

SENATE—Tuesday, September 21, 1993

(Legislative day of Tuesday, September 7, 1993)

The Senate met at 9 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, a Senator from the State of Colorado.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

* * * *For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.*—Romans 13:1.

Eternal God, Lord of Heaven and Earth, we thank Thee for the giants who serve in the U.S. Senate today. Only the perspective of history will reveal who are the Washingtons, the Jeffersons, the Adamsses, the Monroes, the Websters, and the Franklins. We are grateful for the commitment of these statesmen to the Senate, the Nation, and the world. We thank You for the privilege of serving in their midst and their greatness, manifest even before the judgment of history. May Thy blessing be upon them, their loved ones, and staffs. And may they be guided in their use of power—to the glory of God and the blessing of the people.

In Jesus' name. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 21, 1993.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, a Senator from the State of Colorado, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CAMPBELL thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order there

will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 11:30 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

The first hour of morning business shall be under the control of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] or their designees.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 8 minutes on behalf of the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

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

NAFTA

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I announced yesterday my support for the North American Free-Trade Agreement, and I wish to take just a few minutes of the Senate's time this morning to reiterate a couple of points that I made yesterday. I believe the debate about NAFTA needs to take place in the context of world trade today.

There is tremendous frustration throughout the country, and rightfully so, about the adverse trade relationship we find ourselves in. We have a trade deficit this year which is expected to reach \$110 to \$115 billion. That is \$115 billion more in goods and services that we are purchasing from the rest of the world than we are able to sell. Clearly this is not a healthy situation for our own economy. It does result in the loss of jobs. That persistent and chronic trade deficit has continued for at least the last decade. It really began in the early eighties, the very end of the seventies, and it has worsened. Although there have been some ups and downs, it has generally been a major, major problem for us for the last decade.

So that is part of the context and that is an understandable cause for concern about any new free-trade agreement or any new proposal to increase access to U.S. markets.

Another part of the context that we need to look at is the present trade relations we have with Mexico. Many people are not familiar with the way the maquiladora program works. Let me describe that very briefly, Mr. President, because I think it is very important to understand that program when you consider the impact of this proposed trade agreement. The

maquiladora program is a program we have had in place now for well over a decade which provides that United States firms can establish themselves in Mexico, establish plants in Mexico, hire Mexican workers, bring materials and components in from the United States duty free into Mexico, assemble them into finished products, and then ship those finished products into the United States also duty free.

The value of the work going into those, the increase in value in those products is not assessed a tariff when those products come into the U.S. markets.

So that is the arrangement we have today. There is clearly an incentive in the present law for United States companies to construct plants in Mexico and to ship goods back into the United States. That has been happening at a very rapid rate for over a decade. It is another cause of the concern that people have about increased trade with Mexico because they see that increased trade as an expansion of that maquiladora program.

But then we need to look at what is actually proposed in this agreement. What this agreement proposes to do, at least as I see it, is to even up that set of incentives. Under the new agreement not only would there be incentive for United States firms to go ahead and establish plants and produce products in Mexico, which clearly would continue, but there would also be an incentive for sales into Mexico because we would see the tariff that Mexico imposes upon United States products drop to zero over the next several years.

That is a dramatic benefit to the United States which we have not enjoyed. Quite frankly, if we could rewrite history, it would have made a great deal of sense for us to insist upon a lowering of those tariffs as a part of the bargain for entering into the maquiladora program that we have had now for some time.

But that was not done. I think that error is being corrected in this free-trade agreement.

In this free-trade agreement, the opportunity for sales into Mexico will increase very significantly. Clearly, I do not think anybody believes that the last United States plant in Mexico has been established, but I would suggest that the rush to establish production in Mexico will slow because of this free-trade agreement if it is adopted. So that is part of the context that we also need to look at.

The NAFTA agreement, in my view, will help this country help us to compete in the world market which is the larger competition that we face. Our extremely large trade deficit today is not as a result of our trade with Mexico. It is not as a result of our trade with Canada or any other Western Hemisphere country. It is a result primarily of our trade with Asia, and we need a strategy. We desperately need a strategy as a nation to deal with that imbalance in our trade with Asia.

We have a chronic trade deficit with Japan of \$50 billion. I think it was \$49 billion last year. We had last year an \$18 billion trade deficit with China which is expected to grow to \$25 billion this year, and I would point out that China has just begun to trade. China has an enormous economy, enormous human resources, and they have just begun to gear up to export to the rest of the world. The rest of the world primarily means the U.S. market because the U.S. market is under present circumstances the only large market that is free and open to them. The European market is not as open. Japan itself is not as open. And our trade deficit with China is growing enormously.

I understand the frustration that surrounds that. I share that frustration. I think we need a strategy to deal with that larger trade deficit issue.

But it would be a mistake, in my view, to reject NAFTA because of our concern about the larger trade imbalance. NAFTA can be a tool for us to correct that larger trade imbalance.

United States firms working with Mexico can produce products for sale in the world market. We can produce high quality products. We can produce products at low enough cost that they can compete in the world markets.

So I think the opportunity improves for us to sell overseas, the opportunity improves for us to sell in Mexico under this agreement, and I do think it makes good sense for us to do so.

The final point I would make, Mr. President, is that we have a common destiny with our neighbors—our neighbors being Canada and Mexico. My home State was part of Mexico for more than 20 years, 25 years, back in the early 1800's.

We have a long tradition of trade with Mexico. There were wagon trains coming from Mexico City to Chihuahua to Santa Fe and House long before we had wagon trains coming from the east coast in the United States to Santa Fe and House.

So we have a tradition with Mexico. It has served us well. We need to build on that. We need to encourage that.

This free-trade agreement will help us to strengthen the cooperation and communication we have with our neighbors to the south. It can be a good thing economically for the United States and a good thing economically for Mexico.

I think it would be a mistake for this Congress to reject the free-trade agreement at this point. I hope that my colleagues will, after studying the issue, determine that this is something that the country should go forward with. I do believe that it will be a lost opportunity if we fail to ratify this treaty.

So I appreciate the chance to speak again today. I know there are quite a few others who have reserved time to speak, and for that reason I will yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. BRADLEY addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY].

THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his comments this morning and for his speech yesterday in support of the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Today there will be a number of Senators, in the next hour, who will come to the floor to express their support for the North American Free-Trade Agreement. They will be both Democratic and Republican Senators and they will demonstrate support across the regions of this country.

The Senator from New Mexico is from the West. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MATHEWS] is here to speak. He is from the border States. The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] is here. He is obviously from the East, as I am.

The NAFTA has very strong bipartisan support across regions in this country, and I think for good reason. I believe it is in the U.S. national interest. I believe that was symbolized just last week when you had four Presidents—two Republicans, two Democrats—at the White House strongly endorsing the agreement. The two other living Presidents strongly endorse the agreement.

They clearly see the importance of this agreement to the national interest of America, the national interest that they, at different times in their own careers, were called upon to defend and to further. They recognize, as former Presidents, that it is not always easy to see the whole, to see the general interests. They clearly were under, in their careers, pressures from the narrower interests.

But I think it is very significant that all living Presidents, both Republican and Democratic, endorse the North American Free-Trade Agreement. It sends a very powerful signal of support for this agreement that it is in the national interest.

There are good reasons, I believe, why it is in the national interest. They are economic, they are political, and they are social.

The economic reasons are very simple. It means jobs in the United States. It means a more competitive America

in world commerce. It means more economic growth for the long term.

In terms of jobs, what is happening with this agreement is that the barriers that have existed to American exports into Mexico are now being dismantled. Until a few years ago, about 1986-87, Mexico existed as a closed economy. It had high tariffs. It had highly subsidized industries. It imported very little from anywhere in the world. It believed that anything that was consumed in Mexico should be produced in Mexico, regardless of the cost to the Mexican consumer.

That changed in the mid-1980's with President de la Madrid and more profoundly with President Carlos Salinas. They dramatically reduced their tariffs from something close to 80 down to 20, and now it is down to 10 percent. The result was clear. Our exports to Mexico increased from \$12 to \$40 billion and that meant more jobs in the United States—from \$12 to \$40 billion in exports.

On the other hand, on our side of the border, we have only a 4-percent tariff on goods coming in from Mexico. The North American Free-Trade Agreement eliminates those tariffs. Our tariff is not even half of what Mexico's tariff is.

So by eliminating the Mexican tariff, we are eliminating the 10-percent tax on American goods exported to Mexico. And by eliminating the 4-percent tariff, we are eliminating a 4-percent tax on Mexican goods exported to the United States.

But the agreement goes far beyond simply the tariff question. It goes to the nontariff barriers.

For example, before this agreement, a car manufactured and assembled in the United States could not be exported to Mexico. Any car sold in Mexico had to be produced in Mexico. With this agreement, we will be able to assemble vehicles and export them to Mexico.

It is estimated that, in the first year alone, we will go to 60,000 autos. And, in a country that now has a market of 750,000 autos and a population of 85 million people, it will be a dramatically expanded market for the sale of U.S. vehicle exports. That is just one example.

In terms of grains, in terms of agriculture, it represents a dramatically large market. In terms of consumer goods, it is an 85-million-person market that is oriented toward the United States in terms of consumption patterns anyway. Seven out of every \$10 that Mexicans import, they import from the United States. It is a big market, not only in terms of size, but the Mexicans, on a per capita basis, consume more than do Europeans or Japanese of American goods. And that will only increase. It is a tremendous consumer market.

In addition to that, it is a very large market for U.S. capital goods. With an

economy developed behind protective barriers, they did not always have the best equipment, they did not always have modernized equipment. Everything from power generators to refrigerators, the market is now open for U.S. goods. And there will be a tremendous pent-up demand.

The President, in his remarks just last week, estimated that NAFTA would create 200,000 new jobs in the United States, net, over the next 2 years. Name 1 other single act that would produce 200,000 jobs in America in the next 2 years.

Passing NAFTA will generate those jobs. There will clearly be some jobs that are lost from this agreement. Many of them are lower wage jobs. The point to be made here is those jobs would be lost anyway. Many of them have been lost over a decade and they have gone to Asia. With this agreement, if they are lost and go to Mexico, the workers who are employed in those companies will still be purchasing \$7 out of \$10 of their imports from the United States, thereby generating jobs in the United States.

But clearly those workers who are dislocated need to have what I call an economic security platform, which is a guarantee of health insurance, of pension security, and of lifetime education opportunities. But there is no question—and the Congressional Budget Office, I think, settled this debate when it concluded, after evaluating all of the various studies of the effect of NAFTA on job creation—that it would be a net job creator. It will be a net job creator in the short term and in the long term.

The second point on the economy is that NAFTA, in terms of the total amount of net job creation—or from the opponents' side, net job loss—is really a small part of our overall trade and a small part of our overall employment. For example, it is estimated that 1 percent of the job loss every year will be due to NAFTA; only 1 percent every year.

To what is the rest of the job loss due? Defense conversion, downsizing of the defense establishment, and from other international competition. It is indeed on that point that NAFTA is, I believe, in the strongest interests of the United States. With the North American Free-Trade Agreement, America will be more competitive against the real threat to American jobs that are represented by the economies of Europe, China, and Japan.

We now have a \$5.4 billion trade surplus with Mexico. That is likely to dramatically increase in the years ahead. We now have a \$75 billion trade deficit with Asia. That will increase unless we are more competitive. The North American Free-Trade Agreement—the integration of Canada, the United States, and Mexico—will allow us to be more competitive. We will be better able to deal with those challenges as

one economic unit, continentalwide, than we would if we were simply a single country.

So in terms of jobs, it is very clear that the North American Free-Trade Agreement is a positive. In terms of our ability to compete against the real threats to American jobs represented in Japan and China and Europe, we will be better able to compete with the North American Free-Trade Agreement. That is why I think it is clearly in our economic interest.

I know there are other Senators on the floor, and therefore I will make two other points briefly. It is in our political interest because it consolidates the developments that have taken place in Mexico over the last several years: Developments toward more democracy, developments toward a cleaner environment, developments toward a dramatic attack on corruption, and developments toward a clearer integration of the United States and Mexico in the fullest sense.

This should be important to us because we have a 2,000-mile border with Mexico. We already have a sizable illegal immigration problem coming from Mexico. And there are real questions about how we can deal with that problem. I would argue that in Mexico, where half the population is under the age of 19, if we do not have NAFTA and jobs are not created in Mexico, there is only one place that those young people are headed, and that is north. When they come across that Rio Grande, and when they come up into Kansas City or Chicago, or even as far as New Jersey or New York, as well as Texas and California and Colorado cities, they will be displacing the lowest paid American citizens, those who are working at minimum wage. Why? Because they will work for below minimum wage. Illegal immigrants work below minimum wage. They work illegally. They are in constant fear. The result is that they displace American workers.

So if we want to avoid that wave of illegal immigration, then pass the North American Free-Trade Agreement; jobs are created in Mexico; Mexicans are staying at home with their families, where any reasonable person would prefer to be if there was work, as opposed to coming illegally into the United States, displacing low-income workers, and burdening our social service system. That is, in my view, a second powerful reason for the passage of the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

There are any number of other arguments, and I could go on at some great length. I have taken only 10 minutes this morning. I know this debate will be fully joined in the weeks ahead. I am very pleased so many Senators have come to the floor today, and I understand the majority leader, Senator MITCHELL, today will be strongly endorsing the North American Free-

Trade Agreement. I think that is a very significant development.

I simply, again, want to call attention to the fact that the group on the floor today is bipartisan and across region in this country. Like the Presidents who were at the White House last week endorsing it, we believe firmly this agreement is in our national interest.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFFEE] is recognized.

Mr. CHAFFEE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Chair would be good enough to notify me at the end of 10 minutes.

I want to congratulate the Senator from New Jersey for arranging this special hour this morning in which various Senators from different parties and from different sections of the country will be speaking. Each of us will be dealing with a different topic.

The topic I am going to be dealing with in connection with the NAFTA agreement is the environment. But before getting into the environment, I want to say overall that I support the agreement strongly. It is good for the United States of America. It is good for the State of Rhode Island, which I represent.

In the State of Rhode Island, we now have increased our shipments to Mexico over the past 6 years by 65 percent. We have over 1,000 employees in our State whose jobs are directly dependent upon trade with Mexico.

You might say, only 1,000 employees in 1 State? Let me tell you, if somebody announced they were going to bring a company into our State with 1,000 employees, the Governor would be out there offering them special tax advantages. The mayor would be out there to welcome them. There would be a marvelous ceremony. A thousand people in our State is a lot of people. And we have over 1,000 people—1,033 is the best we can compute it—whose jobs are directly dependent upon trade with Mexico. If you apply the normal quotient, for every individual directly employed in a job, there are two others whose livelihood are dependent on it. That boosts the total to over 3,000, which is a lot for our little State.

Now, I would like to briefly address the environmental parts of the NAFTA agreement.

From the outset, the environment has been a key part of the negotiations. First of all, the Environmental Protection Agency—think of it, an outfit that has never previously been involved in international trade agreements—played a role in each step along the way. They released an environmental review; they formulated a border plan with Mexico; they sat at the negotiating table.

Second, major environmental organizations served as a Senior Trade Policy Advisory Committee. Ambassador Carla Hills, right from the beginning,

brought in the environmental organizations and said, "We want you to sit at the table; we want you to hear; we want your advice."

Third, and perhaps the most impressive sign, a new position was created at the U.S. Trade Representative's office. Mind you, that is a lean office. They do not have many people there. But they created an additional post, Deputy Assistant USTR for Environmental Affairs.

So it is not surprising that the NAFTA agreement contains unprecedented provisions on the environment. Let us tick some of them off:

Article 754 and 755: In sharp contrast to other trade agreements, including GATT, which all us believe in, these two articles, explicitly provide that each nation may establish measures to protect human, animal, and plant life or health at levels higher than international standards.

One of the complaints frequently is: "Oh, in California, we will not be able to ban a certain type of pesticide and require that all fruits and vegetables not be permitted to be used if this pesticide has been applied. This will be a higher standard than presently exists. We will not be able to do it."

Nonsense. Specifically, Articles 754 and 755 provide that a State or a nation can have protection for human, animal, plant life, or health that is higher than the international standards.

Articles 765 and 2005. These provisions ensure that in any challenge to these standards under NAFTA, the burden of proof lies not with the nation under challenge, but with the challenger. This is a dramatic provision. Moreover, should an environmental dispute fall within the jurisdiction of both the NAFTA and the GATT, the challenged nation may insist on the more environment-friendly NAFTA forum.

Article 1114. This important provision makes it clear that encouraging investment by lowering domestic health, safety, or environmental standards is inappropriate.

All of these provisions are remarkable steps. But attention now has turned to whether or not there exists the commitment to environmental protection that will ensure enforcement of these rules.

A nation's commitment to environmental protection is both complicated by, and enhanced by, economic growth. Often, commitment to environmental protection is severely tested by the demands of a nation's economic growth. Yet economic growth provides the resources with which a nation may promote environmental protection.

Too often we are presented with the assumption that economic growth and environmental protection are natural enemies. Yet that theory has been rejected by both trade specialists and many sophisticated environmentalists.

As Jay Hair, president of the National Wildlife Federation, wrote in his 1991 editorial "Natural Can Live With Free Trade," "that presumption—that environmentalism and economics don't mix—has been punctured."

Today, environmentalists and economists can be partners, not adversaries. The best way for a nation to handle environmental challenges is for it to become wealthier, and thus better positioned to attack environmental problems. Don't expect Bangladesh to have a good environment—they are hanging on by their fingernails, trying to survive. That there is a direct relationship between increased national income and decreased levels of pollution has been proven by World Bank economists. Moreover, a prosperous nation finds greater popular support for environmental measures: generally, as the prosperity of the citizenry rises, so does interest in a cleaner environment.

By any standard, Mexico has made phenomenal strides regarding the environment. In Mexico City, \$4.6 billion has been dedicated to environmental initiatives, including a 1-day-per-week ban on driving; the introduction of unleaded and oxygenated gasolines; mandatory semiannual vehicle emissions tests—I have seen these tests, and they are far tougher than in the United States, including Los Angeles—the closing of heavy industrial polluters at great cost to jobs; and the planting of pine and cedar trees for increased oxygen. At the border, \$460 million has been committed to border cleanup projects. Mexico is working with the United States on enforcement: Recently, a joint United States-Mexican enforcement effort resulted in the payment of \$2 million by a United States company to clean up a toxic waste dump in Mexico.

Mexico also has taken numerous steps with regard to species conservation. My colleagues may be interested to know of a recent event: In June, at a ceremony attended by Interior Secretary Babbitt, President Salinas announced the creation of the Sonora Biosphere Reserve, which will provide protection for the endangered vaquita dolphin.

These and the many other steps taken by the 5-year-old Salinas government reflect an environmental commitment that is steadfast and growing stronger.

There are NAFTA critics who dismiss President Salinas' initiatives as window dressing. But to thoughtful observers, this criticism rings hollow. Today, Mexico's environmental investment totals nearly 1 percent of its GDP—hardly a faltering commitment. Moreover, President Salinas has received international environmental awards: the 1991 Earth Prize and the 1992 World Conservation Leadership Award. Perhaps most importantly, this criticism seems to ignore Mexico's growing do-

mestic interest in the environment: The Mexican "Green" party won an unprecedented 5 percent of Mexico City's popular vote in the last elections.

Last Wednesday, a dedicated group of environmentalists representing some 7.5 million Americans came out in strong support of the NAFTA agreement. Senator BAUCUS, one of the leading environmentalists in the whole Congress, came out strongly for it, and accompanying Senator BAUCUS at that event to endorse NAFTA were Peter Berle, president of the National Audubon Society; Kathryn Fuller, head of the World Wildlife Fund; Jay Hair, from the National Wildlife Federation; Russell Millermeier, Conservation International; Fred Krupp, from the Environmental Defense Fund; and John Adams, from the Natural Resources Defense Fund. These are well-respected, major environmental organizations in the United States, and they came out strongly for NAFTA.

In conclusion, Mr. President, NAFTA is good for the environment. It is good for the environment of the United States and it is good for the environment of Mexico. I do hope it will be overwhelmingly approved not just by the U.S. Senate but in the House of Representatives likewise.

I want to thank the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. MATHEWS addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator MATHEWS is recognized.

SUPPORT FOR NAFTA

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleagues for permitting me to be a part of this program this morning and to express my support for NAFTA. I want to spend just a few moments giving a salute to the American worker and to American industry for placing us in a position to be able to favorably compete rather than feeling a need to retreat.

Mr. President, a few days ago, President Clinton presided at the signing of a monumental peace accord, and—joined by three former Presidents—he reaffirmed his pledge to another agreement of sweeping change—the North American Free-Trade Agreement. On that occasion, I thought of John Kennedy standing before the Berlin Wall and declaring 30 years ago that no border could forever hold back the human heart seeking a better life. Today, Mr. President, NAFTA is this decade's reaffirmation that borders dividing nations must never divide their peoples from opportunity. And I am saddened to hear Members of John Kennedy's party and the heirs of his heritage saying that is precisely what borders should do.

It is not merely that the bunker-builders who oppose NAFTA are demanding something that should not be

done. They are demanding something that simply cannot be done. If we have learned anything over the past 30 years, it is that borders between nations cannot be made impermeable to trade. For with or without NAFTA, hemispheric trade is the dominant fact of the world's future. That fact is apparent.

In November, the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation meets in Seattle. When APEC's 15 member nations gather, they will bring almost half of the world trade volume into one room. Across the Atlantic, Europe is uniting more than 340 million producers and consumers. Central and South America are rushing onto the stage. A few years ago, the U.S. stock market represented 70 percent of the world's equity capital. Today, it is 40 percent. That is the world we live in, and it is the world we have to compete in.

Mr. President, NAFTA brings us face to face with a decision. That decision is whether the United States turns her economic vision productively and convincingly outward, or whether we try to bury our head in the drifting sand of economic change. I have noticed that when an ostrich sticks its head in the sand, its rump is standing in the air. That is just about as vulnerable a posture as I can imagine. Yet that is exactly the economic posture the opponents of NAFTA are eager to have us support.

President Clinton spoke eloquently and accurately when he framed the core issue about this agreement. He said the issue is whether the United States will face the future with confidence that we can create tomorrow's jobs or whether we will try against all the evidence to hold on to yesterday's economy. He asked how the United States can stake out high ground with GATT and future trade talks if we defeat this agreement. He challenged us to prove we are capable of understanding and acting in our own economic interest. By comparison, the arguments against NAFTA are a serenade of one-string banjos. And frankly the tune is becoming tiresome.

We are told that Mexico—an economic one-twentieth our size—will swamp the U.S. market with cheap imports. The eventual fact is more likely to be the reverse. Mexican goods already enter our economy with an average tariff of 1.9 percent, and on many the tariff is nil. By contrast, Mexican tariffs average 10 percent, and on some goods it is much higher. Under NAFTA, those tariffs fall even further than they have through the enlightened reforms of President Salinas. We have seen the result, and it has been good for America: Since the mid-1980's, United States exports to Mexico soared from \$12 billion to more than \$40 billion, and a \$5 billion trade deficit became a \$5 billion trade surplus. Despite their lower wages, the typical Mexican consumer

buys more U.S. goods than his wealthier Asian and European counterparts. There is also the fact that NAFTA pretends a stronger Mexican economy, and that is beneficial to the United States in ways that are too sensible to ignore. The trend is clear. NAFTA advances it. Americans benefit from it.

We are told that NAFTA is an excuse to export jobs. There are so many considerations with that, that it is difficult to know which ones really apply. We probably should start by realizing that our economy does not need an excuse to export lesser-skilled jobs. After all, we lost 2.6 million of them to low-wage countries in the 1980's. If that trend is going to continue, defeating NAFTA will not stop it. The question seems to be whether passing NAFTA will accelerate it. I believe that American industry's intentions to move to Mexico and its reasons to do so are not evident.

For one thing, labor costs are a small percentage of many products and therefore a small incentive to savings. For another thing, Mexican wages are sure to increase, thereby diminishing any wage incentive over time. But as any business and finance practitioner will tell you, the issue underlying wages is worker productivity, and the increase in productivity of American workers is a strong incentive for keeping jobs here.

On top of all this, American industry's cost curve also is set by the costs of transportation, outlays in plant and equipment, the useful life of existing assets in this country, and a host of other matters. Expatriation increases those explicit and implicit costs. If wage rates were the end-all and be-all of production decisions, we would, indeed, be worried about the economic threat of Bangladesh and Haiti, as the Washington Post pointed out.

What I have heard of this debate so far, Mr. President, prompts me to offer a straight-from-the-shoulder word to those who seek to defeat NAFTA. And what I have to say is that their arguments against NAFTA speak ill of them. For what those arguments amount to is a declaration that American labor has priced itself out of world competitiveness. More than that, they amount to a statement that American consumers, exporters, and manufacturers should sacrifice their opportunity for greater consumption, revenues, and production to keep it that way.

No one respects the American working man and woman more than I do, and that is why I find this implicit argument so unworthy. The fact is that our toughest economic adversaries are nations with higher or faster increasing labor costs. The American worker is productive, skilled, intelligent, and determined. The great promise of American labor lies in becoming even more so. It does not lie in raising the decibels of the debate. We need to re-

member that NAFTA will provide U.S. industry and workers an edge on our foreign competitors like Germany and Japan.

It matters to Germans if they create gains in Germany and to the Japanese if they create jobs in Japan. Gratifyingly, that same attitude is growing today in American industry, including industries that supposedly have the most to gain by leaving the United States. I remind my friends in business and industry that it stands in America's interest and their interest to keep that momentum going.

The Saturn plant in Tennessee is a great example of how labor and management can do right by each other as colleagues in common purpose. Every worker displaced from Detroit by construction of the Saturn plant was promised a job when the plant was finished. Thousands of workers took GM up on its promise, and now they are proud workers and providers for their families. Saturn is more than one of the finest facilities in the world producing one of the world's finest automobiles. It is a blueprint of the future, a roadmap for the way things should be.

