

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Museum Services Act (1984)

Education: National Endowment for the Arts
and Humanities, Subject Files II (1962-1996)

7-13-1988

Museum Services Act (1984): Report 08

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_46

Recommended Citation

"Museum Services Act (1984): Report 08" (1988). *Museum Services Act (1984)*. Paper 11.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_46/11

This Report is brought to you by the University of Rhode Island. It has been accepted for inclusion in Museum Services Act (1984) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu. For permission to reuse copyrighted content, contact the author directly.

ability to provide significant energy development and energy conservation production for the United States, a project at Brandeis. It is not a new one. We have scaled down the level. The university is going to pick up all the operating costs.

The distinguished chairman has told me that we have agreed on an area for transfer, \$2.9 million in funds from a surplus account in schools and hospitals and \$2 million from the energy conservation program. I thank the distinguished chairman for what I know has been a very difficult process, but I am very appreciative of his support for this measure.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, we would have considered this amendment in committee. It is in that gray area between no new starts and cuts. We did in fact enact it here last year only to lose it in conference. So in that sense it is a replay of last year and not new. It is an excellent project. I think the Senator understands the difficulty it may face in conference, but nevertheless we are willing to take this to conference. I am glad to join with him and accept it at this point.

I am advised that the \$2 million is from the energy conservation program direction.

Mr. KERRY. That is correct. If I may add, I offer this on behalf of myself and Senator KENNEDY. It is our perception that we would have a better time this year with the conference. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, we have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment. The amendment (No. 2613) was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, my list shows that only three Senators have an interest in further amendments. They are Senators MELCHER, METZENBAUM, and EVANS. I will soon, in consort with the distinguished ranking minority member, ask for a hotline if there is any further interest in amendments, and if not, we would like to propound at some time a unanimous consent arrangement, then go to third reading, with the exception of the Contra amendment. So I put Senators on notice—I think this is about the eighth time we have put Senators on notice—that we are ready to do business and, if they really are serious about amendments, to come to the floor. We are ready. So I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MIKULSKI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2614

(Purpose: To earmark \$5,000,000 in existing funds, currently available to the Department of Energy, for new steelmaking research and development initiatives as authorized by law, and to provide that any additional existing funds shall only be obligated on a year-by-year basis)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], for Mr. METZENBAUM (for himself and Mr. HEINZ) proposes an amendment numbered 2614.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 87, line 18, after "(15 U.S.C. 4507)" insert "": *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Energy may use up to \$5,000,000 for new steelmaking research and development initiatives as authorized by law: *Provided further*, That any such funds shall be made available from prior appropriations for the steel initiative under this head: *Provided further*, That existing funds otherwise made available for the steel initiative for multi-year contracts may be approved for more than one fiscal year but shall only be obligated on a year-by-year basis."

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, this amendment on behalf of Senator METZENBAUM deals with the steel initiative amendment. It is the committee's understanding that more than \$9 million in prior appropriated funds for the steel initiative remains unobligated. The steel industry and the Department of energy quite frankly have gotten off to a slow start on this important program. Senator METZENBAUM's amendment would authorize the Secretary of Energy to use up the \$5 million of available funds if he so chooses for steel research concepts which were not authorized at the time of the original appropriation. I believe the amendment has been cleared on both sides. No objection has been lodged to it.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Madam President, this amendment will enable the Department of Energy to expand its R&D efforts on behalf of the American steel industry. It is a first step in creating a lasting government-private sector partnership to develop advanced steelmaking technologies.

In 1986 Congress established a steel R&D program at the Department of Energy. This program has been funded annually as a line item in appropriations bills but it has never been authorized. And, unfortunately, DOE

has only recently begun to promote this program.

In order to expand the steel R&D program, I, along with Senator HEINZ, introduced a bill to authorize a 5-year steel R&D program at the Department of Energy. Our bill revises the current cost-sharing requirements to allow universities and independent laboratories to participate. Under the current program, these valuable research resources have been ignored. In addition, it requires DOE to develop a management plan to prioritize R&D proposals.

Madam President, the purpose of my amendment is to provide funding for our bill and to allocate existing funds more effectively. This amendment would permit DOE to make available from existing funds up to \$5 million for new steelmaking R&D initiatives authorized by Congress. It further requires DOE to fund multiyear steel R&D efforts on a year-by-year basis. Year-by-year funding will allow DOE to fund more projects at one time.

Madam President, a strong steel industry is vital to the United State's economic and national security. But without a coordinated, long-term, R&D effort, we will not have a first-rate steel industry. We need to renew our commitment to develop the technologies which can put the American steel industry back on top.

