Senator from Maine, who has been a strong advocate for education and for meeting this Nation's commitment when we have the expansion of college and K-12 populations.

Madam President, I find this is a dangerous trend. It is complicated by the fact that in this legislation we have set aside the billions of dollars for tax cuts for wealthy individuals. That is what makes it completely unacceptable: we are cutting crucial education programs in order to pay for the tax breaks for the wealthy. That is intolerable. That is wrong. That is unacceptable.

I see others on the floor who want to address this. I intended to speak about the Medicare proposals, as well. I will yield now and hope perhaps maybe I will get a few minutes tomorrow at the convenience of the floor managers to address the Senate briefly on that. That is an issue of enormous importance as well and should be addressed. The Senator from Nebraska has been very kind in allocating time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his excellent statement. There will be time tomorrow if he wishes to get into the Medicare matter. We discussed that to some extent already, and I think we should be discussing it further. There will be some time tomorrow, and I would be delighted to yield whatever time the Senator from Massachusetts wishes.

I will shortly yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Illinois who has been waiting patiently. However, I want to elaborate a little bit on what the Senator from Massachusetts has been saying about projected growth costs featuring education. The same thing is true with Medicare, and the same thing is true with Medicaid.

We have been bamboozled around here, I say to my friend from Massachusetts and my friend from Illinois. We have been bamboozled by the statements that an increase is a decrease only in the Nation's Capital. What we are talking about here are not increases in education funding, net, or increases in Medicare funding, net. What we are talking about is trying to disguise the honest dollar amount that keeps the level of the programs where they are today. Yet there has been a hue and cry across the Nation that the Republican budget does not cut Medicare, it provides more money for Medicare. It does provide more money for Medicare. The facts are it does not provide enough money to meet the real needs of the increased population, the longevity of senior citizens and more and more people who will rely on Medicare. You can see it is not a cut in real dollars, but it is a cut in real needs and what the real costs will be for people who are depending on it. Therefore, it is a cut. We get all tied up with semantics around here.

Let me point this out. I had made reference earlier, Madam President, to the fact that Medicare costs were going to outstrip what the Republican budget provides for Medicare. An example: The projected rate of growth in private-sector health care costs over the period that we are talking about would be 7.1

percent per person. Yet the Republican budget on a per-person basis allows Medicare spending to grow only by 4.7 percent. Now, the difference between the projected costs and the Republican budget is 34 percent. Yet the Republicans are saying their increase is reasonable and provides more money.

Plainly, Medicare spending will not be keeping up with inflation in the Republican budget when you consider what the inflation is going to be in the private sector and how many more people are going to have to come into this program. We are being bamboozled here, and the American public know that, even if the U.S. Senate majority does not want to address it.

I say also that the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee attributes the steep reductions in planned Medicare spending in his budget to an effort to save Medicare. He neglects to note that the Republicans sought to reduce Medicare spending by \$270 billion even before last year's Medicare trustees' report came out. He also neglects to mention that the President's budget guarantees the solvency of the Medicare trust fund through the year 2005, without making the deep reductions planned in Medicare spending.

To back that up, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter of May 9, 1996, addressed to myself, the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 9, 1996.

Hon. J. JAMES EXON,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on the
Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: At your request, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has examined the effects of the Administration's budgetary proposals on the Hospital Insurance (HI) trust fund. Under current law, the HI trust fund is projected to become insolvent in 2001. CBO estimates that the Administration's proposals would postpone this date to 2005.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,
Director.

Mr. EXON. I drive home the point that the President is looking at this realistically and should not be put down for that effort.

One more thing, and then I will yield to my friend from Illinois. The chairman of the committee complains about how steep the cuts in domestic discretionary programs are in the President's budget. Yes, it is true the President does achieve substantial savings from discretionary spending, but the President still maintains these domestic investments at a rate of \$60 billion higher than the Republican budget in the year 2002. If the chairman believes that the President's cuts are steep, then the chairman would also have to agree that the cuts that he is endorsing in his particular budget are absolutely fatal.

The difference between the two budgets is that the Republican budget also

cuts taxes so much more. The \$122 billion that the chairman mentioned is just the tip of the iceberg. The real iceberg is much larger than that. The chairman of the House Budget Committee, JOHN KASICH, promises \$180 billion in tax breaks.

The chairman promised, "We would have our own tax cut that we originally said we would have—that there will be a capital gains tax, that there will be a full child tax credit * * * and there will be a host of other tax relief measures."

Who is kidding whom? I simply say that to keep honest, we have to be reasonable. We have to recognize if you are going to provide massive tax cuts primarily to benefit the wealthiest among us, something in the budget is going to have to pay for it. That is essentially why, along with the other details, that we will continue to oppose this Republican budget.

I yield 15 minutes to my friend and colleague from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Nebraska. I see my colleague from Iowa here, and I will try not to use the whole 15 minutes.