At bottom, Mr. President, with our vote on NAFTA we will indicate whether the United States intends to lead, follow, or erect our own version of a Berlin wall. I say we lead—that we join the rank of nations heeding their future and not their fears, nations intent on becoming more prosperous and secure by becoming more productive and more competitive. That is the course NAFTA offers, and that is the course we must choose.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my statement there be printed a list of some 15 companies that have a Tennessee presence or Tennessee headquarters that have contacted me and strongly urged I support the NAFTA agreement and that I made public my position on it.

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

LIST OF TENNESSEE COMPANIES

1. Tennessee Farm Bureau Association, Columbia, TN, Joe Hawkins, President.
2. Waste Reduction Technologies, Nashville, TN, Alan Phillips, Vice-President.
3. Mayfield Dairy Farms, Athens, TN, Scottie Mayfield, Vice-President.
4. Sparks Companies, Inc., Memphis, TN, Robert F. Hine, Vice-President & Principal.
5. Parris Manufacturing Co., Savannah, TN, Craig A. Phillips, President.
6. A.J. Metler Hauling and Rigging, Inc., Knoxville, TN, A.A. Metler.
7. Caterpillar Financial Services Corporation, Nashville, TN, James S. Beard.
8. Bechtel Oak Ridge Corporate Center, Oak Ridge, TN, Joseph F. Nemec.
9. Whirlpool Corporation, La Vergne, TN, Paul D. Hutchins, VP.
10. JC Penney, Knoxville, TN, Bob Mantel, Store Manager.
11. Square D Company Electrical Equipment, Smyrna, TN, Gary R. Abrams, Facility Manager.

12. Chubb LifeAmerica, Chattanooga, TN.
 Elaine M. Duncan.
 13. Procter & Gamble, Jackson, TN.
 14. Brown-Forman Corporation, W.L.
 Lyons Brown, Jr., Jack Daniel's Distillery,
 Lynchburg.
 15. Tennessee Eastman Co., Kingsport, TN.
 Mr. MATHEWS. With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.
 Mr. DANFORTH addressed the Chair.
 The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH] is recognized.

OUTRAGEOUS CLAIMS BY PEROT

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, Mr. Ross Perot claims that NAFTA will put 5.9 million jobs in the United States at risk. That is a very scary statement. Frightening people, scaring people is not something that is new in politics. A lot of people have gained great political popularity by trying to frighten people. But the claim that 5.9 million jobs will be at risk is so outrageous that it deserves an answer. The fact is that today one out of every six manufacturing jobs in the United States depends on exports. One out of every three acres planted by the American farmer is designed for export.

Exports create jobs in the United States. According to the Commerce Department, every billion dollars of exports creates 20,000 jobs. Since 1986, the Government of Mexico under President Salinas has on its own undertaken a reduction in trade barriers. Still, the trade barriers in Mexico are much greater than trade barriers erected by the United States. But even with the partial liberalization of the Mexican market under President Salinas, United States exports to Mexico since 1986 have increased from \$12 billion a year to over \$40 billion a year. Mexico is now the third largest export market for the United States, and the Mexican consumer, who is belittled by Mr. Perot, buys much more per capita of American goods and services than the average consumer in, say, Japan.

Regardless of the good record since 1986, major trade barriers continue to exist in Mexico. NAFTA deals with those trade barriers. Today, Mexican tariffs are 2½ times the tariffs of the United States, on average. Well, that differential will be phased out, those tariffs in Mexico will be phased out, under NAFTA. Right now, the American farmer suffers because 25 percent of American agricultural exports to Mexico must enter that market under import licenses awarded by the Mexican Government. Those import licenses would immediately be terminated under NAFTA. Right now, domestic content rules in Mexico and restrictions on importing automobiles imposed by the Mexican Government have greatly disadvantaged United States automakers and, in fact, only 1,000 American cars a year are now exported into Mexico.

Right now, the maquiladora program amounts to a massive free-trade zone and export promotion program directed right to the United States, right on our own border. That unfair maquiladora program would be phased out under NAFTA.

I understand Mr. Perot's desire to appeal to fear, because appealing to fear works politically. And I can understand why some people want to be scared. Change is scary. Competition is scary. It is much more comforting to run to Washington and ask that Government provide special protection. But it also is the road to decline, as far as our country is concerned.

I want to briefly touch on a variety of statements that Mr. Perot makes in his book that are just false.

First, Mr. Perot quotes former Secretary of Labor Lynn Martin as saying that NAFTA will cost 150,000 American jobs. False. Lynn Martin said that NAFTA will create a net increase of 175,000 American jobs.

Mr. Perot claims that the U.S. automobile industry is on the endangered list under NAFTA. False. The Congressional Budget Office has found that United States auto companies would gain from dismantling Mexican trade barriers. The administration believes that instead of 1,000 exports of cars a year into Mexico, that number in the first year of NAFTA would rise to 60,000 cars.

Mr. Perot claims that NAFTA is a bad deal for American agriculture. False, because it eliminates the import licenses now imposed by Mexico. And for that reason a variety of farm organizations—the American Farm Bureau, the National Corn Growers Association, the American Soybean Association, the National Pork Producers Council, the National Cattlemen's Association, and the Rice Millers' Association—all of these farm organizations support NAFTA.

Mr. Perot suggests that the problems associated with the maquiladora program would be extended throughout the country of Mexico. False. The maquiladora program would be phased out under NAFTA.

Mr. Perot claims that NAFTA jeopardizes the safety of American highways by permitting unsafe trucks and drivers from Mexico to drive in the United States. False. America's safety standards would be maintained under NAFTA.

Mr. Perot claims that NAFTA would lower U.S. health and environmental standards. False. It will not do so.

Well, Mr. Perot has been invited to appear before the Senate Finance Committee, and I hope he comes. I would like to look under the hood and find out what his arguments are all about. But I think he is trying to frighten people, and I think this is still the home of the brave, and I believe Americans are in business to compete. We

can compete in international markets and win, provided that we have a fair opportunity to compete. Right now, with Mexican tariffs 2½ times ours, we do not have a fair opportunity to compete. NAFTA will change those rules, and it will change those rules in our favor.

Mr. PACKWOOD addressed the Chair.
 The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], is recognized.

NAFTA

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, the NAFTA debate up until last week has been dominated by the opponents who have relied upon misinformation and paranoia.

Last week, the President gave a truly stirring address. I was intrigued that he was joined by three past Presidents. Although President Nixon was not there, he does support NAFTA. I was intrigued with the sequence. President Ford was there endorsing NAFTA. He had been defeated of course by President Carter. President Carter was there and he, of course, had been defeated by the Reagan-Bush ticket. President Bush was there, and he had been defeated by President Clinton.

Campaigns do not necessarily do a lot to engender warmth and love, but here we had past Presidents who had been defeated by subsequent Presidents, all joining together to endorse the North American Free-Trade Agreement. Presidents from different parts of the country, George Bush with his familiar early roots in New England; Gerald Ford, Michigan; Jimmy Carter, Georgia; and Bill Clinton, of course, Arkansas.

Those who have been attacking NAFTA have done a great disservice to all Americans who are legitimately concerned about this issue. The debate should focus on facts not fears.

What I would like to focus on this morning, Mr. President, is the claims of NAFTA opponents that the NAFTA agreement will result in job losses and a flood of imports from Mexico into the United States. NAFTA opponents are seriously underestimating our capacity for productivity, and our present ability to compete internationally.

Opponents claim that United States workers cannot compete with low-wage countries like Mexico, and if NAFTA is implemented United States, factories will close and the jobs by the scores of thousands and millions will move to Mexico. My answer to this is, Mr. President, if this is true, why does not it happen now? Mexico's wages have always been lower than ours and our market is already open to Mexico's goods. Any company that wanted to go to Mexico would have gone years ago.

For all practical purposes, we have a one-way free trade agreement with Mexico now, and it is one way with

Mexican goods coming in. If this is a level playing field, our barriers are low and Mexico's are much higher. We are trying to get them down to a level playing field. But this is a benefit to us, much more than it is to Mexico.

What NAFTA critics have failed to understand is that wages are not the principal reason companies decide to locate overseas. If that were true, most of the developing countries would be manufacturing superpowers, businesses would be fleeing in droves, to Bangladesh, Haiti, Pakistan, and other very low-wage countries. They are not. Rather, there are other factors that weigh equally if not more importantly. These include: American productivity. American workers are far more productive than those of Mexico, or most other industrialized countries, and our productivity continues to rise faster than our trading partners.

Last year, alone, Mr. President, the hourly output of U.S. workers rose 4.6 percent. It has far exceeded the increases in productivity of Germany of 0.6 percent, France of 2.9 percent, Canada, 4.2 percent, and Japan, which went backward and decreased 6.2.

Second, infrastructure. The United States has a tremendous infrastructure of transportation and communications systems that are the rival of the world. And they are clearly far more developed than they are in Mexico, or are likely to be in Mexico for decades to come.

Third is location to market. Most companies like to be close to the principal market they are going to serve. In the North American free trade union, clearly the U.S. market is going to be the biggest market, and companies will locate here.

To demonstrate these points, let us consider the cost of assembling an automobile in Mexico and in the United States. A recent Office of Technology study determined that it was actually cheaper to build a car in the United States—\$8,770—than in Mexico, where it was \$9,180, even though labor costs in the United States were eight times higher than in Mexico. Why is this? One, the shipping costs from Mexico to the United States are high; two, the United States-made car could be built faster in a more advanced factory; three, United States workers are more skilled. Overall, and most important, the study found that labor costs were a small portion of the car's total cost. Mexico's labor is 2 percent of the cost, and in the United States, it is 8 percent of the cost. To put it another way, Mr. President, in the United States, 92 percent of the cost of building the car is something other than labor. In Mexico, it is 98 percent. So a very few companies are going to move to Mexico for that narrow difference in total labor costs.

I recently surveyed several Oregon companies about the argument that

United States companies would move to Mexico because of labor costs. And what I found is that NAFTA will entice companies to stay put in the United States and actually increase their employment. Here is an example: Freightliner is a manufacturer of large over-the-road trucks, the kind that you see hauling goods all over the country. In fact, they have now become the biggest manufacturer of large trucks in the United States. They have two big plants, one in Portland and one in one of the Carolinas.

In the past, in order to serve the Mexican market, they have shipped their trucks to Mexico in kit form, and then assembled them in Mexico and sold them in Mexico. They had to do this because of the entry and market rules. I emphasize that Freightliner is a unionized plant—the closest thing we have in Oregon to the auto industry. It is a unionized plant with high, high wages. Freightliner has already increased its market to Mexico dramatically. They indicate that when the market is fully opened, they are not going to move to Mexico. Rather, they are going to quit sending the trucks in kit form. They will manufacture them all in the United States and send them down there, thereby increasing their employment. They have started expansion in Oregon on the expectation of increasing employment.

A second example is Landa, a Portland manufacturer of wastewater recycling equipment. Between 1992 and 1993, Landa has seen a dramatic increase in sales to Mexico—from zero in 1991 to nearly half a million dollars in 1993. Because of high duties, Landa was also considering sending kits to Mexico for assembly. With the NAFTA duty reductions, Landa will be able to manufacture the equipment entirely in Oregon and export to Mexico. That is what they plan to do. This would mean more jobs for Oregonians.

So, Mr. President, Oregon companies have confirmed what every credible economic study has indicated about NAFTA: That after all of the misinformation about NAFTA has been cleared, NAFTA will be a net job gainer for the United States.

I thank the Chair.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DORGAN). The Chair advises the Senator that the time from 10:30 a.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER].

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair for that information. I note that the distinguished Senator from Texas has a presentation on NAFTA following the sequence. I am glad to defer to her on the understanding that my half hour would begin at the time I commence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Penn-

sylvania that the time from 10:30 to 11 is controlled by the Senator from Missouri.

The Chair further advises the Senator that a unanimous-consent request could alter that order.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Texas may be permitted to speak and that my half hour would begin when I start to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas.

NAFTA

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate very much the Senator from Pennsylvania yielding me a little bit of extra time to speak on NAFTA. We have had a series of presentations this morning. I think it is very important, Mr. President, that we hear from all of the sides of NAFTA. Up until this point, we have heard a lot of anti-NAFTA talk, and it is time that we talk about the importance of NAFTA.

Let us look at the big picture, Mr. President. I think it is the most far-reaching treaty that we are going to take up in America for a long, long time to come. We are looking at our past Presidents—President Bush, President Carter, President Ford—along with our present President, President Clinton, come together. They have looked at the global situation and what is happening in trade, and they have seen a closing Europe, and they are looking into the future and seeing that it is difficult sometimes to penetrate trade with Asia.

So what should we do to make sure that we are competitive, that we will have export markets in the future? Obviously, we must look into our own hemisphere, and that is what these Presidents have done.

I applaud President Clinton for carrying on with the treaty that President Bush put forward, and I appreciate President Carter and President Ford and President Nixon all coming together and saying that this is right for America. They are looking at the future, and they do understand that export markets are important for jobs for America, and that is what we are looking at. So this is going to be truly a bipartisan effort.

Some of our opponents are saying that corporations are going to move to Mexico because the labor is cheaper there. There is nothing that keeps corporations from moving to Mexico right now. Some of them have done that. But what NAFTA does is it increases the economy of Mexico, wages will go up, and what happens when wages go up? When wages go up in Mexico, the people of Mexico buy American products.

Right now, the average Mexican citizen spends \$380 on American products, the largest amount of any average citizen in the world, except Japan—larger than Europe—and we must keep that. NAFTA will increase this because that is what we have seen happening.

Since the trade tariffs were lowered with Mexico, we have gone from 12 billion dollars' worth of exports to \$40 billion. As Senator DANFORTH pointed out earlier, for every \$1 billion of trade that we have of export markets, that is 20,000 jobs for Americans. So you can see that when the trade tariffs have gone down with Mexico, what has happened? There have been 500,000 jobs created in America. That is what we are looking at if we continue to decrease the trade tariffs. We are looking at even larger markets, and we are looking at more jobs for Americans, and that is what we must talk about today.

Let us take another of the things that our opponents are talking about—the environment and the labor laws. They are crying about what is going to happen when we do not have the enforceability. How can they even be thinking and say things like this because, in fact, what we have now is no enforceability. The Rio Grande is the most polluted river in the entire United States, and it is polluted without NAFTA. But now we have agreements. We have a tripartite commission that will have the ability to enforce the laws against pollution, so that now with NAFTA there will be a place to go where there will be leverage to clean up the Rio Grande River and to clean up the air in the border cities in my State like El Paso and other border cities that have been so injured.

We will have the ability for the first time, if we pass NAFTA, to enforce the environmental laws and to enforce the labor laws so that we have the best chance that we will ever have to make sure that there is fair labor and that we can begin to clean up the environment on our borders.

The other issue that I think is very important is immigration. Estimates are we will have 1.5 million fewer immigrants if we pass NAFTA that are illegal coming into our country. That is very important. It is very important for all of our America, but especially our border States—Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California—because those border cities have really been burdened with a lot of infrastructure charges created by illegal immigrants.

The cost of educating the children of illegal immigrants, hospital costs, because they come across the border and they use the hospital facilities in those areas is high. Health care and infrastructure, highways, sewers, water lines, all of these things must be expanded when illegal immigrants come across our borders.

But if we continue to build up trade with our partner to the south, the

problems of illegal immigration are going to be reduced. This was reiterated by Leon Garcia Solar, a Mexican economist, who said: "If Mexico cannot buy, your unemployment goes up and your farms go under." He understands that if we are going to have two strong countries together, NAFTA is going to forge that alliance.

Mr. President, NAFTA is not an end; NAFTA is the beginning. Our President and our former Presidents see that. There is a reason that we have a bipartisan effort on NAFTA, with our former Presidents and our present President coming together and saying this is right for America, because they are looking at the global view and they are saying NAFTA is not an end.

What we want is a trade alliance that will start in Canada and go to the tip of South America, so that we will have strong trading partners, and it will be in our hemisphere that we have strong neighbors with strong economies and great trading relationships. NAFTA is good for Mexico; it is good for the United States; and it is good for Canada.

So I thank you, Mr. President, and I especially thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for letting me talk about this very important issue. I hope that the people of America will be able to see both sides of this issue as we go down the way, and that they will support our President, our minority leader, and the majority Democrats that are all coming together and saying NAFTA is good for all of us, and what strengthens our hemisphere is going to make us all stronger.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor back to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

REFLECTIONS ON LILLIE SHANIN SPECTER'S VALUES ON THE OCCASION OF THE 93D ANNIVERSARY OF HER BIRTH

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, after attending the impressive joint session of Congress on March 27, 1990, commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of the President and General of the Army, Dwight D. Eisenhower, I thought it would be meaningful—albeit in a different way—to have a joint session on the 100th anniversary of the birth of my father, Harry Specter, who represented the unique contribution of immigrants who settled America in the early 20th century. Instead, in line with the realities of the Congress, I made an extensive floor statement in the Senate on July 1, 1992, on the life of my father on the occasion of his 100th birthday, noting his inspirational values: love of family, education—although he had no formal schooling—patriotism, courage, sacrifice, hard work,

commitment to do whatever was necessary to do the job, and an overarching sense of optimism.

Given the uncertainties of life and elections, I have decided to memorialize the life of my mother, Lillie Shanin Specter, today, which marks her 93d birthday, instead of waiting until the year 2000.

In commenting on my parents, I do so because their lives demonstrate fundamental values which our country needs to reflect on and revisit. Considering the difficulties they faced, I believe their accomplishments surpass those of my generation, although we have many more material possessions and educational degrees. My parents' generation lived their values; most of our generation give lip service to those values and many of the next generation need to be reminded of fundamental values.

Reflecting on the life of my mother is awesome. To be meaningful, it is necessary to reveal some intimacies, but not all, in accordance with one of my father's wise statements: "Know what you say; do not say what you know."

My mother was a beautiful redhead when she met my father in 1916—just check her pictures hanging in my Senate office. Their romance was interrupted by World War I, when he was wounded in France in the Argonne Forest, carrying shrapnel in his legs for the rest of his life. Before he went off to war, Lillie Shanin gave him a picture, according to my sister Shirley, with the inscription on the back:

The French girls may be pretty,

The French girls may be kind,

But don't forget

The girl you left so far behind.

He did not forget; and on his return, he threw away his crutches and they were married while he was still in uniform.

My mother and I had an extra special relationship. It was more than being the proverbial baby of the family, the last of four children. Perhaps it was a slight—very slight—sense of embarrassment when my Aunt Rose Isenberg told me that my mother was at least mildly unhappy when she found she was pregnant with me. In the midst of the Depression, with three children ages 2 to 9, and a shortage of money in the Specter household, it was not so easy. Confronting my father with her concern, if not displeasure, he replied casually: "So there will be another pair of feet around the house."

But the pair of feet always around the house were my mother's. She was always there for her family in every way—no latchkey children in our house. Our mother did double duty because our father was a peddler—more fashionably today called a traveling salesman. He sold cantaloupes door to door in the summer and blankets to farmers in the winter. When he opened a junkyard when I was 7, it was in

Lyons, KA, which was 100 miles from our home in Wichita, so the family only saw him on weekends. That made him the hero when we saw him for Shabbos on Friday evenings, and left my mother with the week-long parental duties.

Their lives were like a travelogue, but not for fun. They moved half way across the continent seven times—mostly to earn a living. It was "Schvertsu Machen Albn," which is Yiddish for "it's hard to make a living." But they never complained—no matter how tough it was. They were thankful as immigrants to be in America with opportunities for their children, if not for themselves.

Even so, their lives were a decided improvement over their parents'. My father grew up in Russia in a one-room dirt floor shared by his parents, seven brothers and a sister. At the age of 18, determined to avoid the oppression of the czar's heel and anti-Semitism, he came to America. My mother immigrated to the United States from a city called Lugansk in the Katriva Slav province near the Russo-Polish border, according to my aunt, Annie Kletman, at the age of 5 with her parents, Mordecai and Freda Shanin, and a younger brother, Max.

Mordecai Shanin sold fish on the streets of St. Joe, MO, and repaired Singer sewing machines. He died in my mother's arms when she was 15 and he was in his mid-forties, on the back staircase of 922 South 9th Street in St. Joe. Widowed with seven children, my grandmother maintained her pride and independence with all members pitching in to support the Shanin family, including Lillie who left school after the eighth grade to work in a tablet factory.

My grandmother, Freda Myramovich Shanin—we called her Bubba in Yiddish—exuded strength which my mother inherited and passed on—jointly, of course, with my father—to their children. When Bubba once saw me wearing bluejeans, she admonished me saying her sons—poor as they were—never wore overalls. I wonder what she would say today with almost the majority of Americans wearing jeans or overalls.

My mother inherited her mother's sense of humor, notwithstanding the tough times. When I was about 5, sitting with my mother on the St. Joe front porch swing, it broke, and Bubba told me I had to pay for it. That concerned me greatly. Since I only weighed about 50 pounds, I think, contrasted with my mother who obviously, weighed substantially more, I argued proportional responsibility. But then, my grandmother laughed and told me she was only kidding. It relieved me substantially.

Bubba meticulously observed the sabbath and Jewish traditions, passing on a strong sense of religious responsibility to our family. There was total

unity among Bubba's children—my aunts Annie, Rose and Mashie and my uncles, Max, Louie and Albert—perhaps derived from the days when they had to work together to survive following my grandfather's untimely death. When the entire family gathered with many grandchildren at 922 South 9th Street for the Jewish holidays, coming from Wichita, Chicago, and Waco, TX, the grandchildren and some adults would sleep on the floor, but nobody minded. We could not afford a Holiday Inn, even if there had been one in those days.

Like her mother before her, my mother saw to it that our home, however modest, as physically comfortable and psychologically secure. She was always at home. As each one of us would enter the front door, we would go through the ritual, as children do, of yelling "Mom," and back would come her reassuring voice—perhaps the kind of reassurance that is most fundamental for a youngster to know who he or she is and where he or she stands.

Even with our family's modest income, my brother Morton's closest friend, Donald Dushane, was a constant dinner guest. My sister Hilda observed that her friends relished an invitation to our dinner table because our mother "was willing to fashion the most intricate and labor intensive delicacies of food for our palates." My sister Shirley remembers our mother carrying hot egg sandwiches for our lunch to College Hill grade school in Wichita, six blocks away.

Generosity and compassion were my mother's hallmarks. When a distant relative, an unmarried teenager, became pregnant, my mother invited her from Philadelphia to Phoenix so that the young teenage cousin could deliver, return to her home, resume her life, marry, and ultimately raise her own family. After her youngest sister, Mashie, died, my mother went to Waco and stayed weeks caring for Mashie's husband, Leslie Hoffman, and their four children. She looked after elderly neighbors—who lived next door to us in Wichita, the Chances, a couple in their nineties in Wichita—he was a Civil War veteran; and in Russell, our neighbors were the Hoovers, aged 80. She would drop in to see that they were all right and, on occasion, bring some hot soup.

During World War II, many Jewish soldiers were stationed at Walker Air Base, 15 miles from Russell, KS, where we lived. Our home served as a synagogue during the Jewish holidays and an unofficial branch of the USO. The living room-dining room—connected rooms—of our home at 115 Elm Street bears testament to this day with a slanted floor when the supporting beams buckled under the overload weight of about 25 soldiers and their wives who attended a Passover Seder in 1943. The house was built for a family, not a convention or a Seder. When my sister Shirley and her husband, Dr.

Edwin Kety, were posted in a remote Arizona town near the Mexican border in the public health service, my mother interrupted her own activities to care for their children in Phoenix so they could maintain their Hebrew school education without moving away with their parents.

My mother was a prolific letter writer to family and friends—letters which people have saved for decades. Her letters to Joan and me would be saved for Saturday morning and savored around the family breakfast table. Our young sons, Shanin and Steven, would even interrupt their Saturday morning television cartoons—tough thing to get them to do, but they did it willingly—to hear their grandmother's interesting letters.

She could have written a primer on being a model mother-in-law, a proposition subscribed to by all four of her children's spouses. Arthur Morgenstern, Hilda's husband, praises her to this day, marveling at their 33-year relationship. Joan says she learned how to be a mother-in-law by example.

Many mothers are, at least, a little protective of their sons when it comes to marriage. My wife-to-be Joan had her first meal at my parents' home for Thanksgiving less than 2 months after we met when she was 15. I was a much older man of 19, although the 4 years difference in our ages has significantly diminished over the years. Contrary to what might be expected, my mother urged me—in fact, rather strongly to marry Joan some 4 years later. And our wedding album contains a photo of the traditional wedding kiss with my mother smiling and beaming in the background. That picture is worth a million words—really, really more.

My parents' 45-year-old love affair came to an abrupt end in 1964 when my father had a heart attack and died on a trip to Israel. She returned to her home in Phoenix; and at the age of 64, learned to drive a car and carried on her independent life. When I hear of family values, I think of our family's 230 years of uninterrupted marriages: 45 years for my parents; 51 years for my older brother Morton and Joyce Specter; 50 years for Hilda and Arthur Morgenstern, 44 years for my sister Shirley and her husband Edwin Kety; and 40 years for Joan and me.

As I reminisce about my mother, some may wonder if I am writing about an angel. In fact, I am.

If she had a fault—and I am not sure she did—it was that she worked too hard. She was an immaculate housekeeper; and even after the stove was scoured, she would clean it again. She was surely busy. My brother Morton followed her example of extra hard work and never learned to play enough, and the same might be said of her other children. Or, perhaps it was the time sheets that we lawyers keep—pressing us not to waste time and keep

track of each minute. I am glad that the next generation, my sons have a better balance on work and leisure—perhaps moderation perhaps learned from their mother.