This amendment is an important step in extending federally supported steelmaking research into the next decade. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. McCLURE. Madam President, under existing authority the Interior Appropriations Committee initiated a steel research plan in fiscal year 1986. At that time, the plan was commonly known as the "Keyworth Initiative," named after the President's Science Adviser, Mr. George Keyworth. It was the intent of the subcommittee to direct the DOE to implement a research and development initiative at the National Laboratories to achieve advanced, energy efficient process technologies. Simply put, the plan was designed to have national labs work in conjunction with industry in order to find a way to "leapfrog" current technology.

"Leapfrogging" technology means throwing out the blast furnaces and the coke ovens so this Nation's steel industry can become competitive again. I believe the Senator from Ohio was a supporter of that funding which has amounted to \$9 million over the past few fiscal years.

I have only one reservation about the amendment; perhaps two. One is the "Keyworth Initiative" money was to involve industry and industry has not stepped forward to be involved in full measure as we had hoped they would. Second, it requires matching money. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio could free a portion of that money from those re-

strictions of the industry participation and of matching funding.

Madam President, I hope either industry steps forward and comes up with matching funds, and we move the "Keyworth Initiative" forward, as Dr. Keyworth had in mind at the time this was done initially, or that we rescind the funds and bring that particular initiative to an end—one or the other. But I will not object to the adoption of this amendment at this time. Perhaps it will produce something good in terms of basic fundamental research and understanding of new technologies in the steel industry.

We have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. HEINZ. Madam President, I want to join with the Senator from Ohio in support of this amendment to provide partial funding for the Steel Technology Competitiveness and Energy Conservation Act. Senator METZENBAUM and I introduced this bill on June 6 as a timely means of assisting the steel industry in its effort to restore competitiveness. Over the past two decades, hundreds of steel mills have shut down and hundreds of thousands of workers—over 56 percent of the industry—lost their jobs as our industry suffered a serious depression and major structural change. Approximately one-fifth of the industry filed for bankruptcy.

With so much of the industry in debt, adequate R&D investment was an impossibility. The American Iron and Steel Institute for years has estimated that the industry needs to spend \$2 to \$3 billion per year to stay competitive. In this decade the actual level has been closer to half of that. Research and developments efforts have fallen off at the same time our foreign competitors were improving their productivity through investment in the latest production techniques, often financed by Government subsidies. One of the ironies of our lagging investment effort is that we have become increasingly dependent on Japanese and German technology.

It is true, nevertheless, that despite losses of \$12 billion in the 1980's, American steel makers still managed to invest \$4.3 billion in new equipment between 1982 and 1986, although, as I noted, this rate is far below what is needed to remain competitive. At present, most American steel is continuously cast, creating a higher quality product while using a third less energy. The industry's resources, however, are not enough to realize the modernization and productivity increases necessary for the steel industry's long-term survival. The time has come for the Federal Government to demonstrate its commitment to American steel. It is time to forge a stronger Government-private sector partnership to enhance R&D efforts.

In fiscal year 1986, Congress began the necessary steps in that direction by approving a limited program to provide Federal funding for steelmaking

technology research and development through the Department of Energy. This program, known as the "Steel Initiative," teamed the resources of the Department of Energy's national laboratories with the talents of industry and university researchers. The Steel Initiative, however, will terminate at the end of this fiscal year.

The continuation and strengthening of this initiative is crucial if our steel industry is to regain its technological and innovative edge. The amendment my colleague from Ohio and I are offering will help to continue the earlier initiative and thereby encourage long-term, high-risk research which would not normally be supported by a basic industry. Our bill, S. 2470, authorizes \$10 million in 1989, \$12 million in 1990, and \$15 million for each of the fiscal years 1991 through 1993 to the Department of Energy. \$3 million for each fiscal year 1989 through 1991 would also be authorized to the National Bureau of Standards to provide the necessary technical support. It is my hope that the Energy Committee will consider this proposal soon.

Today's amendment is an interim step. It would allocate \$5 million in unspent funds specifically for this initiative.

The need for modernization of the domestic steel industry is no longer a subject for debate. It is an absolute necessity. President Reagan's own Steel Advisory Committee found that "modernization and increased productivity were essential to the survival of the American steel industry." The strength of our economic and national security is directly tied to the viability of our steel industry. We cannot assume that foreign steel suppliers will meet our demands in times of crisis, and we cannot allow ourselves to lose our basic capacity in this basic industry.

Furthermore, many other secondary and tertiary jobs depend on the steel industry. A National Academy of Sciences study found that for every steelworker, there are four other American workers whose jobs rely on a steady supply of steel.