I am going to join Senator EXON in opposing this budget resolution for several reasons. First, we have tax cuts in here. Now, I recognize that leadership of both parties is saying we ought to go ahead with a tax cut. I do not think it makes any sense whatsoever when we have a deficit. It is like when we say we are going to have a 7-year glidepath to a balanced budget, but we are going to start off with a tax cut. That is like having a New Year's resolution that you are going to diet and then you start off with a great big dessert. It is not a very propitious way of doing it. And both parties are saving the tough things, the tough decisions, to the end of the 7 years. That is why we need the constitutional amendment for a balanced budget, in order to really move in that direction.

Second, in the area of defense, the conference is \$11.3 billion over what the Pentagon requested. No other agency gets more than they request, but the Defense Department does. I think it is unrealistic. Let us compare it to the next function, function 150, international affairs. The United States, in terms of our budget, is behind every country in Western Europe and Japan in terms of the percentage of our budget that we now use to help in foreign economic assistance—behind every one. But we are ahead of every one in the percentage of our budget that we put in defense.

Frankly, what other countries question about us in the area of the military and in the area of foreign affairs is not our weapons systems, but our backbone. A few people are killed in Somalia and we get out. In Bosnia, we make speeches for a long time before we do anything.

The budget, I think, is unrealistic in terms of international need and how we

get stability in other nations. But, primarily, I want to talk about an area where Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE has provided leadership, and I am grateful to her for that, and that is in the area of education. We are now \$4.4 billion from where the President requested. We are down \$2.5 billion from where it was when it passed the Senate. Now, every study done of this country, every study for the State of Nebraska, or the State of Iowa, or the State of Maine, or the State of Illinois, done by conservatives, liberals, you name it, every economist says we are going to have to do better in education. In higher education, we are ahead of other countries, but the gap is narrowing. In elementary and secondary and preschool education, we are behind most of the other developed nations.

Among the 18 top industrial nations of the world, in terms of expenditures for elementary and secondary, we are 14th. There are some basic things we ought to do. For example, I was able to get, in the last Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a paltry \$90 million—paltry in terms of its need—to encourage schools, to give a little bit of a carrot to schools to go longer than 180 days. If you go to school in Japan, you go 243 days a year. In Germany, they go 240 days a year. When you go to school in the United States, you go 180 days a year. Can we learn as much in 180 days as our friends in Germany, Japan, and in other countries do with longer school years? Of course, we cannot. Why do we go 180 days? In theory, it is so our children can go out and harvest the crops. Well, I say to the Presiding Officer and my colleagues, I live at Route 1, Makanda, IL, population 402. Even in Makanda, IL, the young people do not go out and harvest the crops anymore. That was a different era. We have to adjust. If we just moved from 180 days to 210, by the time you finish 12th grade, that would be the equivalent of 2 additional years of school, and we would still be, in a major way, behind other countries.

But Senator KENNEDY made the point a few minutes ago that when you look at these cuts, what you have to look at, also, is the growth in student population. And so it is doubly devastating. I remember visiting a Head Start Program, and almost all Head Start Programs have waiting lists, in Rock Island, IL. On Monday morning, one group of kids come in; on Tuesday morning, a second group comes in; on Wednesday morning, a third group comes in, and so on. I asked the woman in charge, "What if you could have these children here 5 days a week?" She smiled and said, "You cannot believe the difference it would make in their lives." We are not doing it, and we save money with a budget like this? You save money like building a house and you do not put a roof on it. Very, very shortsighted.

We make great speeches on prisons in this body. Oh, I have heard speeches about crime and how we put people in

prison and everything. Eighty-two percent of the people in our prisons and jails are high school dropouts. You should not have to be an Einstein to figure out that maybe if we invested a little more in education, we would not have to put so many people into prison, and maybe we would be a much better country if we did. That is the kind of thing we ought to do.

This budget takes a step backward in the field of education, rather than a step forward. I am not going to be around here next year, and my good friend from Nebraska is not going to be around here next year. I hope that whoever sits in this body will listen to the Presiding Officer when she stands on this floor and says that we have to do better in the field of education, as she has done many times. And while it is true you are not going to solve problems by just throwing money at them, I do not hear that same argument used in the Defense Department. And while money alone is not going to solve the problem in the field of education, without additional resources, we are not going to solve the problem.

That is the simple reality. We ought to be asking how do we build a better America as we put a budget together. When you ask that question, I think you will come to the conclusion that we ought to be doing more in the field of education.

I yield the balance of my time back to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, I am not sure we have any more speakers. We may have some more. I note that Senator GRASSLEY is waiting. I have talked with him, and he is not going to talk on the budget per se. I simply inquire of the Republican side, are there any other speakers on the budget? Senator GRASSLEY has another subject he would like to address as in morning business. Senator SMITH is on the floor. Is he here to talk about the budget or another matter?

Mr. SMITH. Madam President, I am here to talk about Senator DOLE when the Senator is finished on the budget matter.