Through all the travail, my mother was cheerful, maintaining a home that was rock solid with love and perhaps most of all—establishing a feeling of confidence in her children. Some bumps along the way—perhaps even failures—were a part of life and ultimate success.

Education—which our parents had little of—and hard work—which our parents had plenty of—were the ingredients for their children's success. Our parents' ambitions were wrapped up in their children. Considering my mother's struggles and the fact that my father had to walk across Europe and travel steerage to America, their children's ambition and motivation to succeed took us on much easier paths, no matter what obstacles we faced.

When I am frequently asked today about what motivates children, what should motivate children, I think in direct and simple terms about my mother and father.

In our family, the children knew they had to behave and succeed because to do otherwise would be unthinkable, considering our parents' sacrifices. We would never do anything to embarrass them or do less than our very best.

While this brief statement obviously cannot match the pomp and ceremony commemorating President Eisenhower's centennial, it is a privilege for me to be in the U.S. Senate—I think here, significantly, or largely, or perhaps totally because of my own background—and to have this opportunity to honor my mother on the occasion of her 90th birthday.

Beyond my own personal pride I take this time on the Senate floor and the expense in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because the life of Lillie Shanin Spector is a model which should be studied by parents everywhere, and perhaps by some children as well.

I thank the Chair. I thank my colleagues in the Senate for the opportunity to make this presentation.

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

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

VOTING AGAINST THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BASE CLOSURE COMMISSION

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I had commitments in Pennsylvania yesterday, visiting the hospital of the Uni-

versity of Pennsylvania, taking a look at the issue of needs on breast cancer and prostate cancer, and could not return in time to participate in the debate on the resolution of disapproval on base closing, so I would like to take a few minutes this morning to comment briefly on my reasons for voting in favor of that resolution and against the recommendations of the Base Closure Commission.

I did so, Mr. President, in part because I am opposed to the process. In fact, I was one of the few Senators who voted against the base closing act. It is and always has been my view that that is a job which ought to be undertaken by Congress. I realize in saying that that there have been some problems in the past, and there is an overriding concern as to the ability of Congress to take on the difficult job of base closings. But I think it is a job we can do and that we should have done and that we should not have assigned to a commission under the arrangement where the commission makes the recommendations which are virtually certain to be ratified by the administration and then a resolution of disapproval is extraordinarily difficult because it takes both Houses of Congress and, if that is vetoed, then it takes a two-thirds override. So once that legislation is passed, it is out of the hands of Congress. I think it is our job to do, I think we should have done it, and we should not have delegated it.

Having been opposed to the process, I view with substantial skepticism what happens flowing from that process.

Then representing the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I have had many, many matters which have come before the Base Closure Commission and that process.

At the outset, Mr. President, let me say that I do believe the members of the Commission have individually done an outstanding and a dedicated job. I do not necessarily agree with their conclusions, but I think that the chairman, James Courter, has worked laboriously as have the other Commissioners: Peter Bowman, Beverly Byron, Rebecca Cox, Hansford Johnson, Harry McPherson, and Robert Stuart.

I have had many dealings with the members of the Commission which have been, on a personal level, pleasant and cordial, and they have been accommodating. I might note that they met in Newark on Mother's Day, and I was one of a number of officials from Pennsylvania who went to Newark on Mother's Day to discuss their findings, and I traveled to Columbus, OH. They worked assiduously on their job. So that my comments and voting against their recommendations does not reflect on them individually. I repeat, I think they are people of the highest integrity and competency and did their very best to do the best job they could.

I think the process is further faulty, Mr. President, because it does not

allow the Congress really to get the basic information that it needs and the public to get the basic information that it needs and the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, to get the information which the law really requires. The statute says that the Comptroller General, the General Accounting Office, is to have access to all of the information which is used by the Base Closure Commission.

In the 1991 proceedings, as it related to the Philadelphia Navy Yard, illustratively, the Navy hid material evidence. They concealed letters from Admiral Claman and Admiral Hekman which said that the Navy Yard should be kept open. They did not turn over all the information, which they were obligated to do, to the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office. Senators like this Senator could not get the information.

As a result of what I thought were very, very bad practices by the Department of the Navy, practices which I had labeled as fraudulent and in bad faith, they went ahead and closed the Navy Yard. The Base Closure Commission affirmed it. And it has led to some very, very intensive and really bitter litigation with those who opposed their findings and those in favor of keeping the Navy Yard open having won two major decisions in the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, really remarkable decisions, based on the issue of judicial review.

It is hard, once a commission has acted and Congress has acted and the President has acted, to get the courts to review their action. But that, in fact, is what we have accomplished at least to date on the basis of two opinions by the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. There is an application for cert pending, but that process is further illustrative of the difficulties which I have seen in the recommendations of the Commission.

This year, when there were issues involved about the closing of Pennsylvania installations, having had the experience from 1991, having found that there was a very material bit of information available which the Navy had not turned over, a group of Members including myself went to court to compel information to be turned over, getting a judicial order. So that my experience with the process has been disquieting and unsatisfactory.

Those, in essence, Mr. President, are the reasons why I voted to reject the findings of the Base Closure Commission yesterday.

I see my colleague, Senator BOND, has arrived in the Chamber. I believe he has time reserved. So I do yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MATHEWS). Let the Chair note that the Senator from Missouri controls the time until 11, and if he wishes to speak now, it would be in order for him to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes. I do not need to use the entire time allotted. I believe others have spoken in the time that I had initially requested.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, yesterday, I was in the State of Missouri, and I spent a good bit of time talking to people who are involved in health care for indigent children, people who run the urban health clinics that serve a great deal of our indigent population in the State of Missouri, and people at public hospitals. I found a couple of encouraging notes in those discussions. No. 1, we have a program in Missouri called Parents as Teachers that gives parents assistance in dealing with their newborn children up to the age of 3 years.

Initially conceived as an early education program, we combined it with health screening for 10-to-20-month-olds. Through that screening process and through the visits of parent educators, we found that this program provides tremendous benefits in getting our smallest citizens into the health care system at a time when service and assistance can be most helpful to them and most beneficial.

Second, we have, as I have indicated on this floor before, a capitation program in Medicaid in Jackson County, MO, the western part of the State of Missouri. The county is most of Kansas City and includes Independence and other cities.

Under that program, which was set up as a result of the waiver I requested from the Health Care Financing Administration when I was Governor back in the early eighties, the Medicaid patient is enabled to select a caregiver, one of two fine community health centers or Truman Public Hospital, or one of the group of PPO's, preferred provider organizations. Each month, the health care provider gets a set amount of money, a capitation payment, for every person enrolled in those programs.

We found that this changes the incentive to make sure that people are kept well rather than treated at the sickest points in their lives.

The interpretations of the data may differ somewhat. But most people agree that we have had improved health in the Medicaid community in Jackson County. Polls that we have taken of the Medicaid recipients show that those under the capitation system are happier than those in other parts of the State. And we have seen some significant million dollar savings in the system as a result of the prepayment or capitation, which puts an emphasis on preventive care and keeping people well.

I mention that program because I am going to talk in a minute about financing health care. One of the ways we have to do that, I think, is by making savings in the system that we now have. I believe we can make savings by moving to capitation in Medicaid. The Health Care Financing Administration estimates about \$42 billion can be saved over 6 years, and I think it can make people healthier.

But let me talk about the concerns. One of the concerns that was raised was whether existing community health centers and urban clinics would continue to be served. I assured the people who ran those clinics that it was my intention, and I believe it is the intention of the administration and others who are pursuing health care reform, not to get rid of the institutions that are doing an excellent job serving the population, but rather to provide universal access and provide the funding resources for the indigent population and others so that they can pay for those services and lessen the need for public subsidies.

I suggested also under a competitive system, those clinics, those health centers that have been serving people in the area would certainly be most likely to attract that same group as their clients under the new system. Certainly, the system that we have proposed on this side of the aisle would encourage that. I will do everything I can to make sure that any system we set up does promote that kind of competition and the utilization of good entities where they exist.

The second point I heard, which was raised with some great deal of skepticism, is how are you going to finance it? This is going to be an expensive business. Health care reform is too important to make vague or overly optimistic assumptions. Several public officials I talked to yesterday were skeptical of the cost savings and the financing that we talked about. We need to be able to reform the system. We must be committed to assuring universal access. But we should not promise more than can be delivered.

I talked to an expert in the field, who had been an official in a previous Democratic administration. He chided me because he thought our savings, the ones we projected in our plan, were too optimistic. I pointed out to him that the savings which are rumored to be included in the administration bill are even more significant, and the promises for additional service and coverage are even more generous.

He shared a very great deal of skepticism that some leaders in this body have expressed. I read in the paper over the weekend and heard on weekly talk shows: We cannot assume too much. We should err on the side of caution, of overestimating costs and underestimating savings.

I think the plan we put forward and offered as a discussion point recognizes

the difficulties in estimating health care and errs on the conservative side. Thus, we save and expand care, and we believe we can demonstrate savings. We believe that we can save \$213 billion over the next 5 years by slowing the growth of Medicaid and Medicare. We then apply those funds to a sliding scale of assistance: 100 percent vouchers for those at the poverty level or under, and we hope at least partial vouchers, at least, up to 200 percent of poverty.

We also believe there are other savings, an additional \$57 billion through other reforms. But we do not count them until they occur. Let me tell you why. Congress and its estimators have been woefully off the mark in estimating health care costs. For example, the 1990 budget agreement; we all joined hands and projected that \$45 billion would be saved in Medicare and Medicaid as a result of the agreement. Now, just 3 years later, technical reestimates in Medicare and Medicaid have not only obliterated the "savings," they have, in fact, increased the deficit in those two programs over the fiscal years 1991-96 period by \$120 billion.

I do not know whether it was Yogi Berra or somebody like Will Rogers who said: You can make predictions so long as they are not about the future. I think they might have been right if they were talking about health care estimates. The key to reforms and the estimating of them is the effect that reform is going to have on behavior of patients and consumers; are they going to consume more or are they going to consume less? And on doctors and hospitals; how will they react to the changes being proposed? Will they gain in the system? Will they overdiagnose or evaluate patients coming in to treat them as sicker? Will jobs be lost? How quickly will premiums and costs be lowered? Will savings from lower premiums be translated into higher wages? Will new jobs occur? How many people will take advantage of new coverage?

These are just some of the questions we must ask. We must keep in mind that one of the primary objectives of this entire reform is to rein costs in for families, small businesses, and governments. Thus we know what new benefits will cost and what savings are realistic.

The bottom line is simple. How the plans will pay for themselves is as important as what is in the plan. Congress and the President cannot promise things we cannot deliver.

Mr. President, passing health care reform will be difficult enough. I will be addressing this issue later.

I also ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point the Monday, September 13, Washington Post editorial entitled "The Cost of Health Care Reform." I commend it to those of my colleagues who may not have read it.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 13, 1993]

THE COST OF HEALTH CARE REFORM

In trying to sell its reinventing government and health care plans, the administration needs to be careful not to destroy a major asset. The asset is its credibility in making budget estimates. When the president named the leading member of his economic team last year—Lloyd Bentsen as Treasury secretary, Leon Panetta and Alice Rivlin as budget officers—he sent a message. The message was that in his administration the basic estimates would be honest. The deficit would no longer be a political toy. They would treat neither the estimating process nor the programs that depend upon it with contempt, as had his two predecessors. His nominees were his handshake on that.

That seriousness of purpose helped the president in the budget debate. There were lots of battles over the numbers the administration used in describing its program. What was the proper baseline or starting point to use in calculating how much new deficit reduction the president was proposing? Was it a \$450 billion plan or a \$500 billion plan over five years, and how did the savings divide between tax increases and spending cuts? How should a hybrid proposal like the one to reduce the net cost of Social Security by subjecting a larger share of benefits to the income tax be classified, as tax increase or benefit reduction? There were disputes as well about the likely effects on economic growth of some of the administration's proposals. But at some basic level even opponents agreed that the president's plan was real in that it would achieve about the amount of deficit reduction the administration said it would. To beat it, the opponents had to come up with one that was equally real, and they couldn't. That above all was why he won.

The claims that are being made for the reinventing government plan, or some of them, are much less solid. The overselling has already weakened the plan, not strengthened it. The debate has shifted in part from the ideas in the plan, which are generally good, to the savings estimates, which are exaggerated. Even administration allies say the plan is overblown. Among their fears: That Republican and other critics will take the president up on the estimates and try to hold the administration to savings that the plan can't support.

The reinventing government issue is less important than the one with regard to health care. The health care plan involves the possible restructuring not of a list of government programs but of a seventh of the economy. The administration has lately seemed to be saying in its zeal that it will be possible to achieve great gains in health care reform at minimal cost. At the federal level, the background briefers suggest, reform will not require a major tax increase and, indeed, will help to produce a major spending cut. The cut in existing health care costs will be so large that it will help not only to finance universal health care coverage but also to reduce the deficit—and all without a reduction in existing health care benefits.

Will it really be that easy? To get to universal coverage the administration would for the first time require employers to help pay the cost of a basic insurance package for all employees. The requirement won't show up in the federal accounts as a payroll tax but standing alone would have the same effects;

it would depress both employment and wages. To ease these effects on smaller businesses and lower-paid workers particularly, the administration would provide subsidies. It would subsidize coverage for the rest of the uninsured as well—those not covered by current government programs who are not in the workforce. To finance the subsidies, the administration would basically try to suppress all health care costs by imposing, not price controls, but payment controls. It would limit annual increases in both private health insurance premiums and public payments through Medicare and the system for the non-elderly needy with which it would replace Medicaid. The bet is that a reorganized health care industry would be able to provide the same quality of care it does today to more people for less money. A further and in some ways bigger bet is that Medicare and Medicaid are as squeezable as the private health care system. Not everyone thinks they are. If they aren't, the president's financing plan falls flat; the government would not be able to cut them enough to recover its costs.

We don't know enough at this point to say either yes or no. What we do know is that, on this one, the president needs to make sure. To underfinance this plan—to err on the sunny side in making the long-term estimates in order to win some short-term support—would be a huge and tragic mistake. The president can't afford to give the green-eyeshade people a veto over health care reform. But this is one on which he can't afford to succumb to temptation, either.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

TERMINATION OF SPACE STATION FUNDING

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I would like to speak in morning business to lend my support to the amendment that we will be taking up later today offered by the Senator from Arkansas to terminate funding for the space station program.

For, me this is not a debate on the scientific merits of the space station only, or just a debate about space exploration in general. Rather, this debate and that which will follow is whether we are really serious about reducing our Nation's deficit.

I am not an opponent of the space station itself; nor of the research that is promised to take place on it; nor any of NASA's efforts, for that matter. What I am an opponent of is our unwillingness to take our Nation's spiraling debt seriously.

The supporters of the space station frame this debate in terms of the future. A group calling themselves Save Our Space Station wrote to me just last week stating:

America cannot afford to turn its back on its future.

NASA has stated, in a document entitled "Why the Space Station Makes Sense" that:

Space flight itself is one critical component of our ability to invest in the future and enrich the lives of our children.

The future and all of the potential research benefits of the space station supposedly weigh in on the support the space station side of the equation, I am told. My children will benefit; your children will benefit. In fact, all future Americans will supposedly reap the benefits of this effort.

This certainly seems to make sense at first—but then you have to remember, what about the enormous debt we are leaving our children and future generations? Is not our struggle with how to reduce the deficit about the future also?

The first thing that comes to mind when I think of the future in America is not space, but the tremendous financial debt we will be leaving our children—and, most likely, grandchildren—to deal with. How much of the Federal budget will it take to service the Nation's debt by the time the space station is up and running. How many critical programs will be choked out by the need to continue to pour billions into paying the interest on our national debt?

It is important to remember that we are not only imposing upon future generations the obligation to continue to pay off the debts that we have accrued; this crushing burden will also deny them the opportunity to make their own policy decisions. The decisions we make here today, such as continuing funding of the space station, may well effectively cut off the opportunity of future generations to make their own policy decisions. I think that is wrong and a denial of their generation's opportunity to make their own mark.

To me, the future also brings to mind a young couple going out to buy their first home—the so-called American dream. In order to purchase the home, you first have to make a large downpayment, usually. That is what I think we did last month right before the recess in passing the President's deficit reduction plan—a \$500 billion downpayment on our deficit problem. This downpayment on deficit reduction consisted of an equal share of painful spending cuts and taxes.

The American people are now asking for more spending cuts to go along with those initial cuts and those taxes. Like the young couple buying their first home, they realize you cannot stop with the downpayment if you are serious about reducing the deficit, or if you are serious about purchasing a home. You also have to make your monthly mortgage payments.

By voting for this amendment, you will be making at least a \$2.1 billion payment toward deficit reduction for this year alone. Call it our September deficit reduction payment. It could turn out to be an even greater payment toward reducing this deficit if we are successful in terminating, or at least delaying, the space station altogether.

I do not want to make any estimate on what the entire savings would be

today, because I am not sure if anyone can tell us for sure how much this program will eventually cost the American people to place in space and then operate after permanent occupancy.

It is this inability to calculate the future costs, whether it be on account of the rushed redesign efforts, the historic cost overruns of the program, or the inherent difficulty in predicting the technical challenges and risks associated with such a complicated engineering fete, that further convinces me to oppose the funding for this project at this time.

There is also talk of the space station being a symbol of international cooperation. It is said that not only will our astronauts link up with the Russian Mir Station and train for future space station operations, but one design would have us working together with the Russians in the actual building of the station, culminating in an international joint effort with the European Community, the Canadians, and Japanese as well. Any effort at international cooperation is commendable. However, perhaps we can teach the new Russian Government a different lesson first—a lesson in fiscal responsibility.

I thank Senator BUMPERS for taking the lead in the drive for deficit reduction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I yield the floor.

NAFTA

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I will take only 5 minutes in morning business. I must say I have listened this morning to the discussion of NAFTA and the Mexico trade agreement.

I am reminded of a song, when I hear this debate, by Bob Wills of the Texas Playboys, a Texas swing band in the thirties, with the verse:

The little bee sucks the blossom,
But the big bee gets the honey;
The little guy picks the cotton,
And the big guy gets the money.

If you strip away all of the chaff on this issue, this is about little guys and big guys. That is what this trade policy is about. Those who support the Mexico trade agreement say this will expand jobs. They want to create opportunity, they want to expand trade, they want to help Mexico, and they want to build a North American trade alliance. They are the ones, they say, with new vision for new opportunity. Their characterization of those of us who oppose it is that we are opposed to change, and we cannot see the future, they seem to suggest. We are the ones who "just do not get it."

We are, in the words of many of them, protectionists, isolationists, xenophobes. If you step back, in fact, from the television ads now supporting the trade agreement with Mexico—you have seen them in the last few days—

step back from the ads, with the flags furling in the background in the gentle breeze, with the "Battle Hymn of the Republic," or whatever it is they are playing, that make it seem like this is an all-American policy, step back, strip all of that away and look at this policy nakedly.

In its naked truth, this policy with Mexico is nothing new. It is no change. It is the same policy cadaver on trade that we have had forever in this town. It is a failed trade strategy at its core. It is more of the same that has given us record trade deficits and an erosion of our manufacturing jobs. At its roots, it is America's corporations telling us this is a global economy and they must, therefore, decide to produce elsewhere and sell back here. They want to find a way to produce where they can access \$1 an hour labor and access our marketplace in return.

Some of the discussions today about this issue have said, well, Japan has done that. They have been manufacturing in Thailand. Yes, but it is interesting, they keep their market pretty much closed. So they manufacture in Thailand not to ship back to Japan, but to ship elsewhere in the world. That is not what will happen with Mexico. This sets up a competition between us and Mexico for jobs, and when that happens, we lose because we cannot and should not compete for \$1 an hour labor.

If we were talking about a staging area for exports to the rest of the world, maybe that is a trade agreement we can talk about. But that is not what is being discussed with Mexico. They say, well, Mexico now has a trade surplus, or we have a trade surplus with them. Sure. If you close another plant, the surplus will be bigger. Close plants and move them to Mexico, and our trade surplus will grow. Is that a sign of economic health? Not where I come from, it is not.

Some say, well, at its roots, let us help the Mexican economy. That is fine. The question is: Where is that on the priorities? I come from a rural economy in this country. My home county, Hettinger County, ND, has lost 20 percent of its population in the last decade. If you are a small business there, you are trying to do business in a depression. If we want to help somebody, at least in my book, those rural counties in America that are shrinking like prunes deserve help at least as a priority versus the Mexican economy.

Jobs. The principal study purporting to push the NAFTA agreement, the Huffbrauer-Schott study, does two things. It measures new jobs created by American exports to Mexico. That does not make much sense, because some of the exports are simply shipping plants. That means we lose jobs. Nonetheless, they count them as new jobs. Interestingly enough, the same study does not talk about displaced jobs by Mexican

imports back to the United States. Is that not an interesting omission?

Second, two-thirds of the new investment in Mexico now comes from the United States. The principal study says none of the new investment in Mexico after this trade agreement will come from the United States. What problem do we have in this country? A need for new investment. We in this country have an investment deficit.

What are we talking about doing, trying to create conditions for new investment in Mexico and denying it in the principal studies trying to sell this plan.

This is a bad trade agreement. It ought to be killed. We ought to decide to kill it and start over.

I am not suggesting we should not have a trade agreement. I am saying what we ought to have is a trade agreement that has two fundamental principles: Fair trade rules and open markets. Any trade agreement with anybody in this world should establish those two principles. We demand fair trade rules so that the trade between the two countries is fair, and we demand open markets so that markets are open. If those principles are involved in any trade agreement you will find me supporting it, but regrettably that is not the case with this agreement.

I intend to speak at greater length on this NAFTA agreement soon. And I might say this country will be significantly advantaged if this discussion about trade will become a central discussion about where this country wants to move in the area of trade. We will and should have, in my judgment, a national debate about trade policy so that we can talk in a significant way about this country's future.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

RANGELAND REFORM INITIATIVE

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, there are two items I wish to discuss with the Senate this morning that I think are very appropriate at this time, especially one that falls immediately upon the heels of an action we took last week when we voted on the Interior appropriations bill. We voted 59 to 40 in favor of placing a moratorium on this administration's proposal to implement their concept of rangeland reform 1994, which is better known as an increase in the grazing fees.

During the debate over that issue last week, I think it became obvious to anyone listening that it was a much larger issue than just increasing grazing fees on public land grazing; that the administration and the Department of the Interior had proposed a much broader approach from citizen participation and a blocking of the

right of that kind of participation which was historically there with what we called grazing boards or advisory boards with the actual proposal to confiscate private property that might be on those public grazing lands or water rights that might be held on those lands. We voted last week saying to this administration no, do not proceed without direct congressional input into that issue. We thought it was very important, by a very substantial vote.

It was during that time that I introduced two internal memos into the RECORD. One of them said—and it was a memo to the Secretary—that grazing fees were only a straw man to draw attention away from management issues, that it was management issues that we were really interested in. And then they went on to say that they had to, if you will, cook the statistics to make things look bad on the public range when, in fact, a statement from the memo proposed that the public range was in better shape than at any point in a century. All of those items were entered into the RECORD.

Now, I have been made aware of a new memo from the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Jim Baca, to all of the State directors of the BLM across the Western public grazing States. He says:

The bottom line is this: We will deliver on grazing reform—both to increase grazing fees and improve our on-the-ground management—

—if you will. And he said that:

We are going to do this no matter what the House or the Senate says.

In other words, we do not care what they do. We are going to do it our way.

Just last week in a very large vote the Senate said to the Interior Department you must involve us. There must be public hearings. There has to be a public process here.

Immediately following that vote, the night afterward, Jim Baca, Director, says to the Senate and to the House we do not give a darn what you do; we are going to do it our way.

I think last week we found out that their way was a major takeover of the public lands in a way that Westerners certainly do not want to see it, and I think a way that nationally we do not want to see it. We want to maintain the kind of working cooperative relationship that we have had on our public lands of the West with the Department of the Interior and with those people who obtain leases for access for grazing and other public purposes.

So, Mr. Baca, hear me, and hear me again, and hear the U.S. Senate: When we spoke last week, we spoke for involvement, not a walk-away or not a suggestion that no matter what the Senate or the House does you will do it your way. Let us meet. We will be meeting this afternoon with the Secretary of the Interior to build upon a cooperative relationship.

EPA CLEANUP RULING

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, one other item. On the front page of the Wall Street Journal today a little mining community in Idaho named Triumph is fighting to not become a Superfund site.

Citizens there rallied, hired scientists to find out that all of the figures that EPA had arrived at in study of water, ground water, toxic levels and all of that were false, that EPA might have been fixing the records to try to find a Superfund site near a very important national recreation site to build an issue.

I say to the director of the EPA, read the Wall Street Journal today and read the front page. I will enter that article in the RECORD with unanimous consent at the conclusion of my remarks.

The article in the Wall Street Journal tells the true story of the citizens of Triumph in trying to work with EPA in a cooperative fashion, not to destroy a community as most all Superfund sites do, but to assure its long-term stability. My congratulations to the citizens of Triumph, ID.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 21, 1993]

FOR THESE RESIDENTS, EPA CLEANUP RULING MEANS PARADISE LOST

(By Tony Horwitz)

TRIUMPH, ID—Dan Tucker lives at the epicenter of what the Environmental Protection Agency believes may be the most hazardous waste site in the U.S.

"It's paradise," he says, setting on his back porch in this scenic former mining town near Sun Valley.

Mr. Tucker, 43 years old, gazes at the hills, sipping well water in which the EPA has found high lead levels. He uses the same water to hose down a plastic "Slip Slide" for his two young daughters to flop on, face first, and skid across a yard that the EPA says is laced with lead and arsenic.

Flanking Mr. Tucker's home—once the machine shop for a lead and silver mine—lie piles of contaminated waste. On dry summer days, the wind sweeps the dust onto nearby homes and gardens. The EPA even found heavy metals inside the Tuckers' vacuum cleaner.