The issue of steel modernization effects more than jobs and trade. Since the steel industry is extremely energy intensive, further improvements in technology would inevitably mean increased energy conservation through more efficient methods of steel production. Reduction of energy expenditures, of course, would undoubtedly result in further lowering the cost of American steel on the world market.

There are many steps in the steel making process in which new technology could conserve energy. For example, installation of a continuous caster can reduce energy expenditures by as much as 30 percent. Many American factories are held back by an energy-inefficient coking and smelting process. A direct steelmaking process and improved steelrolling machines could

cut energy-related production costs to a fraction of what they are today.

Madam President, this amendment will assist the American steel industry in regaining its competitive and technological edge. With the help of the steel initiative, American steel will once again enter the ring of competition with a fighting chance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM].

The amendment (No. 2614) was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLURE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2615

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], for Mr. EXON, proposes an amendment numbered 2615.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 106, at the end of line 14, insert before the period the following: "Provided further, That the Institute of Museum Services shall develop and implement a plan, by which, within three fiscal years, each state shall receive, at a minimum, one-half of one per centum of the grant funds available, provided that each state submits at least one qualified application: *Provided further*, That the director of the Institute of Museum Services shall submit to the chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives report detailing the reasons for a judgment that the application or applications of a museum or museums from a particular state were deemed not qualified, causing that state to fall below the one-half of one per centum criteria."

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, this amendment on behalf of Senator EXON provides the Institute of Museum Services develop and implement over a 3-year period a plan under which each State would receive a minimum one-half of 1 percent of the grants made available to the institute, provided that an application has been received from the State. The amendment also directs IMS to report to the Congress if an application is deemed not qualified.

Madam President, the idea behind this amendment is to help smaller States which need help on museum sciences. We think this is an excellent amendment.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, this is an amendment to that portion of this

July 13, 1988

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 9537

bill concerning the Institute of Museum Services. That agency receives almost \$22 million in funding in this bill. The great majority of that funding is used for grant programs to support our Nation's museums.

This amendment is being offered because I have become increasingly concerned about the manner in which this program is being administered. Let me explain.

Nebraska is a small State in population but it does contain within its borders several museums of high quality. In Omaha, there is the Henry Doorly Zoo and the Joslyn Art Museum. Lincoln boasts the University of Nebraska State Museum, the Sheldon Art Gallery, and the Nebraska State Historical Museum. There are other fine institutions, such as the Stuhr Museum, throughout the State. Nebraska is rightfully proud of these fine additions to their State which add greatly to its high quality of life. I am sure that each State can proudly point to its own similar institutions.

Last year, the IMS awarded almost \$20 million in grants to support museums. That agency found it appropriate to provide less than \$65,000, less than one-third of 1 percent, of that funding to Nebraska museums. This year, 12 Nebraska museums applied for funding from the IMS only to find that only one grant request for \$5,000 had been allowed. The program distributed over \$17 million nationwide. Although each of the museums that I mentioned earlier in this statement requested funding, not one was deemed worthy of support. Over the 2-year period, Nebraska museums have received less than 0.19 of a percent of the IMS's funding.

The IMS does not dispute that many Nebraska museums are worthy of support. It merely claims that the lack of funding is due to the failure of those institutions to prepare competitive applications. To understand that answer, Madam President, you must realize that grant applications to the IMS are scored by a panel of peers. Now I believe that the Nebraska museums that submitted applications for funding made every effort to submit the highest quality and best prepared applications possible. The answer of the IMS can only be disappointing and discouraging to them.

I have, for the past year, attempted to work with the IMS to resolve this problem, with no apparent success. Something is wrong with a program that year after year fails miserably to equitably distribute its funding. I cannot accept that a decisionmaking process that systematically eliminates applications from a particular geographical area is appropriate. The assistance being provided by the IMS should be available to all areas, with each museum being given an equal opportunity to receive funding. The record of the IMS does not reflect that it is concerned with that goal.

The IMS further seems to have little concerns for helping those worthy museums that are most in need of support. For the past several years, Nebraska's economy has been struggling through difficult times. No doubt, its museums have felt the crunch of decreased financial resources. Yet, the IMS apparently has no concern over those difficulties. No effort has been made to help those museums most in need of support. Instead, the museums that are able to spend the most in an effort to receive a grant are at an obvious advantage. Anyone who reviews the list of museums that did receive funding will find that many of the most successful and financially sound museums in the Nation are included. This is clearly a case of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer.

