

Senate and House in the conference moved the bill more toward the position favored by the Treasury and the position of those who had at first objected to the bill. So from the point of view of those who objected at first, the bill is a much better bill.

The revenue loss is reduced by 85 percent.

Of the amendments that the Treasury objected to, four were drastically modified or dropped completely, and the only one we could not modify drastically was H.R. 10, which happened to be an amendment adopted unanimously by the House. It was a Senate amendment; therefore, we had no power to reverse the judgment of the House on that matter.

Mr. President, this is a good bill. The President thinks it is a good bill. The House by its vote thinks it is a good bill. When the House voted to take 49 Senate amendments and agree to the conference report, it seems to me that it is a report that can be agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to express appreciation to the leadership and the membership of the Senate for the consideration which this issue has been given. I do not aspire to be the conscience of the Senate nor thus to hold myself out.

I, and other Members of this body, felt very deeply about this issue—so deeply that we felt in duty conscience bound to make a fight against the final congressional step in passage of a bill which, in one instance, provides numerous examples of stark tax favoritism, and in the other, a bizarre, unwise, and, I think, dangerous innovation of the use of public money for political campaigns and the commingling of public money with private money, at the election of private citizens, in the appropriation of public funds.

But I feel that with this brief statement I have performed my duty. I am still convinced that had the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and I had the audience of the Senate, which now seems impossible, this measure would be defeated. But this is not the last day in the history of our Republic. Congress will be back soon to correct mistakes that may have been made, or perhaps make others, as well as to accomplish good.

I know that there are present, in order to achieve a quorum, Senators whose health is not well served by this exercise.

I am advised that other Members of the Senate have deaths in their families, that loved ones are in critical condition. I shall not personalize, but I feel for those friends.

So, with appreciation, I wish to make a brief statement and then ask for the yea and nays on adoption or rejection of the conference report. It shall be

divided into two parts, but I assure Senators again it will be brief.

The distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] spoke of certain provisions which the Treasury favors. I wish to suggest to Senators, not all of the instances of rank, stark favoritism, but just two or three to illustrate the point.

The senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] referred to one at some length earlier. Let me just read from page 7 of the conference report:

The Senate amendment (in proposed section 201) amends section 48(a)(2)(B) to include among the exceptions from the general rule with respect to property used predominantly outside the U.S. property which is owned by a domestic corporation (other than a corporation entitled to the benefits of section 931 or 934(b)) or by a U.S. citizen (other than a citizen entitled to the benefits of sec. 931, 932, 933, or 934(c)) and which is used predominantly in a possession of the United States by such a corporation or such a citizen, or by a corporation created or organized in, or under the law of, a possession of the United States. Under the Senate amendment, this provision was effective with respect to property placed in service on or after January 1, 1966 (but no carryback of an investment credit attributable to this provision was permitted).

I read this language to illustrate how difficult it is for Senators, and more particularly citizens unlearned in tax law, to read the technical terms of conditions set forth in a committee report or conference report and detect what has been done.

Now, what, in laymen's language, does this provide? It provides a tax benefit retroactively to one large United States corporation, in excess of \$2 million.

What is its justification? There is none, in my view, it extends the investment credit retroactively for a large aluminum plant, already constructed and already under operation, in the Virgin Islands.

When we passed the Investment Credit Act, it was for the stated purpose of encouraging development in the United States—modernization of our plants, Senators will remember—in order to meet competition from overseas. We did not extend it beyond the limits of the United States proper. So this company built its plant there, in the full awareness that it was to be built with no expectation of receiving the benefit of the investment credit.

As I said, the investment is already made, and the plant is already operating.

This amendment which has been attached to the bill is, as has been stated, one of the Christmas packages, because it gives more than \$2 million for no purpose in which there is a public interest.

That is the first point. I could discuss it more fully, but let me go to another.

I refer now to another amendment. I shall not undertake to read the technicalities of it. It is even more technical