NOT IN MY BACKYARD

Yet the fence-builder, like his neighbors, says he isn't putting his family at risk. "My girls are fine, the dog's healthy, the lawn looks good and I'm no more demented than I was when I came here 21 years ago," he says, making light of lead's impact on IQ levels. "I wish they would just leave us alone."

The EPA isn't cooperating. The agency has nominated Triumph for Superfund cleanup and conveyed on it an initial risk rating that exceeds any ever given to one of the nation's 1,200-odd Superfund sites, including Times Beach, Mo., and Love Canal in New York.

Braced for battle against Triumph's toxins, the EPA has been ambushed instead by Triumph's inhabitants—all 46 of them. Resi-

dents insist that Triumph's lead and arsenic are much less poisonous to them than the prospect of backhoes and bureaucrats taking over their town.

They also intend to defend every clod of contaminated soil. "We look like we're a bunch of hicks in the sticks that the EPA can just mow over," says Wendy Collins, a local activist. "But I don't think it will look so good when housewives start chaining themselves to bulldozers."

BEAT UP AND BEAUTIFUL

Triumph, named for a century-old mining claim, is both stunning and badly scarred. Nestled on the floor of a 6,000-foot-high canyon, the town's 17 homes—mostly former miners' cottages—ring a moonscape of mine tailings that locals call "the black sand." On one side of town runs a river, thick with beaver; on the other soars a mountain of mine waste, topped by abandoned machinery and the ruins of a mine that opened in 1882.

This setting has kept land affordable and drawn residents so eccentric that they jokingly suggest Triumph as the set for a TV series called "Western Exposure." When the mine closed in 1957, a religious cult called "the Saucer People" moved in, awaiting the return of Christ on a flying saucer. Then came refugees of the 1960s counterculture, many of whom remain.

Typical is Ms. Collins, a tailor and non-denominational minister from California who calls herself an ex-hippie and New Age environmentalist. "Before," she says, "whenever the EPA nailed some corrupt contractor, I used to go, 'Yeah!'"

All that began to change two years ago, when the EPA came to town. The agency held a meeting to warn residents that their air, soil and water were badly fouled. Experts from Atlanta explained how childhood exposure to lead could lower IQ, while arsenic might poison residents or cause cancer.

Heidi Heath, who hosted the meeting in her garage, says that for months afterward, "I would lie awake at night, crying." As the mother of two young girls, she says, "I kept blaming myself, thinking, 'What have I done to my children?'"

She also felt trapped. Since the EPA's arrival, banks have refused loans to residents and real-estate agents say the threat of a Superfund listing makes houses here almost unsalable.

"We're lower-middle class, our property is everything," says Ms. Heath, a seamstress and part-time bookkeeper.

But soon after that first meeting, Triumph experienced another shock. Blood and urine tests showed that residents' lead and arsenic levels were normal—and well below those in big cities. Adults who grew up in Triumph, often playing in the black sand, also showed no ill effects.

Moreover, all but one retest of the town's well failed to show signs of high lead content. With her bookkeeper's eye, Ms. Heath also began to notice errors. For instance, the EPA issued identical, alarming results from soil tests taken all across town. "You were inadvertently given the wrong sample results for your property," the agency wrote in a follow-up mailing.

ATTITUDE PROBLEM

Such flubs made Ms. Heath wonder how many other errors were in the symbols and charts that the residents couldn't understand. She also was irked by the EPA's attitude. When she and other parents offered their children's baby teeth—which have been used to study lead exposure elsewhere—the EPA refused, saying such research must await "another phase."

Chris Field, the EPA's on-site coordinator, concedes that "certain errors" have been made. "But overall, we stand behind our data," he says. That data clearly suggests to the EPA that the toxins may imperil residents, particularly children.

Mr. Field adds that health tests—four so far—aren't conclusive because they only show recent exposure. "We're the Environmental Protection Agency, not the Environmental Reaction Agency," he says. "It's our job to protect health, not wait for adverse health before we act."

Unconvinced, Triumph has chosen to mobilize and found an appropriately unorthodox leader in Donna Rose, a 47-year-old art dealer who keeps a shotgun by her kitchen door and who dresses in baggy sweatshirts and Technicolor tights.

HEAVY READING

Armed with a video camera, Ms. Rose visited other Superfund sites and gathered testimony about the program's history of cost and time overruns. She plowed through texts such as "Basic Toxicology" to find studies that cast doubt on the EPA's stance. And she thrust it all on her neighbors, many of whom now discuss "the Michigan swine study on bioavailability" as easily as they do the weather.

Ms. Rose also has swayed Idaho's congressmen, and found lawyers and scientists willing to give free advice. The result: When the EPA formally requested "public comment" this summer on its proposed Superfund listing, Triumph fired back almost 1,000 pages, arguing that the EPA had grossly exaggerated the risk to the town.

"I haven't run into this strong and organized an opposition in my time at the EPA," says Michelle Pirzadeh, a 10-year veteran at the agency's Seattle office.

Almost every adult in Triumph signed the anti-Superfund petition, and a door-to-door tour of the town turns up no dissenters. While some residents say they would accept a limited cleanup—a cap on the mine tailings, for instance—they oppose the open-ended, multimillion-dollar process triggered by a Superfund listing.

"Would you hire a contractor who has no references of a successful job well done, has never come in at cost, and who spends most of his money on legal fees?" asks 50-year-old Ms. Collins, the activist, voicing common criticisms of Superfund.

The EPA's Mr. Field says the agency wants to avoid a confrontation. But the EPA has no choice other than to press ahead, in part because a Superfund listing is the only way to free funds for further study. "We're locked in," he says.

"COULD BE SOME ANARCHY"

So, too, it seems, are Triumph residents. While a final decision on the Superfund listing still is months away, the EPA hopes to start an emergency cleanup of residents' yards, perhaps as early as this fall. If it goes ahead, Triumph resident Chris Klick warns that "there could be some anarchy here."

Mr. Klick, 46, who owns a sheet-metal workshop, says he "went out and bought 1,000 rounds of 9mm [ammunition]—that's my public comment." If the EPA approaches his yard, he says, "I'm going to be standing at the gate with a gun. That's the way of the West."

He doesn't plan to shoot anyone, but he does intend to hold his ground, forcing the EPA to call out the National Guard. (Others say they will do the same by blocking the road with snowmobiles or chaining themselves to trees.) Mr. Klick's reasoning is typ-

ical. The health tests and reading he has done have convinced him that the toxins in Triumph are hard to ingest, and even harder to clean up—though both points remain subject to scientific debate. And he feels that whatever risk does exist must be weighed against the otherwise healthy environment Triumph offers, with its lack of city smog, stress and crime.

In the end, he adds, the fight boils down to a "very American principle"—the right to choose, and accept the consequences. For now, folks in Triumph are doing just that. Ms. Rose, the art dealer, enjoys wind-surfing across the ponds that form on the mine tailings. Others keep tilling their gardens, joking about huge "mutant" carrots, and about ice cubes that sink because of all the lead.

As for Mr. Klick, lead and arsenic pale beside other risks. "I ski down avalanche chutes, I race dune buggies in the desert, I ride a motorcycle, I hunt," he says. "Living in Triumph is the safest thing I do."

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, under the previous order, I had 10 minutes. I think we are going to run out of time here. I would like to take just 5 minutes.

I will ask unanimous consent that I might speak for 5 minutes as if in morning business at this point. We will go back into consideration of the Bumpers amendment, and I see our dear colleague from Alabama is here and wishes to speak.

So I ask unanimous consent that I might speak for 5 minutes as if in morning business.

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

HEALTH CARE

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I want to start today talking about health care. I intend to continue this discussion every morning for the next week to talk about our problems in the health care area, but I would like to start today by talking about the need for a reality check in the health care debate and a reality check for both Democrats and Republicans.

One of the things that has been lost as we move toward the President announcing his health care plan tomorrow is that one of the two driving purposes of reforming the health care system, and by far the more urgent, was the explosive cost of medical care in general and the cost to the American taxpayer of Medicare and Medicaid in particular.

The explosion of Medicare and Medicaid costs have created the bulk of the deficit problem in American Government and have taught the whole Nation a lesson in compound interest. If a program grows at 10 or 12 or 15 percent a year it does not take very long until

it destroys the fabric of a budget that is having to pay for it.

The reality check I think is needed is that when the President started to bring together experts from around the country, the focus was on cost savings. But now as we are beginning to get to see the President's package, what has happened is that the President is proposing a massive expansion in benefits, a standard coverage package which will guarantee every American a standard coverage of insurance that greatly exceeds the coverage that many Americans have today, the extension of coverage to 37 million people who are currently not covered, at least by some definition, the inclusion of dental care as an insured benefit, pharmaceutical coverage, nursing home care, long-term care, and alcohol and drug abuse.

My point is this, Mr. President: Those are wonderful things. Those are things that we would like everybody to have, but we started this debate because we cannot pay for the benefits that are currently guaranteed. And I am very concerned that when we are looking at guaranteeing all these new benefits before any savings have been produced by this plan, we are locking ourselves into a program for which there is not enough money in the world to fund it.

As the process has gotten underway, we now have proposals coming from the Republican side of the aisle that seek to guarantee fewer benefits than the President but more benefits than we currently cover. My suggestion is that we have a simple rule which says you cannot spend money until you save it. The President is talking about a massive expansion, \$700 billion of costs, and he is basically tying all those new benefits and all that new spending to a belief that by having the Government take over and basically run health care purchasing in America, we are going to save money to pay for all these things. This health care purchasing cooperative is a little bit like a five-legged animal. It may work, but it is funny we do not see any of them in nature.

This is a totally unproven concept. In fact, try as I may to find some real world example in America, the closest example I can find is the Defense Department.

The Defense Department is the only buyer of defense goods in America. And the President is saying, by making the Government, through these health care collectives, the only buyer of health care, that they are going to be able to eliminate duplication and control costs. I ask my colleagues, if in fact Government can do that, why does the B-2 bomber cost so much money?

So my point this morning is that we need a good dose of cold reality. The debate about health care is largely a debate about exploding costs, about our inability to fund Medicare and Medicaid. Before we create all these

new wonderful benefits, would it be beneficial for Democrats and Republicans to have to prove that their proposals will actually save enough money to pay for these new benefits?

My fear is, if we add these benefits, we will never be able to take them away, and we may succeed, in one bill, in finally bankrupting the Government and at the same time destroying the greatest medical care system that the world has ever known.

So, my suggestion is this. When we adopt health care reform, let us not spend money on new programs until we have proven that we have the cash in hand from proven savings. Let us also preserve the ability of the consumer to choose.

If having a Government-run health care system is good and saves money, let us give people the right to choose to see if they want to engage in it. If it is so good, I think people will choose it. My guess is it will not be so good, and they will not choose it, and we will rejoice that we have preserved our freedom to choose, which is what being an American has always been about.

I yield the remainder of my time.

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Federal debt stood at \$4,389,958,226,339.71 as of the close of business on Friday, September 17. Averaged out, every man, woman, and child in America owes a part of this massive debt, and that per capita share is \$17,090.93.

NAFTA

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, in offering his support for the North American Free-Trade Agreement, former President Reagan compared tearing down the trade wall with Mexico to the tearing down of the Berlin Wall. He was right to do so. Each event represents a historical triumph of American values. Each event underscores the importance of free markets to the well-being of all people. Each event encourages us to take counsel of our vision, not our fears, and demonstrates the very real benefits which result from staying loyal to our convictions.

Are we to be guided by our vision and protect the advantages of a world increasingly in our image, or are we, like a fading power, to be guided by our fears and withdraw from an increasingly competitive world?

NAFTA offers U.S. workers and U.S. businesses the opportunity to compete in a market of 360 million consumers with a collective output of \$6 trillion, a market much larger and much richer than the European Community. I believe the United States can compete in this market and should not shrink from the opportunities it offers.

Phasing out tariffs is in the United States interest because Mexico's bar-

riers are 2.5 times greater than ours. Half of all United States exports to Mexico will be eligible for zero Mexican tariffs when NAFTA takes effect on January 1, 1994. Over 5 years, two-thirds of United States exports will enter Mexico duty-free.

Since Mexico began to seriously liberalize its economy in 1987, United States exports have tripled, accounting for roughly 400,000 jobs. By 1995, workers employed in producing exports to Mexico could swell to over 1 million. As both President Bush and President Clinton have pointed out, these jobs pay 12 percent more than the national average.

In addition to the gains we can expect from exports, production sharing within North America will make the United States, Mexico, and Canada more formidable global competitors, by displacing United States imports from nonregional countries and displacing United States investments in those countries. This will mean a stronger U.S. economy and more U.S. jobs.

These advantages have been recognized by our Nation's Governors. Forty-one Governors support NAFTA. These are people the closest to their constituents and most responsible for the daily management of an economy. Over 100 newspapers have also endorsed NAFTA including the USA Today, the Wall Street Journal, and the Atlanta Constitution.

It is true that NAFTA will benefit the Mexican economy. For Mexico, NAFTA will mean prosperity and stability. It will allow the Mexican Government to more effectively address environmental problems deep within Mexico and along the border. It will mean more resources to fight the war on drugs and will enable the Mexican Government to more effectively fight that war. It will also mean more effective control of immigration across the United States-Mexican border.

The defeat of NAFTA could cost current U.S. jobs and squander the historic opportunity before us to create as many as a million more. Witness the affect of the 1982 Mexican debt crisis on American exports. In 1982, U.S. exports dropped by half and a corresponding number of jobs were lost. Subsequent to the collapse of the Mexican economy, the reforms of President de la Madrid further demonstrated the commonsense connection between lower tariffs and increased U.S. exports. De la Madrid's efforts to liberalize the Mexican economy, although more modest than the efforts of his predecessor, resulted in a nearly doubling of United States exports to Mexico.

The leaders of our hemisphere, with one notable exception, have taken bold steps in the direction of democracy and free markets. Beyond the opportunities NAFTA offers for U.S. businesses and workers and the leverage it will give the United States in negotiating other

international trade agreements, the decision we make on NAFTA will largely determine whether the revolution sweeping our hemisphere continues. It will demonstrate to our southern neighbors whether we are prepared to live and prosper by the principles we have espoused for 200 years, or whether we will retreat in fear of a world in our image. We should not underestimate the impact of the statement we decide to make.

RUSSIAN PRESIDENT YELTSIN CALLS FOR DECEMBER ELECTIONS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the news that President Yeltsin has suspended the Russian Parliament and called for December elections has come as a surprise, despite the fact that Russia has been on the brink of political crisis for some time now.

While we do not have the details of why President Yeltsin made the decision to take this action at this time—although it is my understanding that Secretary Christopher will be giving a briefing very soon which may offer us more insight into Yeltsin's decision—we all know that Yeltsin has had great difficulty, especially in recent months, in implementing constitutional and economic reforms because of opposition from the Congress and the Supreme Soviet. It may be that Yeltsin made the judgment that there was no other way to guarantee that the reform process will continue without taking this drastic step.

And, while it is not clear what the consequences of President Yeltsin's action will be, we know that Boris Yeltsin has been steadfastly committed to democratic and economic reform in Russia. Clearly the Russian people voiced support for those reforms in last April's referendum.

So, in my view we have to watch the situation closely, keep the United States on the side of democracy in Russia, and hope that the December elections will result in a mandate for Yeltsin and reflect the Russian people's support for genuine political and economic reform.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of section 5 of Senate Congressional Resolution 32, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the budget through September 16, 1993. The estimates on budget authority, outlays, and revenues, which are consistent

with the technical and economic assumptions of the concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 287), show that current level spending is below the budget resolution by \$1.6 billion in budget authority and above by \$0.6 billion in outlays. Current level is \$.05 billion above the revenue floor in 1993 and above by \$1.4 billion over the 5 years, 1993-97. The current estimate of the deficit for purposes of calculating the maximum deficit amount is \$393.5 billion, \$27.3 billion below the maximum deficit amount for 1993 of \$420.8 billion.

There has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues since the last report, dated September 14, 1993.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 20, 1993.

Hon. JIM SASSER,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report shows the effects of Congressional action on the budget for fiscal year 1993 and is current through September 16, 1993. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 287). This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, and meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the 1986 First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget.

Since my last report, dated September 13, 1993, there has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER,
Director.

THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 103D CONG., 1ST SESS., AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS SEPT. 16, 1993

(In billions of dollars)

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 287)	Current level ¹	Current level over/under resolution
On-budget:			
Budget authority	1,250.0	1,248.4	-1.6
Outlays	1,242.3	1,242.9	.6
Revenues:			
1993	848.9	849.4	.5
1993-97	4,818.6	4,820.0	1.4
Maximum deficit amount	420.8	393.5	-27.3
Debt subject to limit	4,461.2	4,293.2	-168.0
Off-budget:			
Social Security outlays:			
1993	260.0	260.0	
1993-97	1,415.0	1,415.0	
Social Security revenues:			
1993	328.1	328.1	(?)
1993-97	1,865.0	1,865.0	(?)

¹Current level represents the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest U.S. Treasury information on public debt transactions.

²Less than \$50,000,000.

Note.—Detail may not add due to rounding.

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 103D CONG., 1ST SESS., SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS SEPT. 16, 1993

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS			
Revenues	0	0	849,425
Permanents and other spending			
legislation	764,283	737,413	0
Appropriation legislation	732,061	743,943	0
Offsetting receipts	(240,524)	(240,524)	0
Total previously enacted	1,255,820	1,240,833	849,425
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
CIA Voluntary Separation Incentive Act (Public Law 103-36)	1	1	0
Unclaimed Deposits Amendments Act (Public Law 103-44)	0	1	0
1993 spring supplemental (Public Law 103-50)	1,003	1,119	0
Transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries (Public Law 103-54)	(8)	(8)	0
Small Business Guaranteed Credit Enhancement Act (Public Law 103-81)	(12)	(12)	0
Total enacted this session	984	1,181	0
ENTITLEMENTS AND MANDATORIES			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	(8,443)	922	0
Total current level ¹	1,248,361	1,242,935	849,425
Total budget resolution ²	1,249,990	1,242,290	848,890
Amount remaining:			
Under budget resolution	1,629	0	0
Over budget resolution	0	645	535

¹In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, budget authority and outlay totals do not include the following in emergency funding.

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays
Public Law:		
102-229	0	712
102-266	0	33
102-302	0	380
102-368	1,060	5,873
102-381	218	13
103-6	3,322	3,322
103-24	4,000	4,000
Offsetting receipts	(4,000)	(4,000)
103-50	0	(30)
103-75	4,190	141
Total 1993 emergency funding	8,790	10,444

²Includes a revision under sec. 9 of the concurrent resolution on the budget.

Notes.—Amounts in parentheses are negative. Detail may not add due to rounding.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair notes morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 11:30 having arrived, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2491, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2491) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, com-

missions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Bumpers Amendment No. 905, to reduce funding for the implementation of the space station program for the purposes of reducing the deficit in the Federal budget.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 905

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will note the Bumpers amendment, amendment No. 905, is the pending amendment.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, was there an order last evening establishing an order of speakers this morning?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was not.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the space station program. The Senate has voiced its approval of the program on countless occasions and I feel certain we are going to continue to support it. At least I hope so.

I want to be sure it is brought to the attention of the Senate and all who are listening, the strong support the President has given to the space station program. There is a letter addressed to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator BYRD, by the President, dated September 20, 1993. I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 20, 1993.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wanted to convey to you my strong support for NASA's space station program as an important science and technology investment for the United States, and as a symbol of peaceful international cooperation.

At a time when the long-term economic strength of the United States depends on our technological leadership, we must invest in technology but invest wisely, making the best use of every dollar. Earlier this year, I directed NASA to redesign the Space Station Freedom program to significantly reduce costs while preserving its critical science and space research capabilities and honoring our international commitments. This initiative includes redesigning NASA itself to improve performance, streamline the bureaucracy, and reduce management costs. As a result, the redesigned space station program—Space Station Alpha—will save more than \$4 billion over the next five years and \$18 billion over the two-decade life of the program compared with the costs of funding the previous Space Station Freedom program.

Since its inception, the space station program has represented an important international partnership between the United States, Canada, Europe, and Japan. We now have a historic opportunity to include Russia in this endeavor, thereby achieving an important step in putting the Cold War behind us, and adding a positive new dimension

to the development of an international space station. Our cooperation with Russia in space is the leading edge of the new relationship that President Yeltsin and I began in Vancouver—a partnership where both countries can win from working together on projects that will shape the future.

There is no doubt that we are facing difficult budget decisions. However, we can not retreat from our obligation to invest in the future. I believe strongly that NASA and the space station program represent important investments in that future, and that these investments will yield benefits in medical research, biotechnology, advanced materials processing, and other critical technology areas that will create new jobs and improve the quality of life here on earth. It is an investment in tens of thousands of good, high-paying U.S. jobs, an investment in maintaining the strong technology base essential to the economic and national security of this nation, and an opportunity to invest in peaceful international cooperation.

I strongly urge the support of the Congress for this important program.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, there is a strong letter from the Vice President to the Honorable BARBARA MIKULSKI, Chair of the Subcommittee on VA-HUD and Independent Agencies, in which he strongly supports the space station. I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, September 20, 1993.

Hon. BARBARA MIKULSKI,
Chairman, Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR BARBARA: As the Senate prepares to consider the NASA Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 1994, I would like to express my strong support for NASA's space station program and for the historic opportunity it represents for international cooperation in space.

The redesigned space station—referred to as Space Station Alpha—results from NASA's intensive review and redesign conducted over the last six months with the help of other government agencies and overseen by a panel of outside experts. Alpha is a streamlined version of the original Space Station Freedom. It incorporates scientific facilities and capabilities comparable to or better than Space Station Freedom but will cost significantly less to build and operate.

The space station program offers an unprecedented opportunity to achieve peaceful international cooperation in space. In accordance with longstanding international agreements, the space station will be built and operated as an international partnership among the United States, Japan, Europe, and Canada. Now, with the recent Joint Statement on Cooperation in Space between the United States and Russia, planning has begun to include Russia in the space station as well. Russian participation in this international program offers the potential of reducing the space station's costs and increasing its capabilities.

Russian Prime Minister Chernomyrdin and I, under the auspices of the joint commission that we chair, have directed NASA and the Russian Space Agency to continue studying ways to incorporate Russia's space capabilities

into the station for the mutual benefit of our countries and our international partners. It is our goal that the space agencies of the United States, Canada, Japan, Europe, and Russia work together to produce a more detailed plan by November of this year for Russia's participation in the international space station.

It is important to realize that this initiative on space cooperation fits into the context of a much larger partnership with Russia, a relationship that will define the post-Cold War era. Our negotiations in preparation for the first Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission meeting in early September also produced a key understanding that Russia is committed to adhere to the guidelines of the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), one of the most important international regimes for the nonproliferation of weapons technology. This MTCR commitment is a strong signal that Russia is prepared to be a consistent and responsible partner, one we can work with over the long term.

The President and I are committed to the Space Station Alpha program as a national science and technology priority. We are also enthusiastic about the opportunities that we see emerging in our program of space cooperation with Russia. We hope that you will join us in fully supporting these efforts.

Sincerely,

AL GORE.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I spoke last evening about the space station. It was about 9:30 or 10 o'clock, and I realize many staff members who are following this debate were not present since it had been announced there would be no votes. And the same is true of several Senators. I know there are numerous staff members who are following this debate very closely, who are watching on television, as well as Senators and others who are not in the Chamber. I, therefore, want to mention a couple of things I think are important, but try to refrain from being too repetitious.

No. 1, this amendment to kill the space station directs the funding toward deficit reduction. In my judgment, if the space station is defeated and terminated, the amount of money will not go toward deficit reduction. The House has already passed the appropriations bill that approves the space station and funds it at the amount requested by the President, and that is what is in the bill before us here today. Even if the conference committee were to yield to the Senate position to terminate the program, in all reality, with all pragmatism, we know what would happen. The amount of money that is included will be divided among other agencies and departments that are in this appropriations bill. There will be many causes, many just causes that need money that will get money. It will not end up going toward deficit reduction. I am sure the intent of those offering the amendment to terminate it is that it would go there, but for all practical purposes let us be realistic about it. It will never go toward deficit reduction at this time.

There has been some discussion about the President and the redesign.

When President Clinton entered office, he looked at everything. Originally they talked about terminating it. Frankly, I got worried during the February recess that it might be terminated. I stayed and canceled my February recess to work with the administration, OMB, and others, to see that we continued the important project. After careful consideration from various sources, the President concluded the proposed Space Station Freedom was too costly and it had to be redesigned. He gave direction that a redesign had to occur.

The Vest Commission, the President of MIT, studied this and came up with a new design based on the President's guidance that the cost of the program not exceed \$2.1 billion per year.

The latest factor to be introduced was that of Russian participation. This is a complicated issue, involving nuclear proliferation and the sale of weapons technology to Third World nations including India and possibly some nations that we have classified as terrorist nations.

Again, from a cost perspective, various elements of the Russian space program could be used. They have a tug which could be used effectively. The question arose that perhaps their old space module, or a new one of their design, could be used. But I do not believe the administration is going beyond the cost caps that it has placed on station regardless of Russian involvement.

The space station is designed with sufficient flexibility so that any addition which might come from the Russians can be plugged into the present space station Alpha design, which was recommended by the Vest Commission.

One of the strong reasons why I support the space station is because of the scientific research that can occur in microgravity. There are basically two principles that attract me: One is crystallography, and the second one is electrophoresis. Crystallography is the study of various crystals and the aspect that is so important is that at microgravity, you can grow these crystals much larger than you can on Earth and you can grow them in a manner by which you have propagation in all three dimensions. On Earth, you can grow protein crystals, but they are typically small and do not fully resemble natural structures. It is important to grow a crystal large enough to where it can be carefully examined, certainly under a microscope and otherwise, to determine how the crystal operates. And it is so important as we endeavor to try to find cures for diseases.