This amendment would merely require that the IMS in administering its programs treat our Nation's museums fairly. It requires the IMS to give no less than one-half of 1 percent of its grant funding for museums to each State over a 3-year period. It is not my intent to micro manage this agency and the amendment is tailored to give the IMS flexibility in reaching that goal.

I urge the Senate to adopt this amendment. I have a table that shows where the grant awards from the general operating support funds for this year were awarded on a State-by-State basis. My colleagues will find that, as can be expected, some States do well and others not so well. Nevada and North Dakota received no funding at all. Our support programs such as this one should be operated in a fair and equitable manner and it is evident that the IMS has failed in that regard. As such, this amendment is a modest effort at improving that program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the table to which I referred.

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

State by State comparison of general operating support grants from the institute of Museum Services for 1988

Alabama.....	\$198,920
Alaska.....	51,158
Arizona.....	237,902
Arkansas.....	63,754
California.....	1,732,311
Colorado.....	127,945
Connecticut.....	323,747
Delaware.....	252,537
Florida.....	288,393
Georgia.....	163,285
Hawaii.....	47,647
Idaho.....	63,070
Illinois.....	723,719
Indiana.....	344,717
Iowa.....	127,211
Kansas.....	345,612
Kentucky.....	75,000
Louisiana.....	96,512
Maine.....	227,011
Maryland.....	330,893
Massachusetts.....	1,333,755
Michigan.....	639,736
Minnesota.....	255,127

Mississippi.....	80,000
Missouri.....	226,632
Montana.....	175,732
Nevada.....	0
Nebraska.....	5,000
New Hampshire.....	181,659
New Jersey.....	41,953
New Mexico.....	158,693
New York.....	2,286,792
North Carolina.....	436,066
North Dakota.....	0
Ohio.....	640,561
Oklahoma.....	71,553
Oregon.....	174,290
Pennsylvania.....	1,623,845
South Carolina.....	110,000
Rhode Island.....	127,672
South Dakota.....	137,294
Tennessee.....	269,268
Texas.....	352,090
Utah.....	91,024
Vermont.....	137,404
Virginia.....	456,755
Washington.....	525,670
Washington, DC.....	75,000
West Virginia.....	26,602
Wisconsin.....	249,088
Wyoming.....	75,000

Mr. McCLURE. Madam President, I know that the Institute of Museum Services does not like the direction that this amendment takes. I understand exactly what the Senator from Nebraska is attempting to do, and I do not want to fly under any false colors here.

I suspect that there will be strong resistance from the House conferees when we get to the conference. But, with the understanding of the managers of the bill that it has an uncertain future—and I do not want to indicate by that that we are going to jettison the amendment when we walk out the door, which is sometimes the case, but, in honesty, I want people to understand that this has an uncertain future in conference—I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, I am somewhat disturbed by the statements made by my friend and colleague from Idaho. I appreciate his forthright attitude.

It might well be that a rollcall vote will be necessary to establish whether the Senate feels it is necessary to be fair in this measure. I was trying to expedite things, and I am not particularly encouraged by the statement made by the Senator from Idaho.

I simply say that if Idaho had been treated as have several States, including the State of Nebraska with \$5,000 and the State of Nevada with zero and the State of North Dakota with zero, I imagine that the Senator from Idaho would feel a little more strongly about this than he does. I do not know how Idaho was treated, but I suspect that Idaho was treated a little better than some of us who do not happen to have members from a particular State on the Appropriations Committee.

So I advise, in answer to the remarks made by the Senator from Idaho, that I will be following this with keen interest, and I will alert the members of the Nebraska delegation on the House side.

defeated in House/Senate Conference

I believe that the intent of this amendment is not to try to dictate, other than to say that a minuscule, minimum amount should be provided in each instance of the States, which I think the review group should not object to on the merits. I am not trying to be unreasonable, and I think the Senator from Idaho knows that. The Senator from Louisiana indicated that he thought it was a reasonable amendment.

So I hope the Senator will take this up with great deliberation and see if the House of Representatives will understand the fairness of the measure put forth by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, I do not understand my colleague from Idaho to exhibit a lack of enthusiasm for the amendment but, rather, I think he stated what is the fact, and that is that we may run into trouble with the House Members in conference.

We will do our best, but I urge my friend from Nebraska to work his magic not only on his own delegation but also on the members of the conference committee. We have many items here, and they can be very tough in their bargaining over there.

Any help we can get from the Senator from Nebraska, particularly on this amendment, will be greatly appreciated and may be necessary to ensure a fair consideration by the House Members in the conference.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, I thank my friend from Louisiana.