Mr. EXON. All right. I will just pose a question to the leadership on that side of the aisle. Since there are other Senators wishing to proceed on other matters, maybe we could close down the debate on the budget and proceed as in morning business.

Mr. GRASSLEY. If the Senator will yield, I had a discussion with Senator DOMENICI on that point. He asked me if I was going to be here. It was his understanding on our side of the aisle that there was no more reason to speak. He spoke of two or three people on your side of the aisle. When that was done, he figured that the debate on the budget was done for today.

Mr. EXON. Well, I have just been handed a note that Senator LAUTENBERG is on the way over. I would like to close off debate on the budget, if I might. I do not want to cut people off. I guess the best thing for me to do to

protect my colleagues is to say that why do we not temporarily go off of the budget to allow the Senator from Iowa and Senator SMITH to proceed as they see fit. If, when they have finished, we do not have any more speakers, we can put the budget debate over until tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent that we temporarily go off the budget matter before us and allow the two Senators on the Republican side, who wish to address other matters, to be able to proceed as in morning business, if that is their request.

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

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

THE ROAD NOT TAKEN: DRUG POLICY AND LEADERSHIP

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I have spoken a number of times, last year and this year, on the need for a sound drug policy. We have entered a time, of course, when more teenagers are using drugs. It is a very serious problem. When more teenagers see no serious harm or wrong in using drugs, it seems to me that we cannot simply accept these facts in silence. We need to ask ourselves if we are prepared to see a repeat of the drug epidemic of the late 1960's and 1970's that claimed so many lives. It was an epidemic that destroyed so many young people and, of course, it brought a cycle of enduring pain to their respective families.

Of course, I do not believe that we can afford to remain silent. It is not a responsible policy to be silent. It certainly is not effective leadership to preside over a repeat of what we know to have been a social disaster of epic proportions. To today's ears, this may sound like exaggeration, but a brief reminder might serve to make the memory fresh in our thinking.

Before the 1960's, we had virtually no major problems in this country with illegal drug use. Then, beginning in the mid 1960's, the notion became current that drug use was not so bad, that drugs were your friend. It became common to hear the refrain that drug use was a personal choice that did no harm to anyone. That drugs could be used responsibly. That making drugs legal would end crime.

Hollywood picked up this theme and replayed it in countless movies. Music and cultural leaders made drugs fashionable and exciting. Even government got into the act. By the mid and late 1970's, a number of States had decriminalized marijuana use and lowered the drinking age to 18. Federal authorities began to talk about responsible drug use. Government experts accepted the notion that cocaine was not addictive. That marijuana use did not lead to so-called harder drugs. As the chorus on the wonders of drugs increased, dissenting voices were drowned out. Contrary opinions were overruled as unenlightened holdovers of a repressive past that had to be dismissed.

As a consequence, we decided to walk down a path that encouraged people, young people especially, to believe that drugs were okay. The result was the de facto legalization of drugs in this country. It was a vast social experiment based on wholly foolish notions about the dangers of large-scale drug use and its anticipated consequences. It relied on creating in the mind's eye some mythical drug user of heroic proportions, an everyman, someone who could use drugs with no ill affects, someone whose mind and consciousness would expand to include new horizons of enlightenment, someone who would be a better citizen. It was a form of a collective delusion. We found that the path we had chosen led to a dead end.

In the space of a few years, we went from having virtually no drug problem to having over 70 million people who had tried drugs and at least 6 million addicts. When you stop to consider that the vast majority of those addicts came from among kids, then the scale of the disaster becomes more apparent. We had an explosion of emergency room admissions and a plague of drug-related deaths and violence. In the very years that we stopped enforcing drug laws we saw a corresponding explosion in violent and property crimes. It is not wholly a coincidence that the explosion in drug use also accompanied the explosion in crime throughout America. It is no coincidence that the devastation of our inner cities, already suffering a host of problems, was a product of crack.

We learned, the hard way, that there was no heroic individual drug user. There were just people. Ordinary people. Most of them kids. We found that they listened to what adults said. We found, to our sorrow, that drugs worked. We discovered that when you make drugs widely appealing in large quantities at affordable prices more people will use drugs. Being a commercial and trading people, this should not have been a surprise, but under the spell of the drug culture, we ignored our experience.

We learned, to our profound regret, that dangerous drugs were illegal for a reason. We learned that they were illegal because they were dangerous, not dangerous because they were illegal. We learned that increased use leads to more addiction and to all of the collective woes that come with it. We learned these lessons because we ignored reality. We disparaged common sense. And we paid the price.

The first people to recognize the true extent of the consequences were parents. It was not some mythical Everyman that was using drugs, it was their kids. In alarming numbers. Parents began to fight back. In doing so, they enlisted the government. Finally, beginning in the early 1980's, we made extraordinary strides in reducing use. That meant we got more kids to just say no to drugs. Remember that phrase? It may have been laughed at by some, but it worked.