The second aspect of microgravity research in space that interests me is known as electrophoresis, and that is the separation of the cells into the smallest integral parts. Using these two concepts, crystallography and electrophoresis, microgravity research

has the potential of finding cures for many diseases. Already we have grown cancer cells and we have grown AIDS cells. This has been done on the shuttle thus far, but the shuttle is insufficient because of the limited time that it is in space. We need a permanent laboratory where you can watch and can determine for several weeks and months at a time the growth and development of the cells and crystals in these experiments.

In regard to medical applications, I said last night, and I will repeat again, I am probably the Senate's No. 1 example of the benefits from the space program. I happen to have had some heart problems a few months back. And on three different occasions, I had an angioplasty, which is the balloon aspect of opening up an occluded artery, an artery that is clogged up. The imaging technology that makes the use of this device possible was developed as a result of the space program.

Another aspect that came out of the space program and has helped Members of Congress, perhaps even some Members of the Senate, is the device that regulates your heartbeat to prevent heart attacks. This is a device attached to the heart that uses an electrocurrent modulated by feedback from the heart muscle itself.

There are numerous other scientific discoveries that have come out of space research. There is no question that the cumulative benefits that have been derived from the space program outweigh those of any governmental program that we have ever had. For example, digital technology and satellites have produced jobs and generated revenue far in excess of what has been spent on the space station. I am told that the return on investment for space research is near 10 to 1.

Recently, a noted scientist, Dr. Jeanne Becker of the University of South Florida's Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, spoke to a congressional luncheon on the important role that the space program can play in providing cures for a number of diseases that affect women. I would like to take a moment to discuss some of the new scientific developments that she spoke about.

Scientists like Dr. Becker have just recently become aware of the exciting potential of microgravity research through the use of microgravity tissue culture vessel called a rotating wall vessel. This device was designed by scientists at NASA so that cells could be carried aboard the shuttle.

In the unique environment developed in this device, cell growth occurs in three dimensions, just as they grow in the human body. Traditional tissue culture methods allow only two-dimensional growths. The importance of this development is that by growing tumor cells in a way that duplicates the way they grow in the human body, sci-

entists gain a more authentic model on which to test cancer drugs. Dr. Becker's own research has concentrated on ovarian and breast cancer.

Other scientists across the country are doing important work making use of this NASA microgravity device. Researchers in Texas are using the device to study bowel cancer; a group in Delaware is using it to study heart muscle growth, and I say to the distinguished Senators from Massachusetts that scientists from their State are making use of the microgravity device. Harvard scientists are using it to grow samples of cancerous colon cells. At MIT, the device is being used by researchers to grow cartilage cells for use as implants.

In both cases, these Massachusetts scientists learned that cells grown in this way are far superior to those obtained through conventional cultured methods. The technique has only one major shortcoming, a shortcoming which we will now soon take action to overcome. Tumor cells grow very slowly and for this work to progress, these scientists need a permanent space platform that provides long duration microgravity conditions. To quote Dr. Becker:

Long-term, large-size cellular development can only be achieved by the microgravity conditions provided by the space station.

I want to add that many other medical researchers are also excited by the potential of the space station. At Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, scientists have found that bone cells grow but do not harden under microgravity conditions. This behavior mimics that of osteoporosis, that is the disease where the bones become hard and brittle and so many old folks have broken bones by falling, for example, to point out what happens in regard to osteoporosis. This disease affects currently over 25 million Americans. Scientists at Walter Reed hope that by studying bone changes that occur in microgravity, they will find new methods to slow or cure this degenerative disease.

In my own State, researchers at the University of Alabama in Birmingham are playing the leading role in space crystallography. This technology used to grow protein crystals seems destined to revolutionize biomedical and agricultural research. Proteins are one of the basic substances that animals and plants need to grow, reproduce, and resist diseases.

Understanding these substances and the way they react is an essential first step in creating new medicines and agricultural products. Because individual protein molecules are too small to see, scientists have begun to grow protein crystals to learn about their functions and their structure. To determine the structure of individual protein molecules, however, scientists need crystals far more perfect than those that can be grown on Earth.

NASA has begun an ambitious program to grow these crystals in space. The extremely low gravity and controlled environment that the space shuttle operates in provides near perfect conditions for these experiments. Protein crystal growth experiments are being flown in the middeck of the space shuttle. Upon their return to Earth, the newly formed crystals are analyzed using x-ray diffraction and then modeled on computers to create three-dimensional images. Studying these images, scientists are better able to understand the interaction of these complex molecules and use this knowledge to engineer new drugs and agricultural products.

Among the most recent achievements of this technique is the determination of the three-dimension structure of an enzyme which shows promising potential in the design of cancer and AIDS chemotherapy and the suppression of the human immune system during transplants.

Mr. President, I must say there are some problems with using the shuttle for performing crystallography experiments. First, due to limited space and equipment on the shuttle, only a small number of experiments can be performed on any given mission. This problem is compounded by the difficulty in predicting the proper solution concentration that will result in accelerated crystal growth.

The most serious limitation of the shuttle is, however, the relatively short period of time it spends in space. For example, the current mission is scheduled to last 13 days which strictly limits the types of protein crystals that can be grown.

Mr. President, I must say that there are some problems with using the shuttle for performing crystallography experiments. First, due to limited space and equipment on the shuttle, only a small number of experiments may be performed on any given mission. This problem is compounded by the difficulty in predicting the proper solution concentration that will result in accelerated crystal growth. The most serious limitation of the shuttle is, however, the relatively short period of time it spends in space. For example, the current mission is scheduled to last 13 days, which strictly limits the types of protein crystals that can be grown. Growing crystals is a time-consuming procedure and some promising proteins take months to grow in the best of conditions. If we are to pursue this technology more effectively, we need a research platform permanently stationed in space, we need the space station.

I hope my colleagues that support high-technology research like space crystallography fully realize that this work cannot grow to its full potential without a permanently manned platform in space.

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS

The space station is not just an American program, though as the world's only superpower we are certainly the leading player. Japan, Canada, and 10 European nations have been active partners in this bold endeavor, and it is likely that the Russians will also be joining the international team. Building the space station will be the biggest technological endeavor ever undertaken among nations, and will make it a prototype for future international projects in science and technology on the ground and in space.

The involvement of the Russians in the space station program will be a dramatic step. Not only will this program go far in improving relations between our countries, it could also help ensure the future security of both. Part of the rationale behind having the Russians team with us on station is to provide them with a project that will keep their space program viable and scientists employed without having them resort to foreign sales to raise capital, such as the proposed sale to India.

President Kennedy, who during the Cuban missile crisis came face to face with the danger of nuclear conflict with the Russians, prayed for a different world where the scientists of these two great nations could work together for the benefit of mankind. Thirty years ago he said:

Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science rather than its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the oceans depths ***.

Today we can make President Kennedy's dream a reality. Our scientists at NASA are poised to work hand in hand with their Russian counterparts to build the space station, mankind's first permanent habitat in space. But perhaps there are no visionaries left among us. Perhaps the days of dreaming of a brighter future are dead, killed by the worries of day-to-day existence. It is true that the recession, unemployment, rising crime, and the other social ills that now beset this country have made it hard to look up, to see the light at the end of the tunnel.

But it is precisely at times like these we need a challenge that when met, makes us proud of ourselves and our country. Space station is a project that will demonstrate our confidence in mankind and it will reaffirm that while we toil to overcome the problems that challenge us today, we are preparing for the challenges of tomorrow.

COMMERCIAL SPINOFFS

Mr. President, research in space has yielded over 30,000 commercial spinoffs in a broad range of areas including: Computer technology, industrial productivity, environmental sciences, public safety, and transportation.

In the area of environment and resource management, spinoffs from NASA include a new meteorological in-

strument used to predict the onset of severe storms and tornadoes, soil surveys for the Department of Agriculture using ground-penetrating radar, and a new wastewater treatment system for private homes.

In the area of industrial productivity, spinoff technologies include micro-lasers used in new communication systems and medicine, high temperature composite used in aircraft engines, ruggedized minicameras and specialized dry lubricants.

In transportation, spinoffs include new computer software used in designing safer, cheaper automobiles, longer lasting brake material, and new material used in radial tires that should increase their life by as much as 10,000 miles.

Again, all of these are spinoffs, inventions that no one predicted. They occurred because NASA is constantly pushing technology to its limits to meet the challenges of space. Today, the scientists at NASA and at universities across the country are pushing the limits to meet the challenges of the space station. No one can predict what new technologies we will gain from the space station, but I am certain that if we kill this project today, we will lose an important bridge to our future.

MISCONCEPTIONS

This program easily stands on its own merits, and its opponents have consistently relied on distorted or incorrect information to create a number of damaging misconceptions concerning the space station.

I have heard some say that it is too expensive and we cannot afford it at this time, as if the station alone is responsible for the deficit. The truth is that space station funding represents about one-tenth of 1 percent of the Federal budget and NASA itself represents far less than 1 percent of the Federal budget. Moreover, the key to America's long-term economic growth is improving productivity through investment in research and development programs like NASA.

One of the most popular misconceptions I have heard voiced is that the space station is squeezing out other small science programs. The truth is that the space station program is growing at a lower rate than the rest of the science budget and its main purpose is to serve as a platform for thousands of future low cost, high payoff small science projects. In 1992, space station grew by 6 percent, space science and applications grew by 10 percent and the National Science Foundation [NSF] by 14 percent. In fact, in the 5 years since space station contracts were awarded, the science budget has grown by 77 percent. In the final analysis, without the space station's unprecedented abilities and resources, students and commercial users will find that small science projects will continue to have very limited access to space.

I have heard some of the proponents of this amendment say that cancellation of the space station program will reduce the deficit and send a strong message to the American people that we are serious about solving this country's problems. They could not be more wrong. I agree canceling station will send a message; the American people would get the wrong message that we have no idea what we are doing.

The loss of the space station's science, research, and employment opportunities would certainly send the wrong message to the youth of this country about the importance of math and science and engineering education. It would also send the wrong message to our international partners and the rest of the world about how seriously we take our international commitments. Finally, canceling station would send the wrong message to the thousands of defense engineers and scientists trying to transition to other areas of work. I have recently heard predictions that the cutbacks in defense next year will result in another 25,000 layoffs. These are some of our finest engineers and scientists and they deserve the opportunity to put their skills to use. Many of the opponents of the space station support the idea of defense conversion, but don't seem to recognize it even when it is staring them right in the face. NASA is defense conversion. NASA needs these men and women, just as they need the opportunity to work on challenging programs that will carry us into the next century.

There is also a misconception that station's cost has skyrocketed from \$8 billion to \$118 billion. I believe space station opponents have inflated the program's cost figures to create a shock effect. This is a huge and complex program, and some cost growth is expected. The \$118 billion cost estimate is derived by projecting the cost decades into the future in an effort to make the present cost seem unacceptable. By analogy, the average voter would never pay over \$64,000 for a \$12,000 car. But if you priced out how much this car would cost if you operated it for 30 years, you would be lucky to spend less than this amount. Station opponents use this same twisted accounting to inflate the station's cost.

The final misconception I would like to address is the charge that space station is only a shadow of its former self and is irrelevant to real science and economic competitiveness. The truth is that the space station will be an international laboratory with unprecedented capability for scientific research and technological development that cannot be duplicated on Earth.

If the space station does not continue as planned, the United States will be deprived of a national laboratory in space that will not only facilitate our future manned space program, but also

provide the opportunity to do basic scientific research that will lead to new processes and medicines on the Earth that will cure diseases and make the United States more competitive internationally. Cancellation would result in tens of thousands of America's finest engineers and scientists losing their jobs. We simply cannot allow this to happen.

The Senate has passed countless pieces of legislation and Sense-of-the-Senate resolutions supporting the space station. I am confident that we will continue to support this program as we have for the past several years. If the United States wishes to remain the world leader in science and technology we can do no less. Mr. President, I therefore urge my colleagues to defeat the proposed amendment to terminate the space station program.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise as a member of the HUD-VA Subcommittee on Appropriations to support the space station.

Mr. President, as we look at what we are doing as a nation, I think we have to work to our long suit, not work to our short suit, and much of what I see happening back here is we are suddenly retrenching and looking at America's shortcomings rather than what we do really well.

I submit to you that what this country does really well is develop the technology of the future, and the space station offers us the opportunity, the greatest opportunity we have, to be a major player, in fact the world leader, in developing the technology of the future.

I say, after we have already invested \$10 billion, after we have already made that investment, to change course, to put our head in the sand, to say that we are going to forget about the fact that we are a leader in science and technology, is just to capitulate to what all of our competitors want us to do, to show us that America does not have the resolve, we do not have the commitment, we do not have the political will to do what we do best in the world.

What we do best in the world is increase man's knowledge, increase our scientific know-how, and produce the kind of technology that, as the experts have estimated, for every \$1 billion we spend on space research and development, we will throw off \$7 billion in commercial application and technical know-how.

The total budget of the space station has been reduced by 16 percent, from \$25 billion to \$21 billion, and it has today the same amount of science than it did before the redesign.

It seems to me that if we want to retain the world leadership, if we could

reduce costs by that much, this is a totally worthwhile mission.

Let me speak about its economic mission for a moment. We have all been on this floor—yesterday, I tried to stop base closures. I was run over by a roller coaster. We lost tens of thousands of jobs in the decision we made yesterday. Today, in this decision to fund the space station, we can generate 75,000 direct and indirect jobs nationally. In my own State, it means 12,500 jobs—5,000 jobs direct. A multiplier factor of 2.5 equals 12,500 jobs in the State of California, where 1.4 million people are unemployed today—for a mission that is worthwhile.

Now, let me talk for a moment about the mission that is worthwhile, and let me submit that mission in 10 brief points, 10 points of mission, of payload, of throwoff, of scientific technology, of improvement in man's knowledge.

First, a continuous, stable, low-gravity environment is expected to yield many new developments in materials, electronics, medicine, and the treatment of disease. Again, \$1 of investment yields \$7 in productive commercial application.

Second, the space station will help prepare future astronauts for the rigors of long-duration space travel. Just as every youngster looked at Batman, looks at Superman, space becomes the kind of harbinger of the future, the thing to look forward to, to aspire to be an astronaut, to probe the heavens, to see what is out there. This is part of life. This is part of living. This is part of the future.

Third, research will help develop new communications systems, improve computer memories, sensors, and solar cells.

Fourth, microgravity research will increase the quality of life on Earth by helping in the development of new pharmaceutical products and the enrichment of protein in some foods.

Fifth, more perfect protein crystals can be grown in the space station that could lead to treatment for cancer, AIDS, emphysema, and high blood pressure; increase the success of organ transplants; and enhance protein nutrition in some foods.

Sixth, by studying combustion without the effects of gravity, we can gain a better understanding of the entire combustion process that could lead to advances in propulsion, in energy, in explosion control, in fuel burning efficiency, and in fire safety.

Seventh, earthquake prediction could be improved through research conducted on the space station. Astronauts could study and correct sensors that would later be placed on satellites.

Eighth, women's health, which Senator HEFLIN spoke about, could be improved through space station research, such as new treatments for breast cancer, endometriosis, and osteoporosis.

Ninth, by improving crystal growth on the space station, the United States will be able to make better semiconductors and electronic circuits.

The final, 10th point is gravity affects the flow of blood in a body and the growth of bones. Through space station research, we could develop cures for high blood pressure and bone disease.

Mr. President, just in conclusion, the only question I believe that exists about the space station is whether it is launched at an orbit of 28 degrees or 51.6 degrees. The lower orbit, I am told, the 28-degree orbit or inclination, is sufficient for all of the scientific research. In other words, all that research can be done at 28 degrees. The higher orbit, of course, gives us the ability to lock onto the Russian space station. The 28 degree orbit only gives us the opportunity to observe one-third of the Earth, mostly water. The 51.6 orbit would give us the opportunity to observe the entire Earth and do those kinds of geologic studies, take those kind of photographs that might, for example, enable us one day to predict earthquakes. A major earthquake is going to come for sure in my State with probable great loss of life and property. The space station at the higher orbit, not only in conjunction with the Russian satellite but alone, could give us the opportunity to make some definitive geologic studies from space on fracture zones, on plate movement, and perhaps enable us to increase earthquake predictability.

So, in conclusion, Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee, I would like to give my strong support scientifically, economically, and socially for the space station, and my hope is that this Senate will vote to appropriate the necessary funds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my letter of February 9 to the President of the United States in support of the space station, and a more defined NASA white paper on the benefits of research on the space station.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, February 9, 1993.

Hon. BILL CLINTON,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing as a follow-up to my previous letter of February 5 in strong support of continued full funding for Space Station Freedom.

Space Station Freedom is an integral part of the United States' civilian space program and is vital to continued manned space exploration. When considering your budget request to Congress, please keep in mind the following significant benefits that Space Station Freedom will provide:

Space Station Freedom Is Defense Conversion in Progress: With the end of the Cold War and reductions in defense spending, the U.S. civilian space program offers an opportunity for the defense industry to utilize its

high-skilled labor force and advanced technology for civilian uses. As you stated in *Putting People First*, increased investment in the civil space program will "create new jobs for our highly skilled former defense workers, and increase our understanding of the planet and its delicate environmental balance."

Freedom Provides Important Contributions to Science: Entire industries and new technologies have been spun-off from the civilian space program and advances have been made in the fields of medicine, manufacturing electronics and communications. In addition, research that would take place on the Space Station could lead to cures for life-threatening diseases, lower pharmaceutical costs, and better prepare astronauts for the rigors of space travel.

The Space Station Is An In-Place Economic Stimulus: Nationally, 75,000 people are employed in Space Station related jobs. In California alone, over 10,000 jobs, mostly high-quality and high-skilled, have been created and over \$5 billion in spending is directed at the State.

Space Station *Freedom* Is a Revenue Enhancer: Historically, there has been a return of over \$7 to the private sector for every \$1 the U.S. has invested in space research and development. According to a study by Management Information Services, in 1986 alone, the NASA procurement budget generated \$17.8 billion in total industry sales, \$2.9 billion in business profits, and \$5.6 billion in government tax revenue. As the core of the civilian space program, the Space Station plays a vital part in NASA's overall economic impact.

Freedom helps protect U.S. Global Competitiveness: The U.S. civilian space industry is a notable exception to the decline of America's competitiveness in the global marketplace. As Vice President Gore stated, "the aerospace industry is our last surviving jewel." Aerospace manufacturers accounted for 10 percent of all U.S. exports in 1990 and the industry's trade surplus was \$27 billion in 1991.

Space Station *Freedom* Represents an International Commitment: As you recognized in *Putting People First*, "by organizing effectively on [the Space Station], we can pave the way for future joint international ventures, both in space and on earth." *Freedom* represents the largest international research and development project ever undertaken. Japan, Canada, and Europe have already invested nearly \$3 billion in the program and are continuing to spend significant percentages of their national budgets on the Space Station.

The Space Station is Next Step in NASA's Space Mission: With the knowledge and expertise accumulated over the last decade of successful shuttle missions, Space Station *Freedom* represents the crucial next step in building a space infrastructure for the future. *Freedom* is a symbol of this country's continued leadership in space exploration.

As you can see, Space Station *Freedom* offers significant benefits to our Nation, including technological advances, new research opportunities, opportunities for continued space exploration, and many others. In addition, *Freedom* is vitally important to the economy of the State of California and the entire country.

I am aware of potential cost overruns associated with the Space Station project, but I understand the program is on track and on time. More than 50 percent of the Space Station is already complete with less than half of the total development costs spent.

Through corrective measures and proper management, I am confident that Space Station *Freedom* can be a cost-effective and viable part of the U.S. civilian space program.

Mr. President, I urge you to include continued full funding for Space Station *Freedom* in your FY 1994 budget. I realize that cuts in government spending are required, and I fully support efforts to trim unnecessary expenditures and waste. However, Space Station *Freedom* is an important part of the United States' civilian space program and is critical to California's economy.

Sincerely,

DIANNE FEINSTEIN.

THE BENEFITS OF RESEARCH ON SPACE STATION FREEDOM

Space Station *Freedom* will be an unprecedented facility for first-class basic and applied research in life sciences; microgravity materials, fluids, combustion and biotechnology research; and technology development. This research is directed towards expansion of scientific knowledge, our commitment to improve the quality of life on Earth, and our national goal of world leadership in space exploration.

Scientific and technological research on *Freedom* will commence in the mid 1990's. When *Freedom* becomes permanently occupied, the station work environment will be analogous to an Earth-based laboratory, within which investigations will be expanded in number and complexity. Specific research plans and potential benefits are described below for several areas of study. Because of the diverse nature of the research which will be conducted on Space Station *Freedom*, no one can exactly predict the exciting knowledge and benefits which will be realized in the next 30 years.

EXPERIMENTS TO BENEFIT PRESENT MEDICAL RESEARCH AND FUTURE LONG-TERM SPACE FLIGHT

From our current vantage, it is difficult to identify all of the potential benefits of doing biomedical research in the microgravity environment. However, because of the very fundamental role gravity plays in both physiological and physical systems, research performed on Space Station *Freedom* will provide a unique window into the function of these systems. In the area of biomedicine and biotechnology, the pervasive effects of gravity on human physiology will be absent in the microgravity environment providing a powerful tool to explore human physiological function, with both near- and long-term benefits.

The potential benefits to the terrestrial medical community, because of a better understanding of the mechanisms that underlie space flight deconditioning, promise to be significant. One of the health hazards of long-term space flight is bone loss induced by the absence of gravity loading of the skeletal system. This loss bears certain similarities to osteoporosis. Space sciences research is targeted at determining the mechanisms of bone loss in space that could assist in the search for new and better treatments for bone loss on Earth. An understanding of the immune system compromise in microgravity may help elucidate the cause or potential treatments for a number of common diseases that involve immune suppression or autoimmune (against self) reactions. Examples of these diseases include rheumatoid arthritis and Lupus. Both clinical research and basic research conducted in space flight could help in the ongoing quest to identify the definitive cause of malignant diseases.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE TECHNIQUES, AND LOGISTICS SUPPORT

Space Station *Freedom* will provide valuable information on the operation and maintenance of a large space vehicle. Human factors research on the human-machine and human-robot-machine interfaces has significantly influenced the systems designs and the development of operations techniques. These designs and operations techniques will provide command and control concepts that may involve numerous ground-based and on-orbit personnel, systems and interfaces. The designs and operations techniques are being implemented to allow evolutionary change as we gain experience. Actual Space Station operations will demonstrate these concepts, permit their evaluation and guide their enhancement for the Space Station itself and for their specification when applied in future longer duration space flights. The Space Station will provide the quintessential testbed for validating and guiding new development of these operations and logistics support concepts.

DEVELOPMENT OF SUPPORT SYSTEMS TO BENEFIT LONG-TERM HUMAN SPACE EXPLORATION

Long-term space flight will require systems that are compact, lightweight, energy efficient and reliable. Space Station *Freedom*'s systems are being designed to meet these requirements. Examples of technologies and systems that will be advanced by Space Station *Freedom*'s development and operation include environmental control and life support; power generation, storage and management, and thermal control.

Space Station *Freedom* will advance environmental control and life support technologies through development of closed-loop air revitalization systems for crew breathing, closed-loop water regeneration systems for drinking and washing, and environmental contamination control systems to ensure a healthy environment. Many of the sensors and process technologies that are being developed for *Freedom*'s life support system have potential for future Earth-based applications in environmental monitoring and control. Indoor air quality, a significant problem in many office buildings and industrial settings, could be monitored and controlled through the application of sensors and technologies derived from Space Station *Freedom*'s life support system.

Freedom's power generation and storage system will be the largest capacity space power system ever flown. Energy storage, for use when *Freedom* is in the Earth's shadow, will be provided by high capacity nickel-hydrogen batteries, with the largest power storage capacity produced to date. They represent an advancement in the state-of-the-art through their ability to be frequently discharged and recharged over many thousands of orbits while retaining their original high power output levels. High efficiency solid-state remote power controllers are being developed for the Space Station. Besides having applications on future spacecraft, these technologies can also be applied to terrestrial power systems.

Freedom's thermal control system will employ improved active cooling technology and will utilize a two-phase ammonia cooling system with deployable and articulated radiator panels. The thermal control system will transport the heat generated in the pressurized modules and radiate it to space. *Freedom*'s thermal control system will be designed to have high cooling efficiency, low power consumption, high reliability and long life. This technology could be used to improve the energy and cooling efficiencies and reliability of cooling systems here on Earth.

STUDIES OF ORGANISMS, PLANS AND ANIMALS IN LOW GRAVITY TO BETTER UNDERSTAND LIFE

Gravity plays a key role in the development of most, if not all, biological systems. The opportunity to examine microorganisms, plants, animals and humans in a low-gravity environment is unprecedented in the history of biology. Experiments will focus on identifying the organ or site of gravity reception; on determining the effect of gravity on reproduction, development and evolution; and on investigating physiological responses to low gravity. Research will take advantage of a large centrifuge which will provide controlled levels of gravity for the experiments.

EXPERIMENTS ON GROWING PLANTS IN SPACE TO BENEFIT ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES

For long ventures in space, the resupply of life-sustaining materials from Earth could be impractical, both technologically and financially. Extended Space Station missions, or longer term human expeditions to the moon or to Mars and beyond, will need to somehow be provided with life-sustaining materials (air, water and food). The feasibility of generating these materials on board will be investigated on Space Station Freedom. NASA is developing Space Station Freedom payloads which will provide environments for the growth of plants in space. Plants not only provide organic materials that can be used as a food source, but, in addition, they release oxygen, absorb carbon dioxide, transpire moisture than can be condensed for use as potable water, and utilize waste products as nutrients. Therefore, this research offers a unique vehicle for investigators to explore plant growth and development while isolating the effect of gravity from other forces, such as temperature changes and lighting. Two significant by-products of this research are technologies that enhance the yield and quality of crops, and new technologies for water pollution control and waste disposal.