I simply say that I do not know whether the same caveat has been placed on other amendments that have been taken as has been placed on the amendment I have offered.

I guess anything is at risk, as we understand that, during the conference procedure. I simply emphasize that I feel very strongly about this and will be doing everything I can to assist my colleagues who will be serving on the conference committee to make proper explanation of this in the House, in the hope that they would see the reasonableness of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2615) was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLURE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I wonder if I might engage the acting chairman of the subcommittee and the Senator from Alaska in a brief colloquy concerning funding for the timber program in Alaska's Tongass National Forest.

Mr. STEVENS. I would be pleased to discuss this program, which I know

has been a matter of some interest to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I would be pleased to respond to any comments from either the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am concerned that funding for the timber program in the Tongass National Forest is adjusted so that spending more accurately reflects the anticipated timber product and pulp demand from the Tongass, and reduces backlogs of Tongass timber investment made in excess of market demand since 1981.

Mr. STEVENS. My concern is that Congress assures an adequate supply of timber to the Tongass timber industry. In the past, investments in this program have not always reflected market demand or the needs of the southeast Alaska timber industry. This has contributed to increases in the cost of doing business on the Tongass. In the future, Federal spending on the Tongass Timber Program must provide an adequate timber supply to the timber industry at reasonable costs.

I would also note that the Forest Service has made substantial changes in its administration of the Tongass to deal with these concerns. One of my principal concerns is that now they are underestimating timber demand levels for the future.

Mr. JOHNSTON. During our conference with the House, I expect the committee to address the concerns of both Senators. The committee has reported the President's recommendations for Tongass spending for fiscal year 1989. However, the committee has received conflicting statements of the amount of timber available for sale, and the quantity of unharvested volume available under all contracts. I hope to resolve them for fiscal year 1989 in conference.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Forest Service has provided the Congress with conflicting information. These discrepancies significantly affect the level of funding necessary to make adequate supplies available to industry consistent with market demand and sound resource management in fiscal year 1989 and future years. Congress should fund the Tongass Timber Program to offer and administer Tongass timber sales at no greater level than necessary for meeting anticipated demand for timber products and pulp from the national forest. To do this, we must reduce the backlog of fully prepared timber to be offered or sold. We must reduce the timber industry's backlog of timber under contract but unharvested. And most important, we must reduce the backlog of added investments in road construction and pre-commercial thinning created by the Forest Service since 1981.

Mr. STEVENS. I would agree with my colleague, Mr. PROXMIRE, that the inventory of timber readily available to the timber industry should play a significant role in determining the

level of Federal expenditures for the Tongass Timber Program. However, Congress must continue to invest in marginal timberlands to ensure an adequate supply of timber to the Tongass dependent timber industry in southeast Alaska.

I have not yet reached agreement with the Senator from Wisconsin on the appropriate volume of timber inventories under contract for all Tongass timber purchasers. I was just in southeast Alaska, around the Ketchikan area, during the Fourth of July recess, and spoke to several industry people who were very concerned about the availability of timber. One or two of Alaska's mills have enough under contract to last them several years. Many others could run out in the next year if they are unable to purchase timber from small timber harvesters or more is not available for them to purchase. However, I believe we have reached agreement on how to treat this inventory volume in setting the timber preparation level for next year.

Mr. JOHNSTON. In agreeing to the President's budget proposal for fiscal 1989, the committee understood that it was recommending funding for the Tongass Timber Program sufficient for the Forest Service to maintain an adequate supply of timber under contract and prepared for harvest. The information provided to the committee has not always been consistent and clear.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Forest Service indicates that there is currently 565 million board feet [mmbf] fully prepared for harvest in the two long-term sale areas. The volume available at the beginning of fiscal year 1989 will depend upon the volume harvested this year, which the Forest Service currently estimates at 210 mmbf, and the new volume prepared during this year, which is scheduled to be 260 mmbf.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield, I point out that the two long-term sale holders report a harvest of 162 mmbf as of May of this fiscal year, and expect to reach nearly 300 mmbf by October.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator. In addition, there will be 84 mmbf available for sale to short-term timber purchasers at the beginning of fiscal year 1989. At that time, there will be an estimated 211 mmbf to 478 mmbf of unharvested timber under contract by short-term timber purchasers.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Last year, we were faced with a similar debate with the House over the funding level for the Tongass Timber Program. To resolve it, we worked out a procedure which should be applied again this year. The most difficult step is arriving at some agreement on the volume of timber which should be under contract and ready for harvest at the beginning of the fiscal year.

Once this issue is resolved, it is a simple calculation to add the volume