CRYSTAL GROWTH AND SOLIDIFICATION RESEARCH AND ELECTRONIC AND PHOTONIC MATERIALS, METALS, ALLOYS, GLASSES AND CERAMICS

Onboard Space Station Freedom, detailed scientific research in the area of semiconductors, metals, alloys, composite materials, glasses and ceramics will be explored. Furnace facilities will be installed to expand our knowledge in a wide variety of materials with broad potential applications. These applications include new optical communications systems, improved computer memory technology, improved sensors and solar cells, and optical storage media for commercial and defense applications.

PRODUCTION OF CRYSTALS FOR WIDE RANGING COMMERCIAL APPLICATIONS

Commercial organizations are planning research into the production of zeolites on Space Station Freedom for a wide range of industrial applications. Zeolites are crystals with microscopic tunnels which allow them to be used in many industrial processes which involve filtering. They are also used widely as catalysts to initiate or control chemical reactions. Industrial users of zeolites include the chemical industry for such applications as petroleum refining and waste management, and the biomedical industry uses zeolites for purification of fluids. Zeolites are also used in life support systems, such as the planned usage in the Space Station Freedom air revitalization system.

The ultimate goal of zeolite synthesis in space is to grow larger, more uniform zeolite crystals. Many industries, including the chemical processing industry and bio-

technology/medical industry, will be interested in these crystals, particularly if they can be grown in significant quantities. The space-grown zeolite crystals could result in the development of portable kidney dialysis machines; improve industrial chemical processes; and improve radioactive waste cleanup by extracting radioactive elements through their ion exchange capability.

SPACE TESTING OF INTEGRATED CIRCUITS TO BENEFIT PRESENT GROUND-BASED RESEARCH AND FUTURE LONG-TERM SPACE FLIGHTS

Technologists will study the behavior of integrated circuits in the space environment where radiation such as cosmic rays can cause failures (upsets) in the circuits. These upsets could jeopardize critical spacecraft functions. Experiments will be conducted to establish cause and effect between radiation and circuit failures and to evaluate the circuits' ability to recover from upsets (fault tolerance). While the incidence of cosmic ray induced upsets is low on Earth, large-scale computer systems may also be affected by this radiation. The results could be used to improve the reliability and fault tolerance of integrated circuits in spacecraft and may be applicable to large-scale Earth-based systems, as well.

GROWTH OF HIGHLY ORDERED PROTEIN CRYSTALS FOR STRUCTURAL BIOLOGY AND POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF NEW PHARMACEUTICALS

Protein crystals will be grown in the low-gravity environment of Space Station. Space grown crystals will be analyzed to determine their three-dimensional molecular structure and identify active sites on these molecules where the actual function of the protein is performed. This information is used to design pharmaceutical compounds which will inhibit or enhance the action of a specific protein in the body, plant system or chemical system. Some of the potential applications are the development of systems and products to potentially treat diseases such as cancer, immune deficiencies, emphysema, and high blood pressure. Other potential benefits are products which will increase the success of organ transplants and implants, the development of pesticides to enhance crop development, and the enhancement of protein nutrition in some foods (of particular interest to developing nations). Many companies are making use of the knowledge gained from this basic research, presently being performed on Shuttle flights.

SPACE-BASED GROWTH OF CELLS, PROTEINS AND OTHER MOLECULES BY COMMERCIAL ORGANIZATIONS COULD YIELD NEW AND BETTER MEDICINES

Commercial organizations are developing a payload that will provide a controlled environment for experiments related to microorganisms, cell and crystal formation research. Temperatures within the device will be adjustable so that researchers can provide a suitable environment for the growth and development of bacteria and other cells, as well as for proteins and other molecules. This work is crucial for long-term space habitation research into topics as diverse as waste treatment and mammalian growth and development. On Earth, this work means that our scientists will be offered a controlled environment for the growth of specific molecular and macromolecular compounds, and pharmaceuticals. New type of cells, via space-engineered organisms, may yield new by-products with a wide range of applications.

GROWTH OF CELLS AND TISSUES FOR SCIENTIFIC AND BIOTECHNOLOGY APPLICATIONS

In Earth-based laboratory research, cells are placed in solutions which are circulated at a very slow rate so that the cells receive their necessary nutrients. This technique simulates low gravity by keeping the cells or tissues gently suspended. Recent results indicate that such suspensions of cells promote development of three-dimensional tissue. Space Station Freedom will provide scientists with an unprecedented environment for the study of growth of normal and cancerous human tissues outside the body. In the low-gravity environment of Space Station, cells will remain suspended in the solution. This could become an invaluable tool for gaining important information in medicine and the biological sciences. The knowledge gained through this research may then be used to develop new medical technologies.

SEPARATION AND PURIFICATION OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIALS TO BENEFIT DEVELOPMENT OF PHARMACEUTICALS

Commercially oriented research is being planned with the process of electrophoresis. Electrophoresis is a ground-based process which will be explored for use in space to separate components of biological materials for the development of pharmaceutical products. If successful, this process could be used by pharmaceutical companies in the development of such products as growth hormones for the treatment of impaired growth and stature-related problems in children; beta cells which are being explored as a potential single-injection treatment for diabetes; and epidermal growth factor products for the treatment of burns and wounds.

RESEARCH ON STRUCTURAL DYNAMICS AND SPACECRAFT MATERIALS TO ENABLE LONG-DURATION MISSIONS

Future planetary exploration or the development of bases on the moon or Mars will require spacecraft and systems that are larger and more complex than any existing space platforms. This will include the structural components of the vehicle itself, as well as large-scale antennae and solar panel structures that will be required. In order to ensure that these vehicles and systems perform acceptably, we must understand the dynamic behavior of very large-scale structures in space and devise technology to control their dynamic response. Space Station Freedom will provide the first opportunity to verify dynamic models of a large space vehicle, on-orbit, over an extended period of time. These models will provide the basis for the design of future spacecraft. Additionally, characterizing the dynamic response of the Station will provide valuable correlations between the Station dynamics and payload behaviors and insight into the impact of reboost on structural components.

With plans for extended space missions on Space Station Freedom and other long-duration spacecraft, the impact of the space environment on spacecraft materials and coatings must be understood, and new materials must be tested in the space environment. The results of the Long Duration Exposure Facility (LDEF) experiment (1985-1990) indicated significant changes in the composition and functionality of materials and coatings after prolonged exposure to atomic oxygen and cosmic rays in space. Space Station Freedom will allow samples of new materials to be tested in orbit as they are developed on Earth.

NOISE AND VIBRATION RESEARCH TO IMPROVE WORK ENVIRONMENTS IN SPACE AND ON EARTH

Engineers will develop the technologies and methods required to design and operate

the Space Station. One example is technology to ensure acceptable levels of vibration and noise exposure to the crew. Station experiments and systems. Approaches and technologies for improving the research and living environment on Space Station will be developed. Applications on Earth may include improved methods for noise and vibration control in industry and transportation.

COMBUSTION EXPERIMENTS TO BENEFIT ENERGY, PROPULSION AND FIRE SAFETY IMPROVEMENT

Combustion involves the release of large amounts of chemical energy. On the ground, gravity causes air currents near flames, feeding the flame with oxygen, and removing heat. Researchers can gain a better understanding of combustion by studying the process without the effect of gravity. Scientists will study how flames spread, smolder and stop. Applications may be found in areas such as energy, propulsion, explosion control, fuel burning efficiency and fire safety.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREAUX). The Senator from Tennessee. Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN], and myself to eliminate further funding for the space station.

Mr. President, I am sure my colleagues will recall that, during the recent debate on the deficit reduction bill that occurred here on the floor about 6 weeks ago, many of our colleagues were howling that there were not enough spending cuts in the deficit reduction bill. They were saying, "I would support this bill if there were more spending cuts." In fact, some were coming on the floor with very elaborate charts indicating that there just were not enough spending cuts and that is why they could not support the bill.

They are going to have an opportunity today to put their vote where their mouth was. They said that only a single-minded focus on cutting spending would resolve this Nation's deficit crisis. As I said earlier, the cries to cut spending were ricocheting off the walls of this Chamber out into the Halls and out across the country.

I do not come before my colleagues here today to try to reignite the partisan fire or really to revisit the budget debate. I will say that myself and many of our colleagues on this side of the aisle have a long and documented history of making and recommending specific spending cuts. I will say, as chairman of the Budget Committee, these so-called general cuts, to say we are going to put a cap on this or we are going to make a 2-percent reduction across the board, those things just do not work. What you have to do is recommend and execute specific spending cuts.

We are ready to roll up our sleeves right here today, some of us. I see my

friend from South Carolina here, the distinguished chairman of the authorizing committee. I suspect he will join with us. We are ready to roll up our sleeves and add to the \$255 billion in spending cuts that were already enacted into law.

It is because I am ready to cut spending further—to cut spending further—today that I support this amendment to terminate funding for the space station. We have heard a lot of discussion here on the floor about the great things, the great scientific achievements that are going to flow from this space station. The truth is, Mr. President, when you blow all of the foam off of it, what you have in this space station is nothing more and nothing less than a jobs bill. It is a jobs bill. It is being supported by many of our colleagues who just a few weeks ago were saying Government cannot create jobs. Now they are coming to us and saying let us keep this project going because we need the jobs, and we are willing to increase the deficit to do it.

That is the bottom line. That is what we are talking about here today. Let me make it perfectly clear that a vote in favor of this amendment will reduce the deficit by \$9 billion in outlays over the next 5 years. That is because the amendment that Senator BUMPERS and I are offering directs the Office of Management and Budget to reduce the cap on discretionary spending by \$9 billion in outlays that would have been spent on the space station over the next 5 years.

I have heard Senators say on the floor of this body and privately: "Yes, I would vote to terminate the space station if we could actually make the savings, and if we could actually reduce the deficit; but I am not going to vote to terminate the space station because those funds will simply flow into another project if we do not do something about reducing the caps and make sure that the money cannot be spent."

That argument does not hold anymore. They cannot have it both ways. They cannot come in here now and say: "Well, I would have voted to terminate the space station, but if I had done so, they would have simply taken the money and spent it somewhere else."

The vote on this amendment will be whether you want to fund the space station, or do you want to reduce the deficit by some \$9 billion in outlays over the 5 years?

So no Senator can come to the floor and claim that a vote to eliminate the space station will not go toward deficit reduction. This amendment will put a lock around all those savings.

I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in a bipartisan way—and this is a bipartisan amendment before this body today, offered by Senator BUMPERS and myself from our side of the aisle, and offered by the distin-

guished Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] and the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] from the other side of the aisle—if you are serious about eliminating billions of dollars of wasteful spending, then it is time to saddle up, ride out, and sound the alarm about the dangers of the continued funding of the space station.

I will just say that, sure, it would be nice to have a space station. The Russians have already done it. They are bankrupt. But it would be nice to have a space station if we could afford it. It would be nice to have a lot of things if the budget was in such a shape that we could afford it. But as chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, I have long been concerned about this space station's very enormous price tag. When it comes to cost, you do not need to be a NASA rocket scientist to realize that the space station defies the laws of gravity as the costs keep going up and up and up. Despite several major reductions in its size, its scope, and its complexity, since the program was first announced by President Reagan in 1984, the cost of the space station is still headed literally out of the ionosphere.

Senator GRAMM of Texas made the analogy in his speech last evening that, with regard to redesign of the space station process, it has gone through one redesign after another, after another, after another, each time allegedly reducing it in cost, but also reducing it with regard to its mission.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] said we started out with a Cadillac and ended up with a Chevrolet. But I think we started out with a Pinto and have ended up with a Yugo here today. That is what we have. According to the GAO report issued in May of this year entitled "Space Station: Program Instability and Cost Growth Continue Pending Redesign."

What was sold as an \$8 billion project at its inception has escalated to over \$40 billion. The total lifetime cost of the space station, prior to the latest redesign effort, was over \$120 billion. How in the world colleagues who just a few weeks ago—and I see my friend from Massachusetts on the floor, and he will remember this—were saying that we have to cut spending more, and the reason I cannot support this deficit reduction plan before us is that it does not cut spending enough. How those same colleagues can vote to fund a turkey like this space station that could still end up costing \$120 billion over its lifetime is absolutely beyond comprehension.

The majority leader of the U.S. Senate, the Senator from Maine, who is a wise man, once said on the floor of this Senate: "The essence of democracy is accountability."

I ask my colleagues, how are you going to say, "I could not vote against that deficit reduction bill because it did not have enough spending cuts,"

and then come out here on this floor in the light of day and vote for a project that may, even after the latest redesign effort is completed, still end up costing the taxpayers \$120 billion over its lifetime? It is a project of very dubious utility that has been redesigned time after time after time, until all of the designs and redesign has designed virtually all of the utility out of its project.

I must say that I fought the President on his insistence on yet another redesign by NASA of the space station. But consider this: The previous scaled down version of the station did not yield any savings. My concern is that when the latest design is submitted, the taxpayers will still find themselves with more than a \$30 billion yoke hanging around their necks. And what for? According to many experts, the already scaled down, but still \$40 billion-plus space station *Freedom*, would generate very meager and very questionable scientific benefits.

The National Research Council estimated that 87 percent of the so-called microgravity research plan for space station *Freedom* could have been accomplished with either the shuttle or unmanned space vehicles. Mr. President, at a later time, I will go into further detail about the scientific problems with the space station. But the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is on the floor and he wishes to speak. I also see the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee here, and he wishes to speak. I do not want to impose unduly on their time.

I think the time has come for those of us on this Senate floor to make a determination. Do we simply want to talk about reducing spending? Do we simply want to talk about fiscal responsibility? Or do we want to be accountable? Can you actually vote today to save the taxpayers more than \$100 billion over the lifetime cost of this program?

I remember what the senior Senator from Texas said when we were debating the deficit reduction bill just a few weeks ago. I say to my friend from South Carolina on this floor, and I want to quote him. This is what Senator GRAMM said: "We want to cut spending first. I for one," he said, "would be willing to work to do that, and I pledge to the President today on just the off chance that we might get an opportunity to put our vote where our mouth is."

So said the senior Senator from Texas. He is going to have an opportunity, Mr. President, either today or tomorrow, along with many others of our colleagues here, to put their money and their vote where their mouth is and let us see if they want to cut spending or if they simply want to act out a charade. Let us see if they are really concerned about the deficit or not, because we are going to have to stand up and be counted on this.

Mr. President, I will yield the floor at this juncture with the statement that I will have more to say later on this subject perhaps this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

TERMINATE THE SPACE STATION

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Tennessee, first of all, for his courtesy and secondly for his leadership on eliminating waste from the Federal budget.

I was most interested in his observation that we cannot afford to continue funding this program if its sole purpose is as a jobs program. Certainly, creating jobs should be our No. 1 national priority, but the space station is not the way to accomplish it.

First of all, it is a grossly inefficient jobs program costing \$80,000 to \$100,000 per job. Second, it is a grossly unfair jobs program, benefiting only a handful of States but asking all to pay for it.

We heard a great deal from the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California about the benefits of the space station. Well, it is probably not a coincidence that 5 States—among them Texas and California—account for 85 percent of all space station contracts. However, funding for the project comes from general revenues, which means that taxpayers in the other 45 States pay for the jobs created in those five States. In my home State of Massachusetts, for example, firms receive about \$600,000 from NASA contracts—so there will be pain in Massachusetts if the space station is terminated. But that \$600,000 is insignificant when measured against Massachusetts' share of the taxes that fund the space station—\$63 million in 1993. In effect, Massachusetts received a return of one penny on every dollar that we invested in the program.

But the fact that the program is grossly inefficient and unfair as a jobs program is not its only problem. The other problem is that it is not the best use of our tax dollars.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERRY. For what purpose am I asked to yield?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. To answer a question. Is the Senator aware that the citizens of Texas have put \$400 million into this project and have \$300 million in contracts? I did not know if the Senator was aware of that.

Mr. KERRY. Absolutely, I am aware of that. That is precisely what I am talking about.

The only test of this program is not whether each State gets more or less than it puts in. That is not the issue.

The issue here comes down to the extent to which this space station—and the benefits it might or might not provide—measure up against the other priorities that we are required to choose among in the name of the people who pay taxes.

When you balance the space station's potential benefits against the current reality of the priorities we need to fund in this country, eliminating the space station is not a hard choice.

The experts agree that the benefits from this project simply do not justify its cost. The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers has said:

We concur that technology developed by the space station may well have commercial applications, but as with the space shuttle, relatively insignificant when compared with the cost.

Let me repeat that:

Insignificant when measured against the cost.

And, the March 1991 report by the director of the White House Office on Science and Technology, President Bush's science adviser, Alan Bromley, included the following statement:

Neither the commercial processes nor the scientific merit of the microgravity experiments come close to justifying the cost and effort required to build, deploy, and operate the station.

The experts agree that the benefits are just not there in sufficient measure.

Now, Mr. President, like most of us here I grew up excited by President Kennedy's challenge to the country to go into space, go to the Moon. All of us have lived with the extraordinary contributions of the space effort and of our astronauts—including both Senator Garn and Senator GLENN. But when you balance what this space station offers, exploration, against the needs that we have here and now, it does not cry out for the enormous funding level it receives.

As we look at the issues in front of us here, we must ask ourselves what we can do to hold together the fabric of American society. These are the priorities that do not get funded when we continue to pour billions into the space station and projects like it.

The incidence of crime in Florida and all across this country is appalling. It did not even shock most Americans that another tourist was just killed in Miami. Thousands of Americans are killed every day in America and we do not have enough cops on the street to do anything about it.

We still do not have full drug treatment in America. Years after we first declared a "War on Drugs," drugs are as prevalent as ever on the streets, in the schoolyards. How can anyone tell me that at this moment in time, at this instant in America, that rather than providing full drug treatment or putting sufficient numbers of cops on the streets to provide for the safety of Americans, that we must put billion-dollar gadgets into space?

I cannot accept that argument.

And it is not only the security of American citizens that suffer so that we can fund projects like this, it is also other scientific research about which I

care deeply. As a member of the Commerce Committee, I have fought alongside the chairman to fund many scientific programs. At times we have had to beg, borrow, pray, and steal and in the end we often wind up shortchanging most of these programs. For me, allowing this extraordinarily large science program to receive funding at the expense of these other so-called small science—but often more valuable—scientific programs is unconscionable.

I would like to share with my colleagues what the cost of funding the space station is in terms of some of these other projects.

First, there are the NASA projects. NASA's purpose, Mr. President, is not just to launch space craft. Its true goal should be gaining knowledge of the universe. And there are many ways in which we can gain this knowledge of the universe, but because we have placed so much priority on the space station the other NASA programs other than the space station suffer enormous cuts.

Let me just point a couple of them out. The National Aerospace plane that performs research in air dynamics and pollution technology. That is a project that would help the U.S. aircraft industry to get from the 747 technology to the technology needed to design an environmentally sound commercially viable supersonic transport. That is a project that would put many more people to work and make us more commercially strong in the world. But it is always short of its funding target despite the fact that is key to that industry and to exports.

The Galileo mission to Jupiter, on which we have already spent \$1 billion, will not be able to obtain the scientific information it was built to obtain—about Jupiter and its radiation environment—for lack of \$15 million to finish the antenna.

Second, there are the worthy projects of the National Science Foundation which funds research in such areas as condensed matter physics—which advances our knowledge of how to make more efficient semiconductors, critical to California, critical to Massachusetts and other States, critical to our overall competitive posture. Yet this research is seriously underfunded.

Third, the National Institutes of Health provides grants to researchers in the whole scope of health-related fields including cancer research, breast cancer, emphysema, AIDS, Alzheimer's disease. These grants spawned biotechnology.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will observe the hour of 12:30 has arrived.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate remain in session until the Senator from South Carolina has completed his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLINGS. May I have 10 minutes?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Reserving the right to object, I would be very happy to accommodate the Senator. I know there were so many who wanted to express their views, I certainly would not object. I hope my colleagues who have completed their remarks will, in the caucus, help me when I arrive after the time agreed upon.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I will take my 10 minutes after the Senator concludes.

Mr. KERRY. I will indeed help the manager.

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

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the grants I am talking about within NIH spawned the biotechnology industry. They continue to provide important discoveries that are crucial to curing disease and to developing new drugs. NIH research grant funding will basically stay even with last year and is grossly insufficient given our need to find solutions to such diseases as breast cancer, AIDS, and others. It is just unconscionable that we cannot find funding for real research into these diseases and put it into gimmicky projects concocted to justify the space station instead.

Then there is the National Institute of Standards and Technology's Advanced Technology Program [ATP] that performs research into critical technologies such as materials processing, biotechnology, and microelectronics. ATP is now funded at some \$68 million, but thanks to the leadership of the Senator from South Carolina, the Commerce Committee recently passed a bill seeking to raise that funding up to \$200 million. But all of us understand there is very little possibility that this priority is going to be fully funded because we do not know where to find the money. But it goes into the space station at a rate the GAO and every other study has said is beyond any comprehension.

Mr. President, the fact is we must really stand back and ask the question: Are we still a Congress that in the name of the American people can pretend to be responsible about the deficit and the budget while we continue to fund things because we would like to rather than because they are the only things that are really vital to the quality of life and our ability to hold together the fabric of our communities?

I was recently in an inner-city school in Boston called the Jeremiah Burke School. It has 900 inner-city kids. They have one guidance counselor. The teachers are struggling to provide materials for these students because they did not have enough books to go around. The school had a set of computers but no one able to teach these

children on them because of the budget cuts.

You can go across America and find communities like this where the fabric is just being ripped apart because we are not making the hard choices.

People are screaming out about personal security in America. Crime is worse than it ever was. I look at the court system I used to work in. I have gone back and talked to prosecutors, talked to cops. They tell me it is falling apart. They cannot get the court space. They cannot move people through the system. There is nowhere to put anybody. We are willing to put people into space but we are not willing to put people into jail who belong in jail.

This is a basic simple choice. Are we prepared to decide for America what we need to spend money on rather than what we would like to spend money on?

You can look at the job training programs. You can look at the child immunization program. We have diseases coming back in America that we thought we had eradicated a few years ago. Why? Because the Child Immunization Program does not reach everybody, and it was cut.

We have libraries and schools in the United States of America that are shut in the afternoon and kids have nowhere to go. We have whole cities that are deprived of Boys and Girls Clubs so only 10 percent of the population has a place to find an outlet. But we can find money to put a few astronauts up in space at this moment in time?

I would love to do that. I was raised on the promise of President Kennedy. Someone here asked earlier, "Don't we have people of vision anymore?" Yes, Mr. President, we do. But the vision is to restore the American dream to our citizens, to restore their sense of safety on the streets, to invest in technology that will increase our competitiveness and the quality of jobs, to invest in the research that will cure our deadly diseases, and to restore our communities to the condition where children can learn and dream.

Will terminating this program hurt in California? Will it hurt in Texas? Will the loss of \$600,000 hurt in Massachusetts? Yes, it will hurt. But if we measure that loss against the pain that people across the country are feeling because we are not willing to address our fundamental needs as a Nation.

It is a hard choice time. That is what this is about, and I think the American people are waiting feverishly to see whether the United States Congress can actually do something for once—whether we can really deliver some spending reductions and make some of the choices we ought to make for our future.

Mr. President, I hope we will finally ante up and deliver to the American people. I had a separate bill to try to cut the space station and a number of

other wasteful Federal programs. I am delighted to join the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Tennessee and others who are leading in this effort to try to help the Congress do the responsible thing. I hope we will succeed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, let me right away thank the distinguished manager of the bill. She is very generous to allow these few minutes to speak.

As chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, I oversee many Federal programs designed to stimulate the economy, provide jobs, and assist industry in competing in international markets. I believe that science and technology will pay an increasingly important role in our Nation's future economic health and success. For this reason, I have supported investments in the U.S. Civil Space Program.

However, at a time when our Federal budget deficit soars over \$300 billion, we cannot afford to continue funding monumental science and technology programs that have questionable returns on investment. While technical risks are inherent in all research and development programs, NASA needs to ensure that taxpayer money is spent prudently.

The recent \$1 billion loss of the Mars Observer spacecraft is a great disappointment to the American public. The total loss of the Mars Observer follows partial failures of the Galileo and Hubble space telescope. Despite NASA's history of successfully developing and operating spacecraft, these recent examples reduce our confidence in investing precious taxpayer dollars in expensive space programs.

Let us consider our investment in the space station. Since 1985, Congress has provided \$11 billion for development of the space station program. Even with the cost reductions from redesign, NASA would still require another \$21 billion to complete the space station. Furthermore, if the full costs of all the space shuttle flights, personnel, and facilities that NASA would need to build, operate, and maintain the space station are included, the total life cycle costs would approach \$100 billion. So even with this latest redesign, the space station remains extremely expensive to build and operate in these difficult budget times.

The administration claims to save 4 billion over the next 5 years through redesign of the space station. While I commend the President for confronting the escalating problems of the space station program, initiating a redesign which resulted in reduced costs while ensuring the integrity of science objectives and maintaining the interests of our international partners, unfortunately, the question is not how much

this redesign saves, but how much we still need to spend if we are going to continue funding the space station.

Let me make clear that I am not advocating that we abandon our space program. Currently, we spend \$4-\$5 billion annually for NASA's space shuttle fleet. This is a significant level of funding that, if used effectively, should allow NASA to pursue valuable scientific research in microgravity environments using the space shuttle and the highly trained astronaut corps. A research program based on the space shuttle will yield important benefits in medical research, advanced technologies, and scientific exploration without the exorbitant cost of the space station.

Instead of spending billions of dollars on large space projects, NASA should focus its research and development strengths on efforts that can help turn around the U.S. economy. Aeronautics, robotics, and biotechnology are examples where NASA has special knowledge and capabilities critical to our Nation's competitiveness and future. In this regard, I commend the administration's efforts to make possible United States and Russian cooperation in space. The post-cold war era promises to provide many opportunities to encourage greater international cooperation in areas such as science and technology.

Likewise, the opportunity exists now for NASA to play a key role in technology development and to work more closely with U.S. industries. However, the space station will continue to consume a disproportionate share of the NASA budget and will not contribute substantially to developing the critical technologies that may enhance U.S. competitiveness.

Cutting a highly visible space program is difficult. However, we cannot shirk our responsibility to reduce unnecessary spending for high-priced Federal programs. I ask my colleagues to take responsibility for addressing our Federal budget deficit and vote to terminate the space station program.

Again, recognizing the distinguished Senator from Arkansas' leadership on this particular score, I followed him before and very quietly voted with him before. As chairman of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, I am particularly grateful again to the Senator from Massachusetts who has accurately distinguished between what is desirable in government and what is necessary in government.

I necessarily rise with trepidation. The former Speaker of the House, Tip O'Neill, said that all politics is local. We can add a corollary to that. All politics is a true/false quiz. We live in the age of the 20-second sound byte and there is little room for reason now, in this most deliberative body. But once you emit a sound on any score, you are either for or against and that is the

way the particular 20-second sound byte is going to appear. You are not allowed nuance. You cannot expound or explain at length why we should delay, put off, or prioritize any particular program.

In that light, I am not against the space program. I am very, very much an enthusiast for its fine work and the advances in science, technology, and health that it has produced. Yet, at the same time, I cannot go along with this space station.

I have tracked it from its drawing board stage, and you can see right now after years, we are back at the drawing board stage. It has not been developed. NASA management has been rather lax in its letting of contracts. They have not audited them properly; they have not coordinated them properly. There are many public misgivings.

It is disturbing today to hear the case made that we should not cut the space station because the money will not actually be saved, it will be siphoned off to other programs. False. It is exactly the purpose of the amendment by the Senator from Arkansas to ensure that every dollar cut from the space station is applied strictly to deficit reduction.

We have listened to wonderful arguments about health spinoffs from space station research into crystallization and microgravity. I serve on the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Resources. This year out at the National Institutes of Health, 85 percent of highly rated research proposals—approved for funding—will go unfunded for lack of money. This is a far greater blow to health research than the loss of microgravity research on the space station.

Yes, it is discouraging to young scientists, to brilliant minds in medicine, who decline to come forward in research because they say, "I'm not going into it. I can do good work and still be denied, and there is no opportunity there." On this score, the underfunding at NIH is a far greater threat to health care than the elimination of the space station.

We need, as the senior Senator from Texas just enunciated, a reality check on health care. I happen to agree. In fact, foreseeing exactly that, I went to the President in February and recommended a tax measure to fund health care reform. The Senator from Texas said as a mantra: cut spending first, cut spending first, cut spending first. No one in their right mind really believes that we are going to fund a multibillion-dollar expansion of health services through spending cuts alone. There have to be savings; there have to be cost cuts. But you do not finance health insurance for an additional 37 million Americans strictly through spending cuts and savings. You are going to have to have taxes, which the administration recognized when it

started talking about liquor and cigarette taxes and other measures with respect to small business. The Senator preaches: "Let us have a reality check; let us not go into this program until, in essence, we have the money for it."

I am reminded of church on Sunday, and the first thing they sing is:

Let there be peace on Earth, and let it begin with me.

Likewise with spending cuts, what about each Senator saying "let it begin with me."

In my own case, I have supported cuts in programs that are near and dear to me. I just finished an 8-year term on the Intelligence Committee; I strongly support intelligence; but I insist that we can save some \$2 billion out of the intelligence budget. It is on the public record that the CIA has hundreds of analysts whose salaries and bonuses allow them to earn more than a U.S. Senator. When you and I retire, we can go out and get an increase in pay by being one of those analysts at Langley.

The time has come to cut spending on programs that we would love to fund if we were not so deeply in debt. For starters, we must eliminate the super collider, the Osprey and the space station.

If we cannot see the distinction between the desirable and the needed, then this Government is gone, I can tell you that. We simply give credence to the term limitation movement, because they say this crowd on Capitol Hill has not sobered up yet.

There must be sacrifices. I supported the space station. I did not join as a cosponsor on the amendment. I thought my duty as chairman of the authorization committee was to try to preserve these programs in space. But we all have a higher duty, irrespective of our committee assignments, of trying to save the Government first. When they say cut spending first—and I constantly hear that chant on the other side—here is the opportunity. If you cannot see this one, we are goners, I can say that.

Once again, I thank the distinguished Senator, the chairman of our Budget Committee, for his leadership on this score; and particularly the junior Senator from Maryland, the chairman of the subcommittee that has to fund these programs. I hate to have to vote against it, but we have to start somewhere.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the Bumper's amendment to terminate funding for space station *Alpha*, although I do so with some reservation. I too, am very concerned that this project has been over budget for too long and it is years behind schedule. As our national debt continues to mount and become an even more threatening crisis to future generations of Americans, we need to

carefully scrutinize all Federal spending. However, I feel that terminating this project at this time is not the most prudent course. I reserve the right to reassess this position when future funding requests for the space station come before the Senate.

Although we do not currently have an actual physical product to show for our past investment in the space station project, we do have an embryonic space capsule design that offers a great deal of promise—including cures that are expected to come from space station research in medicine, advanced technology and research, and other scientific accomplishments that could benefit all of mankind.

Long-term planning and thinking is never easy in the face of yearly fights over budget priorities and 1-year budget cycles. We must have some long-term Federal investment in future American jobs and future scientific research. However, with each passing year, we need to assess the progress being made toward these longer term goals. So far, the space station has been a close call when assessing its progress and potential benefits versus its cost and its contribution to the Federal debt. For this year—I am willing to give the space station one more chance. That may not be my conclusion next year. I look forward to the greater progress of the space station in the next fiscal year.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, throughout its early days, NASA stood as a metaphor for the American spirit—challenging ourselves to do our best, pushing past our physical and technical frontiers, and setting the highest goals of the mind and spirit. It was because of this Agency and its singular determination that America achieved what is arguably the most impressive technical accomplishment of this century, the landing of men on the Moon and their safe return.

Having noted that, I rise in strong support of Senator BUMPERS' amendment to cut spending of the space station. Obviously, there is an irony here. We have the NASA of the past. And we have today's Agency. All of us know NASA is in deep trouble. The space station is just one more in far too long a string of disasters and blunders. If there is any forward motion at NASA at all, it is due to inertia—and inertia is not a rationale for any agency or program.

There is a saying about Government projects. There are only two phases: too soon to tell and too late to stop. Unfortunately, the space station is a perfect example. In 1984, we were promised the world and all on the cheap. The space station was to provide a way station to the Moon and to Mars. Astronauts would use it for satellite repair and study in astronomy and environmental sciences. It would house specialists from all over the world who

would create new industries with their scientific revelations. All for \$8 billion. When it was too soon to tell, the Congress signed on.

Mr. President, we have spent \$8 billion and, as we all know, we have no space station. But at least it appears NASA has moved successfully to the second phase of the project: too late to stop.

Notwithstanding all of NASA's efforts to economize, the costs of this project remain out of control. This year, the GAO estimated that the space station would cost \$43 billion to build and \$120 billion if operating costs are included. Of course, NASA said it would cost less, but we are redesigning it anyway. And we are proceeding ahead, anyway.

I do not want to argue against the vision embroiled in the space program. I wish to debate its realities. The space station is poorly managed and, however configured, will return very little science for the immense cost. We all know the project was oversold. We all know that the project has been fundamentally mismanaged. At last count, we are on the sixth design overhaul. It is unfortunate that this debate today presumes the program will continue. On the Senate floor, the burden of proof is clearly on those who wish to cut the program. Given the facts, this is backward. Given our general concern for a deficit that is out of control, we should presume that the space station program will be terminated and the burden of proof laid on the proponents. But that is not the case.

Mr. President, the space station is not a public works project. The space station may create jobs, as any multi-billion dollar project would, but that should not be the essence of this project. The station must grow from the needs of science of the desire for new understanding. Over the last decade, the science of the space station has steadily diminished. Its rationale has likewise shrunk. Its budget has remained. It is time to put these two—the science and the budget—back in sync. It is never too late to stop.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:45 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. MATHEWS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum and ask that the clerk call the roll, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks in opposition to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for that purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, over the course of the past 6 to 7 hours, we have had very deliberate and serious discussion as to whether the United States should continue with development of the space station. I associate myself with the remarks of the chairperson of the subcommittee and others who have indicated the importance of continuing this national effort.

I would like to make just one point. We are going to be dealing with a variety of issues, all of which fall loosely under the rubric of the economic future of America. Soon we will be in the midst of a major national debate on the North American Free-Trade Agreement, a part of the economic future of America. We will be discussing questions of worker retraining, the issue of the development of an American infrastructure. I believe it is in that context we should be considering the appropriateness of this continued national investment in a space station.

A basic question for this country is what kind of jobs are we going to be assisting in the development of for our and future generations of Americans?

One thing that is clear is America is not going to be the nation which will be building those products that are labor intensive, in the traditional sense, and low-wage jobs.

The issue of the North American Free-Trade Agreement is not whether jobs are going to move from the United States to Mexico. Under current conditions, large numbers of jobs have already moved to Mexico. They have moved to Taiwan. They have moved to Korea. They have moved to areas around the world that have had lower wage structures and, therefore, can be more competitive than the United States.

What we have to do, in accepting the economic reality of the mobility of jobs and places of production, is make investments in those areas which will assure that high-technology jobs, high-paying jobs will continue to be available to the American worker.

That is what the space station does. The space station is an investment in

the same way that we have invested in the past in everything from our extension in the land grant college system to boost the economic prosperity of American agriculture, to investments in those things that have made America a leader in medicine, in communications, in transportation, and the areas which are today providing the high quality jobs to the American worker.

I do not believe that we will be doing our Nation and its future a service if we decide that we are going to become protectionist and become isolationist against an investment in these areas of high technology which have been America's traditional economic future.

So, Mr. President, I urge that the amendment be defeated and that we continue with an American commitment to leadership in space, but even more important, an American commitment to an investment in the future of high quality jobs for the American people.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. SHELBY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Bumpers amendment.

I am standing here today to participate again in the annual Senate ritual of attempting to cut the space station. We have been here before. As a matter of fact, we have been here year after year. I would like, Mr. President, to keep my remarks brief and, hopefully, to the point. The debate over the space station, I believe, is simply more show than substance.

This amendment, the Bumpers amendment, is not about cutting the deficit by one dime. The Bumpers amendment would not lower the discretionary spending levels in the budget by any amount. As a result, any savings, at best a few billion dollars over the next few years, would be spent, Mr. President, on other spending programs.

In this case, Mr. President, the amendment basically asks us to choose between competing priorities. In general, I am not given to believe that there are many Government investments that yield much in the way of economic growth. There are some, yes, but not many. However, in the case of science and technology spending I am convinced that tangible benefits do accrue to the country and its industrial base over the life of the investment and beyond.

Space spending has traditionally yielded \$7 in economic growth for every \$1 of Federal expenditures—7 to 1. I have no doubt that the life sciences and habitation work being done for the space station will yield similar results.

Mr. President, if we are not talking about deficit reduction, but are talking instead about priorities, I firmly believe that the space station is a meri-

torious investment that will benefit our children both economically and scientifically.

In addition, Mr. President, we have extensive commitments, as have been stated on this floor heretofore, to our international partners, commitments for cooperation and investment that now extend to the Russian Republic, among others.

Certainly refinancing international agreements is never good policy. However, canceling the space station and its accompanying agreements would be extremely dangerous because of the signal it sends to the international aerospace industry, Mr. President. Canceling the station is nothing more than a statement of America's willingness to abandon its diminishing edge in aerospace research and development that we have led for so many years.

Certainly, Mr. President, we should be working to enhance our high tech industrial base through projects like the space station rather than clipping away at it by undermining vital projects such as this.

Without a clear direction and future, the U.S. aerospace industry cannot orient itself to compete in the international marketplace. The annual reorientation of space priorities, or threat thereof, keeps our aerospace industry in a constant state of limbo and anxiety.

Mr. President, I believe we must have stability in NASA to have stability in our aerospace industry. A completed space station is critical to that stability.

Finally, Mr. President, cutting the space station is a flashy issue, but one that has little if any budgetary impact as I have just stated. Even if the pending amendment cut Federal spending by the amount of the life of the space station, which it does not, the savings would amount to little more than one 1 percent of 1 year's annual Federal expenditures.

So, Mr. President, I ask my colleagues here today to understand that this debate is not about fiscal restraint here this afternoon, but about investment priorities. In this case I am convinced that the space station, in its past or redesigned present form, merits the investment that we are making for its construction. I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing the Bumpers amendment.

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

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

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I have been following the debate on the space

station with great interest. For over 10 years in the other body, I served on the Science and Technology Committee of the House of Representatives, during which time I was perhaps one of the most ardent supporters of our efforts in space. I watched with considerable satisfaction as our endeavors in space matured and became more scientifically oriented. Then I watched with some dismay over the period of years as the space program moved from a civilian endeavor to a military endeavor.

When I first started my tenure in the House of Representatives, the space program was about—and here is where I do not know my figures correctly, but I think I am in the right ballpark—80 percent civilian and 20 percent military. Over the ensuing years, the space program changed. It became almost 80 percent military and about 20 percent civilian. I think I am roughly in the right ballpark.

Some of us tried to stem that. We wanted the space program to remain a civilian endeavor, a peaceful endeavor; one that promoted the best instincts of the human race, not the worst instincts; one that did not seek to take advantage of our technological superiority in order that we might build more efficient, effective weapons of war; one that would seek to bring together people from other nations in a joint endeavor to satisfy the deepest yearnings of the human race—that is, to explore the unknown.

So while, on the one hand, I promoted and encouraged and voted for our endeavors in space, on the other hand, I tried with the best efforts I had at the time to change it from being a military effort to one of continuing its civilian effort, which is as it was envisioned and started under President Kennedy.

So for the last several years, as I moved from the House to the Senate, I became so disappointed with the militarization of our space program, with moving it from what it had been envisioned as in the early sixties, what it started out as, to what it had become—just another arm of star wars, another arm of our military endeavor, to gain some type of military superiority, to place weapons of mass destruction in orbit around the Earth.

I spoke about that on an amendment I offered a couple weeks ago on ASAT. I tried to knock funding out of the Defense Department bill on ASAT, anti-satellite weapons, because I feared if we moved in that direction it could for decades, if not centuries, deny to us many regions of space, because of the debris that would be orbiting the Earth.

So for the last several years in the Senate, I have become one of the most vocal opponents of the space program, not because I wanted to see the space program end, I wanted to see it changed. I wanted to see it moved back

again to the civilian endeavor that it had started out to be in the 1960's. Move it back again to exploration, to satisfying that yearning of mankind to explore the unknown, to once again enable, to excite us once again about the possibilities of the future.

So I have, in the past, voted against the space station. I joined with Senator BUMPERS in the past in voting to kill the space station because I felt that it was going down the wrong path. We were doing it not for the best purposes and instincts, but I thought for the worst purpose, and that is to militarize it, in competition with the Soviet Union.

Well, to the amazement of my friends on both sides of this issue, Mr. President, I will state my conclusion first, and I will tell you why I reached that conclusion.

I am today going to vote against the Bumpers amendment, and I am going to vote to continue funding for the space station. That is my conclusion.

I will sum up why I am doing that in just perhaps this sentence. I believe that the agreement we reached with Russia, in terms of a joint endeavor to build the space station and to jointly move ahead in the exploration of near space, is so monumental and so important to the future of our relations with Russia and to the future of all of space exploration—and I might add, important to the issue of nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems—that we must vote to continue the space station.

I must tell you, Mr. President—and I tell my distinguished chairperson of this subcommittee, my dear friend from Maryland—if that agreement had not been reached with Russia, I would be on Senator BUMPERS' side, because I would see no changing from what that space station had been envisioned to be. I add that the initial design of the space station has been cut down and drastically altered. The most important thing to me is that it has been designed not just as a space station, but as an international space station, one that will use the best hardware of this country and of Russia, the best technological expertise of both sides, including the French, Japanese, and others, to build a truly international space station, one not just designed to be an arm of the military but designed to be an arm of our scientific community, and I think also one that will again pull in people from all nations.

I think that agreement between us and Russia is so important that we cannot fail at this one.

So, Mr. President, that is why I have changed my mind on this, and that is why I think we cannot back off now, because I see a change, going back to what we wanted the space program to be in the beginning—a civilian effort, dedicated to peaceful pursuits, dedicated to science, yes, but dedicated

again to exploring the unknown, which I believe to be one of the deepest aspects of human nature.

So we are at the beginning of a new era. In the last many years, our space program was driven by one overriding consideration, and that was competition with the Soviet Union.

Who can forget the panic that swept this Nation as Sputnik was up in 1957? I will relate a funny story. I remember that I was a junior in high school. I did not read the morning paper, but I went to school that morning. I will never forget it. I went to physics class. I was taking physics as a junior, and our teacher was Professor Landry. I will never forget sitting in that class, and he came in. He had white, flowing hair that almost reminded you of Albert Einstein.

He comes into class and is waving a newspaper, which he has rolled up, and he looks at us students—mind you, we were juniors in high school—and he says: "You dummies. Look what you have done." And he went on berating us. We had no idea what we had done. He unfolded the newspaper, and there was the announcement the Russians launched the satellite. He went on berating us because we were not studying hard enough, that we had fallen behind.

So I remember that day very, very vividly, and I remember the fears that we had of Soviet nuclear bombs orbiting a few hundred miles above United States cities. That was the big thing. Sputnik went up. The next thing was nuclear bombs orbiting. They could drop down on us, and then the nightmare of nuclear-tipped missiles unchallenged by American capability.

The Russians had indeed beaten us to the last frontier. Overnight U.S. space resources doubled and doubled again to reverse this defeat in our competition with the evil empire.

John F. Kennedy was elected in large part because he had pointed out the previous administration failed by letting the Soviets get ahead of us in space. Of course, we remember the famous challenge in 1961 to put a man on the Moon and return him safely within the next decade. But this was driven again by a civilian desire to get into space, and we created a civilian agency. I think it is very telling that the first human to set foot on the Moon was a civilian, not a captain or commander, not anyone in the military. It was Neil Armstrong, a civilian employee of NASA, a civilian. I think that said something about what we were up to. American scientists, engineers and technicians met this challenge.

Now, it changed. It became a military thing driven by fear of the Soviet Union, fear of the nuclear arsenal of the Soviet Union. And that has driven us, but now all that has changed.

There is no Soviet Union. Many times I hear the Soviet Union talked about. There is no such entity. It does

not exist. There is no space race any longer.

After all these years of confrontation and competition and fear and anxiety, we have an opportunity for expanded peaceful cooperation in outer space. Vice President GORE has laid the groundwork for unprecedented cooperation with Russia in building what is fast becoming, as I said earlier, a truly international experiment.

It could not come at a better time. By cooperating with the Russians, we can reduce the economic burden of our own space ventures, and, Mr. President, we can occupy Russian scientists and engineers not in trying to match us in trying to build weapons of war and mass destruction and their delivery systems, but we can occupy Russian scientists and engineers, and they are very good, by the way, in the peaceful pursuits of space exploration. We can further provide a market for the considerable Russian experience in human-occupied near-Earth orbiting vehicles, reducing the incentives for the Russians to sell military missile technology to unstable Third World nations. Think about that.

The fear we have is that Russia because of its situation—we heard Senator BUMPERS last night go on and on—I was occupying the Chair when he introduced his amendment telling about what a bad shape Baikonur was in, and others, and I will respond to that in a minute talking about the Russian hardware.

Well, what do we want? Do we want the Russians because of their dire economic circumstances to start selling that technology to an unstable Third World country like Saddam Hussein's, and others? And they will do it. They need the money. Or would we rather join with them and use that technology for the peaceful pursuits of outer space combined jointly with us? I think the question answers itself.

Mr. President, as I said, also, the design of the space station has changed. The cost has come down. Last year's design would have cost \$18 billion over the next 5 years. It would have cost \$25 billion before we achieved permanent human occupancy. The total life cycle cost of last year's space station would have been over \$50 billion. But that has been changed. President Clinton directed NASA to reduce the cost and they have. It has been reduced from \$18 billion to \$10.5 billion, and the cost of permanent occupancy cut from \$25 billion to \$19 billion and life cycle cost estimates from \$50 billion to \$32.5 billion.

These are very important because we are concerned about the budget deficits and the impact on the budget.

Now, again, some of the reduction in the design cost is due to the purchase of proven Russian hardware, including two Russian lifeboats and two Russian tugs which provide communication and propulsion for the space station.

Vice President GORE and Russian Prime Minister Chernomyrdin has laid the groundwork for even greater Russian contributions. A decision is planned for this November to add the equivalent of a Russian MIR-2 module to what is fast becoming, as I said, a truly international space station. This major contribution of Russian hardware would have two significant effects:

First, the United States could have a working space station laboratory in space by July 1997, nearly 2 years ahead of the *Alpha* design schedule. Similarly, the day of permanent occupancy could be moved from 2003 to 2001.

Second, the full-blown Russian option would further reduce costs, primarily as a result of reducing the schedules by utilizing existing Russian hardware.

Now again, Senator BUMPERS went on. He asked the rhetorical question how would we feel, how would our astronauts feel about using Russian hardware, Russian technology. Well, as a matter of fact, Mr. President, they might feel pretty good because the joint agreement is with, of course, NPO Energia of Kaliningrad. Under the regulations of the Russian Republic, NPO Energia of Kaliningrad has control of assets. Therefore, they must sign off on programs involving its own assets.

NPO Energia is the world's oldest and largest space organization. Like many Russian organizations it is being transformed into a commercial company.

It holds a pretty distinguished place in space history. It was the lead organization that developed the Sputnik. It was the lead organization that planned the flight of Yuri Gagarin, first human in space. It developed the first space station, the *Soyuz* PPM, and today the only space station, MIR and NPO developed and launched the space shuttle and the heavy launched vehicle the largest launch vehicle that we have in the world today.

NPO Energia is an organization sophisticated in cooperation with the West. It was the organization on the Russian side of the *Apollo-Soyuz* flight of 1975.

Mr. President, I went down to Florida for that launch of *Apollo-Soyuz* 1975. It was exciting. I watched a lot of lift-offs but this one was particularly exciting. Here were Americans going into space to link up with the Soviets to hopefully do what I thought we would start doing and that is getting back to civilian use of space with joint efforts with the Russians. I remember when the astronauts came back from that flight we had them over in our committee room later on. I was privileged to meet the Soviet astronauts who had linked on the *Apollo-Soyuz* linkup back in 1975. We had high hopes that this was the beginning of a joint effort with the Soviet Union only to have

those hopes dashed because of the military confrontation and competition with the Soviet Union.

But again the entity that we are dealing with, Senator BUMPERS said how would we feel about using Russian assets and their hardware? This is the lead organization that planned the *Apollo-Soyuz* flight. It was the one that lead the world in space flight, space stations, heavy-lift vehicles. I think we ought to feel pretty good about it.

I am like every other American, every other red-blooded American, I take pride in what we do. I tend to think everything we have is the best. But, quite frankly, the Russians have developed some pretty darn good hardware for space exploration.

The status of the space program—despite all of the political uncertainties the Russian space program continues its operational status, continues to evolve. Launches are still continuing at a rate higher than the United States. The MIR-1 space station continues to be permanently manned. It has been occupied throughout this year including a visit by a European researcher. The cargo resupply from the Progress launch vehicle also continues at an appropriate rate. So again, I do not know what Senator BUMPERS is talking about. It sounds like the Russian space effort is continuing. It may not be as fancy as ours but they get the job done.

I believe that we should feel very good about joining with them and using their hardware and using whatever technologies they have.

But I think of equal importance in terms of reducing the cost which I was speaking about and using their hardware, of equal importance is this new plan would make a major contribution to stabilizing the Russian space program.

As I said, it would significantly reduce the temptation of the Russians to sell hardware or expertise to potential missile proliferators. And the Clinton administration's plan would make this a truly international effort, combining contributions from Japan, Canada, and our European allies with those from the United States and Russia.

So for these reasons I have decided I will support the current plan, *Alpha*, for the space station, with the understanding that the United States will move ahead with the Russian option to fully integrate Russian MIR hardware into the space station design.

My continued support will also depend on NASA's performance in controlling costs and meeting schedules. We must insist that the taxpayers' dollars are spent effectively and efficiently. Again, my continued support will depend on our continued relations

with Russia, whether or not we continue to use their hardware and whether or not this continues to be a peaceful joint enterprise with the Russians and with our allies.

In short, my continued support will depend on whether or not this truly is an international effort. We will take the lead. We should take the lead. We are the world's only remaining superpower. We have the capability to take the lead in this, and we should take the lead. But that does not mean exclusively; that does not mean only our taxpayers should bear the burden. Space exploration is not just for Americans; it is for the entire human race.

I know there are those who are concerned that perhaps by utilizing some Russian hardware, some of our jobs may be in jeopardy. I have heard that. I know that is circulating around. There are those who want to hold this up as a possibility, but not really completely integrate it with our Space Program for that reason.

I give a warning to those who would think thusly, in saying if we do not fully integrate the Russian hardware, they are going to be selling it to other countries. Our space program will dwindle and we will be shifting our engineers, our scientists, right back into Star Wars once again. Maybe some people would like that. I hope not. But I think we ought to be about the peaceful pursuits of space, and that is why I changed my mind from what I previously voted. I explained that earlier.

I will just sum it up by saying we have a proud history in space exploration. We are the world's only superpower left, and we should be about taking this lead. I think we have to insist—and we here, who cast these deciding votes on the money our taxpayers must spend—we have to insist we do not shirk and we should not yield in exploring this last frontier of mankind.

We must go into space not as Americans, not as Russians, not as Japanese, but as a people of planet Earth, as human beings. This space station as it is now envisioned may be called Space Station Freedom. That is fine. It should be. I like to think of it as perhaps space station *Enterprise*. We have all seen the Star Trek movies, right? The Star Ship *Enterprise*.

The one thing I have always liked about the Star Trek series and watching the *Enterprise* was that the space ship was multiracial and multinational. It talked about what we ought to be doing in space. I see the space station as that, a truly international effort—multinational, multiracial, not for the purposes of weapons production, not for the purposes of proliferation of nuclear weapons and bombs in space, but satisfying the deepest yearnings of human nature, that yearning we all have to understand the unknown, to explore that

which we do not understand; to find out the answers to the age-old questions of who we are, and are we alone; to satisfy that deepest yearning of mankind to strike out from the shores that we know, to cast our boats adrift, to explore the unknown. That is the deepest yearning of human nature.

In doing so, I believe we will ennoble ourselves. Who knows what we will find? Who knows what awaits us? We hear all about the experiments, the scientific experiments. I am sure there will be great spinoffs from this. There may be things we just do not know of. Think of, perhaps, those who pushed ahead the frontiers in exploring the unknown in the past, whether it was those who explored the oceans, those who explored the new frontiers of new countries; new frontiers, whether it is the United States or other countries. They had no idea of what would come of it. I see the same thing in our space exploration. We do not know what will come of it, but we have to do it. And there is only one way we should do it: Not just as Americans, but we ought to do it internationally.

This is the first step toward that, this agreement with the Russians. I hope we do not back off now. And I hope, as we proceed on this, it will not just be the Russians; it will be the French, it will be the Japanese, it will be the Germans, the Brazilians—everyone else. We all have a stake in it, and I hope under the leadership of President Clinton over the next several years, we will truly see an international space effort and a truly international space station.

I thank the distinguished Chair of the subcommittee for her great leadership on this issue, and so many others. She and I share, I know, a strong feeling that we must meet the human needs of our people in this country—the social needs, the health needs, the employment needs, the training needs, the education needs. We believe that very deeply. I know we share that feeling.

There is one other thing I believe we also share, and that is this feeling we cannot back down from this last great enterprise of exploring the unknown. So I congratulate her for her leadership in so many areas, and especially in this one. I am sorry I could not have been with you in the past, Madam Chairperson, but I am with you now, and again I sincerely hope we defeat the Bumpers amendment and we continue this joint exploration with the Russians. I hope in the Senator's capable hands, we make this truly an international space station.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Iowa not only on his fine speech, but his superb grasp of the strategic issues involved in

the space station debate. The Senator from Iowa has truly grasped the strategic benefits that we will gain from this space station. He has also articulated our very sincere and effective cost cutting efforts.

The Senator from Iowa chairs the Subcommittee on Labor, Education, and Human Resources in the Appropriations Committee. No other Senator has a greater struggle meeting the human needs of our country in education, preventive health care, higher education demands, the funding of the great National Institutes of Health, the Public Health Service, and a whole other array of agencies. This Senator has struggled with skimpy budgets and compelling human need, and he understands that every dollar counts.

I thank the Senator for his support of the space station. I thank him for articulating clearly the achievement of the strategic purpose which we undertake, and then also our cost cutting.

Mr. President, I would like to just amplify this. First, a lot has been said about the cost of the space station. What many people have ignored in this debate is that we have cut the cost of the space station without cutting its ability to do significant science.

When I first became the Chair of this subcommittee and had the concerns I had about the space station, my concerns were that it was overweight and underpowered and had no clear objective. I was concerned the only reason we were getting into this was so it could be a condo in the sky, so sometime in the future we could make a jump to Mars.

Mr. President, that would have been a \$500 billion undertaking to go to Mars, or attempt to go to Mars, with a manned spaceship in the first decade of the new century—\$500 billion. We said—we said, meaning this Senate, particularly the leadership of Mr. ALBERT GORE, now our Vice President, then the chair of the Subcommittee on Space in the authorizing committee—and I said, "No, we are not building condos in the sky." Sure in heck we are not building condos in the sky when we have homeless in the streets, when people are wondering whether they are going to afford their home, and kids have their first mortgage called student debt and wondering where they are going to work.

Condos in the sky are not going to be built. But do we need a space station? And the resounding answer is "Yes." Yes, for scientific research, not a man in the can to rotate around the orbit to show an endurance contest. We do not want a man in the can, no more than we want a man in the condo or now, thanks to Dr. Sally Ride and other women astronauts, a woman in a condo in the sky, a woman astronaut. We said significant science.

So we already stopped a \$500 billion—"B" in billion, "B" as in Barbara, not

"M" in million, like in Mikulski. So we have stopped that. That was our first big cost-cutting effort.

Then when we looked at the design of the space station, we felt we could get a design where we could do significant science, bring us in a fiscal discipline and at the same time meet the agreements we have with our international trading partners.

President Clinton, who also wanted to be sure that all questions were answered on not only the desirability of the space station but the viability of it from both the scientific and fiscal standpoint, ordered a review. They have come up with a design that has now cut \$2.2 billion off the cost of the space station.

While we were doing that, we were able to, because of a Vice Presidential initiative under the direction of the President, reach across the Atlantic and those barriers that normally divided us, like the Berlin Wall, like the Warsaw Pact nations, to the Soviet Union on a cooperative basis, using the best of their technology, working with an American-led space station could save us time in getting in space and save us money in getting in space and, at the same time, for those scientists who are rocket scientists, who are geniuses at propulsion, to put them to work on this civilian cooperation in terms of the American-led space station. And there will be international laboratories of the Japanese, of the Canadians, and of the European consortium.

My gosh, my gosh, when President Reagan was here speaking during a State of the Union Address and called the Soviet Union the evil empire, when we thought its leadership resembled Darth Vader, to envision an opportunity where, on a bipartisan basis, whether working with all Presidents, that we would now bring to an end the cold war—and special recognition to President Bush for his deft leadership on this—now to think that instead of the evil empire, scientist to scientist, to think about how we can come together and create a space station that will do life science, that will look for cures for cancer, that will look for other answers in life sciences and others, I think what we all hope to be.

We funded NATO to bring an end of the cold war. We stood sentry over all of the forces that were poised against the United States. We were smart enough at the end of World War II to reach out to the German scientist named Wernher von Braun and his whole crowd and say, "We know you were developing rockets to bomb London and maybe even a new device that would have reached the United States of America, but the war is over. And now the war for our future begins."

So we brought the German scientists to the shores of the United States of America and, working with the Amer-

ican scientists, we took their propulsion genius and our American know-how and we created that American space program. We would not have gone to the Moon, we would not have a space station unless we had done that effort with the Germans at the end of the war. We put aside old hostilities, we put aside old antagonisms and old bitter feelings and worked with the Germans, whose names now are Werner von Braun and the rest is American history.

Now we have an opportunity to do that same type of thing. No more Darth Vader, no more evil empire, but scientist to scientist. Instead of inventing propulsion devices aimed at each other, we will come together on propulsion mechanisms that will take us into space. Yes, this is the space station. Other devices that will take unmanned propulsion devices into space—

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Only when I finish my point I will be happy to yield.

And then hopefully beyond, hopefully beyond. I think this is a very reasonable undertaking.

In a letter the Vice President of the United States sent to me, he talks about how "The redesigned space station—referred to as space station *Alpha*—results from NASA's intensive review and redesign conducted over the last 6 months." It offers an unprecedented opportunity to achieve international cooperation in space.

He says, and I quote:

Russian Prime Minister Chernomyrdin and I, under the auspices of the joint commission that we chair, have directed NASA and the Russian Space Agency to continue studying ways to incorporate Russia's space capabilities into the station for the mutual benefit of our countries and our international partners.

*** It is important to realize that this initiative on space cooperation fits into the context of a much larger partnership with Russia, a relationship that will redefine the post-cold war era.

Mr. President, I truly believe that the strategic considerations and the budget cutting need to be understood as we vote on this space station. I know other Senators are here and wish to speak. I have more to say about the space station. Let me answer the question of the Senator from Utah, and then I will be happy to yield the floor for those Senators who have not yet spoken.

I yield to the Senator from Utah for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LIEBERMAN). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for her expertise and her background on this. Being new to this body and this issue, I hope she can enlighten me.

It is my understanding—and I ask for confirmation and clarification—it is my understanding that other countries

have made significant contributions, not only in terms of scientific expertise but also in terms of appropriated funds from their own governments on the basis of what they consider to be a contract with the United States, and that if we were to withdraw at this point, it would be breaking faith with that, indeed, might even constitute a breach of contract. Is that a fair understanding?

Ms. MIKULSKI. The Senator from Utah, though new to the Senate, is certainly well versed in this issue. The Senator is absolutely correct. The Canadians, the Japanese, the European consortium, made up of France, Germany, and Italy and other international partners, have appropriated funds for their laboratory work and other aspects of this space station. They regard this, and their participation with us, as having a treaty-like status. If we terminate this, they will view it as rupturing a treaty on scientific exploration and cooperation.

Mr. BENNETT. So it is the Senator's understanding that cancellation of this program would be more than just a unilateral domestic decision, it would have implications overseas that could produce very significant consequences; is that a fair statement?

Ms. MIKULSKI. It would have enormous consequences in terms of our relationship with these nations that have been our friends in war and peace. And we want to maintain a relationship with them, and also if we break this covenant with them, they will regard the United States of America as an unreliable partner on any other scientific endeavor or opportunity for scientific joint cooperation.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator for the clarification. I find that a very significant aspect here that has not been aired in the press, and I think in and of itself is a very strong argument in favor of the space station.

I thank the Senator.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I yield the floor. I note other Senators are waiting.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, will she take one other question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has a question for the Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator. I think that is an important question raised by our colleague, but I would like to draw the Senator's attention to a report issued by NASA in September of 1993, current. On page 4: "International Partners' Assessments." Is the Senator familiar with the paragraph that reads:

Following NASA's formal invitation on July 21, 1993, the International Partners participated in the Space Station Transition Team activities. The International Partners

acknowledge the progress made by the Transition Team to consolidate a Station design based on Option A as proposed by the Redesign Team.

However, recent and significant changes to the configuration, without the necessary substantiating data being made available to the partners, have made it impossible for the partners to complete their overall assessments for inclusion in this report.

Now, Mr. President, I feel that that shows less than a strong coalition of other nations that are totally dependent on this program. To me, that is an indictment of the many things that we have brought forth in this debate.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Does the Senator want me to answer?

Mr. WARNER. Yes. I ask the question.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, to respond to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, this is the report. This new involvement in the space station, particularly with the Russians, was a development in late August. Because of certain strategic situations, they could not get all of the details.

It is my understanding from both Mr. Goldin and the White House itself that our international supporters, our international partners, are fully supportive of this and have ratified the design, the so-called *Alpha* station design.

Mr. WARNER. Well, Mr. President, may we read on just one more sentence, and then I will yield the floor. The next sentence:

Furthermore, the Partners were provided with only a minimum of general information concerning Russian participation, as the results of the U.S.-Russian study were not available until August 31, 1993. The Partners are concerned that the configuration identified in this report lacks the necessary review and maturity.

Mr. President, I find that far short of a ringing endorsement.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, responding to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, I do not consider that an indictment. We were in the process of redesigning the space station. This tremendous opportunity occurred late this summer for Russian participation.

What our international partners are worried about is that whatever is done would have enough power to sustain their laboratory modules, and they wanted it specific, they wanted it definite, exactly because they bankrolled a lot of this, as the Senator from Utah raised a few seconds ago.

It is now my understanding that those questions have been answered for the Canadians, for the Japanese, and for the Europeans.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if that is the Senator's understanding, is there any documentation that the Senate might refer to?

Ms. MIKULSKI. I bring to the attention of the Senator from Virginia the letter dated September 20, from the Vice President of the United States, in which he says:

Russian Prime Minister Chernomyrdin and I, under the auspices of the joint commission that we chair, have directed NASA and the Russian Space Agency to continue studying ways to incorporate Russia's space capabilities into the station for the mutual benefit of our countries and our international partners. It is our goal that the space agencies of the United States, Canada, Japan, Europe, and Russia work together to produce a more detailed plan by November of this year for Russia's participation in the international space station.

What the Vice President is essentially saying is we are all moving in the same direction, and the international partners are fully supportive of this effort.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield for an additional question?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Does that answer the Senator from Virginia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I have to say, in all fairness, no, because I referred to the same letter to which the distinguished manager, the Senator, referred to: September 20, 1993, from the Vice President to the senior Senator from Texas. In the second paragraph, he states:

The redesigned space station—referred to as space station *Alpha*—results from NASA's intensive review and redesign conducted over the last six months with the help of other government agencies and overseen by a panel of outside experts. *Alpha* is a streamlined version of the original space station *Freedom*. It incorporates scientific facilities and capabilities comparable to or better than space station *Freedom*.

Now, what do we have in the way of documentation to show that it is comparable to—

Ms. MIKULSKI. I can only say to the Senator, I will be happy to arrange a phone call for him over the next 45 minutes with Mr. Goldin, the director of NASA, to reassure the Senator.

We submitted a series of questions to NASA and the White House in anticipation of this robust debate, and one of those questions that we submitted was—and I will then give their written response:

How are our current partners viewing this program? Are they concerned that we will build a phase II program with the Russians and stop there?

Essentially, anticipating the sensible questions raised by the Senator from Virginia. What they then say back is this:

The partners have expressed their support for examining the possibility of Russian participation in the station. Like us, they will be assessing the November 1 plan when it is complete. In addition to that, the partners are working with us for a review of the final design due November 1.

Now, you might say, well, what are we buying? That would be an excellent followup question. Do we know what we are buying?

Well, that is exactly why we fenced half of the money, so that we do know

in detail what we are buying. Right now, what we have is assurances that everyone is moving in the same direction and supportive subject to the final design being done November 1.

The distinguished Senator knows from his work on the Armed Services Committee, science and technology can not be rushed to meet a parliamentary deadline. So we then fenced the money. There will be the final design November 1, at which we anticipate all of their questions will be answered, as they are now.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished manager for entering into a colloquy. I will have further questions. But I see my colleague from Arkansas seeking the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Would it be helpful to the Senator from Virginia if he did have a conversation with the Director of NASA?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I assure the manager that Administrator Goldin attended the noon conference of the Republicans, at which time I had a chance to question him very carefully about the costs; and I may address in later remarks his response.

Mr. BRYAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. MIKULSKI. The Senator from Arkansas had asked if I would yield.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, the Chair just recognized the Senator from Nevada, and I would like to ask him to yield to me for a moment to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has yielded to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. I heard Senator HARKIN, who has voted to cut the space station, a moment ago say he was changing his vote to vote for it this year because of this monumental accord between the United States and Russia. And there is \$100 million in this bill, incidentally, for Russia. But I wanted to ask the distinguished chairman if she is aware of this. This is a UPI press story just off the wire:

President Boris Yeltsin dissolved the Russian Parliament late Tuesday and ordered new legislative elections, a move he said was designed to save the country from chaos, disintegration, and catastrophe. He told a nationwide television audience that this was the only way to overcome the crisis that's plagued the Russian Government, hampered reforms, and threatened a political breakdown in Moscow's fledgling post-Soviet democracy.

It goes on:

Yeltsin's abrupt announcement promises to stir a strong reaction from legislative leaders who oppose Kremlin policies and who have been warning that Yeltsin had planned to declare Presidential rule. In anticipation of Yeltsin's announcement, present Parliament Speaker Khasbulatov, Yeltsin's archrival, summoned legislative leaders and other top Government officials to the Kremlin, including the country's top judge, Vice

President, the chief prosecutor, and the head of the Army General Staff, to an emergency meeting.

In light of that, does the distinguished chairman still think this is a great idea, to get in bed with Russia on this?

Ms. MIKULSKI. The Senator's first question was, was I aware of what the Senator just read from UPI, off the wire? The answer is no. In anticipation of the many questions I knew the Senator was going to raise in the debate, I have been devoting all of my time to pouring over the information on the space station.

I thank the Senator for bringing to the Senate floor the version of Hanoi News and bringing to me this most stunning announcement. That is exactly why I think we need this cooperation, because that part of the Soviet society which is held together, one, by a code of scientists who have their own code of cooperation, and the fact that it is in this cooperation with Soviet scientists that we will be able to help that society hold itself together and at the same time get something from it which is saving time and saving money and accomplishing our own national agenda with international partners.

It will enhance, I think, the situation there. And the fact that Mr. Yeltsin called for an election and has faith that an election will take place, I think is a tribute to the fact that democracy in the Soviet Union has taken hold. They are not doing it with a coup. They are not doing it with tanks. They are not doing it with a stand down of nuclear weapons. They will be having their elections so that there is confidence in the Government; and at the same time the fact that they would know that one of the anchors will be scientific cooperation with the United States, I think will be a significant stabilizing force focused on civilian research.

Mr. BUMPERS. Would the chairman's answer be the same if tomorrow morning she picks up the paper and finds out the army is taking over Russia?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Hopefully the vote will be done on the space station before tomorrow.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I reclaim the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. I thank the President.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas to eliminate funding for the space station, as I have done in each of the prior years since I joined this Chamber.

I serve on the Senate Commerce Committee. I am not unmindful of the efforts that have been undertaken to revise and to modify the space station. I acknowledge that those efforts have been with the best of intentions. Unfortunately,

no amount of revision or fine tuning can correct the fundamental flaw of this program; that is, we do not need it, and we cannot afford it.

It has been 9 years since President Reagan proposed the development of the space station at an estimated cost of \$8 billion. Even at that price, the merits, cost effectiveness of the space proposal were always somewhat questionable. By the end of this year, we will have spent more than \$11 billion on the program and we are still not even close to completing the project.

Earlier this year President Clinton ordered a redesign and reevaluation of the space station program. NASA was instructed to prepare space station options which could be completed in 5 years at three different levels of funding, \$5, \$7, and \$9 billion.

NASA has completed its study and presented its results to the President. None of the options developed by NASA meet any of the cost targets. In fact, all of the options are several billion dollars more expensive than the most expensive option requested by the President.

Furthermore, none of the options developed would result in an operational space station by the end of the 5-year period which was the parameter requested in the President's revision directive to NASA.

In spite of NASA's failure to meet the President's targets, NASA intends to move forward with the space station at a cost during the current fiscal year of \$2.1 billion. As many of our colleagues have already pointed out, we are being asked to provide \$2.1 billion for a project whose final design and mission has yet to be defined. The total cost of the scaled back and revised space station program, including interest, is now estimated to be more than \$100 billion. This program has been marked by cost overruns, management problems, multiple design changes, and a lack of a consensus overall on its mission.

Mr. President, the time has come to cut our losses, and terminate this program.

I am well aware of the arguments raised by the space stations defenders. I understand the problems the termination of the program may cause for NASA, particularly with regard to our international partners, the subject of the colloquy just transpiring on the floor between the distinguished manager of the bill, and one of my other colleagues.

I understand also that some are concerned that without the space station NASA may be left with a limited manned space travel mission. And I further understand the potential research benefits of the space station, although I also believe that much of this research can be conducted in other than a space station.

Finally, I understand and completely sympathize with the job losses, that

may occur in the aerospace industry as the result of the termination of this program. Unfortunately, none of these arguments are persuasive. The current budget situation and our massive Federal deficit simply do not allow us to fund every potentially useful program.

Mr. President, a few weeks ago this Chamber reverberated with the oratory and rhetoric of those who are committed to deficit reduction. One Senator after another rose to express his or her commitment to reducing Federal expenditures, and some of our colleagues predicated their vote against the President's budget proposal because the spending cuts did not come up front as they desired, and the increased tax measures were up front and, indeed, in some instances retroactive.

Mr. President, now is the time to redeem that oratory, to have our actions match our rhetoric, something which this Chamber has not distinguished itself in, in recent years.

It is clear to me that the major benefits to the space station are derived from the process of constructing the station, the employment that may be realized, the international prestige, and the stimulation for the aerospace industry.

The actual goals and supposed mission of the space station actually contribute very little to the efforts to defend the program. The space station and other massive science programs, such as the superconducting super collider, will continue to cause significant problems in our Nation's efforts to prioritize our scientific research efforts. Big ticket science is not necessarily the best way for us to go as we seek to develop a more competitive economy in the international marketplace and place more of our natural resources in research and development in the civilian sector as opposed to the military sector.

If we continue to build the space station, other potentially more important research programs will need to be cut. We will continue to fail to bring the deficit under control. Given its questionable benefits, the space station is little more than a somewhat short-term employment program for the aerospace industry.

I understand the pressures faced by that industry and the desire of the communities that are affected by that loss of employment, to keep this program going.

Unfortunately, the long-term solution to the problems in the aerospace industry cannot be solved by what amounts to a multibillion-dollar subsidy for a program that we do not need and we cannot afford.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas to terminate this program and thereby achieve some savings which can go to offsetting the mounting national deficit.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I say to any Senators waiting that I understand there is no time sequence, but I will try to be as brief as I can. I understand Senator METZENBAUM has been waiting also.

Mr. President, there are a few Senators I would like to compliment. Obviously, the distinguished Senator from Maryland has done a wonderful job on this bill, although I do not agree with it in every respect. In fact, I hope there are additional amendments that might seek to restrain other areas of the HUD appropriations bill. But I think she and the new ranking member, the Senator from Texas, Senator GRAMM, have done a good job of putting this bill together. I hope we will get the support of the Senate, with the issue before us intact as it has been presented by the Appropriations Committee.

I am sure the good Senator from Arkansas will wonder why I am going to congratulate him—that is, Senator BUMPERS—but I am, because he has won, frankly. Through his efforts over the years, this program has been dramatically reduced. But not only that, real firmness has been built into it by the new director, appointed by President Bush, retained by our new President, at least thus far, because of the admonitions here on the floor of Senator BUMPERS and others about this being a runaway program, about it needing some real management. That has all been done.

As a matter of fact, the President of the United States—and I really do not believe, having just gone through the budget fights, that he would be asking for a program here for this space station that would be out of control, that would not have definition to it, and would not have new management.

All of those things can be attributed, to a significant degree, to Senator BUMPERS and his allies, who for years have been asking that we cut this program out. It is amazing to me, when you take a program of such importance to our Nation—after all, it has been said here on the floor, and I repeat, if we are anything as a Nation, besides having our culture and our spiritual values, we are a country of technology. And if we are not at the cutting edge of technology, applied to business and development, yielding good, high-paying jobs, we are nothing.

As a matter of fact, the most significant problem with America's future is not that we will lose low-paying jobs to Mexico, but rather that we will lose high-paying jobs to the world, because we are not at the cutting edge of high-value jobs through applied technology.

Everybody knows, whether it has been perfect or not, NASA and the space program has been cutting-edge

technology. It has been the magnet attracting young people in America to become engineers and scientists and space engineers and physicists, and it has yielded a myriad of spinoff technologies that continue to enhance our capability to compete day-by-day. Why should we terminate a program when in response to congressional critics, led by our friends here in the Senate who want to kill the program, when this program of such significance to ourselves and the world has already accomplished a mission of being a budget saver?

The amount of money to be spent on this program before the President of the United States and the new director got together and said let us make more management sense and let us put some realism into the dollar numbers—that may never have happened but for the arguments here on the floor of the Senate.

I understand that, contrary to what has been said on the floor of the Senate, this program does have a given amount of money and a given number of years after which you will either have a space station ready to go, or you will be ready to go on a space station, or you will terminate the program. I do not know how much more management we can build into a program as difficult as this. But I have very significant trust in the new director. I have read some of the things he has done. They probably should have been done 10 years ago or 9 years ago. In fact, I say to my friend, the new Senator from Texas, I believe the idea of having a lead American industrial company take the top rung of managing this program, and do it as a business—which Boeing is now doing—is long overdue. I understand from some readings that it was a typical bureaucratic nightmare until that occurred.

So I close my remarks today on this part of my argument, and by saying, let us compliment the director, the administrator, the President, and the NASA hierarchy for coming up with a realistic program that we know how much we are going to spend on, that is going to achieve very significant goals and tests. Within the next decade, we are going to be proud of the fact that we defeated the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas today and proceeded with one of America's true technological potentials that may indeed keep us on the cutting edge for a while longer.

There is another argument being made—and perhaps some of it is directed to Senators like myself and others—which says, "You have been talking about cutting the budget first. Why do you not accept this one?" Mr. President, I hope some Senators on our side—and I will join them—will pick a program or two out of this appropriations and say we would like to cut it out. It fits what we think we ought to

do. Perhaps it is the community development block program, which is \$175 million more than the President asked. It is our privilege to say that is a program we do not think we need. Let us take it out and lower the caps so we save money. But does that mean that because we are for cutting the budget that we have to assume we are in accord with any program that any Senator wants to take out of our national budget? Does it make sense that because we want to cut the budget, that somebody comes to the floor and says, take two more divisions out of the U.S. Army, which has already been reduced, but for you Senators, the other side talking about cutting the budget, here is your chance.

Mr. President, what if we do not agree that we ought to take two divisions out of the U.S. Army, and we think we ought to leave those and cut somewhere else? So while I was one who suggested—and perhaps it caught on here in the Senate—that if you are going to cut a program, you ought not run around and say you are cutting the budget, unless you cut the budget. So they have incorporated in their amendment that not only would they cut the program, but the allowable money to be spent in the next 5 years would be reduced proportionately. I compliment them for that idea. In fact, I think we ought to use it on some other programs when we try to do that. I hope that everyone knows if we do not support the cuts—that is, the space station—then we are not denying that portion of this amendment which says cut the budget proportionately. We are not denying that. It is relevancy, and it is important to the future of a realistic budget plan.

Mr. BUMPERS. If the Senator will yield for a question. If a point of order is made because of the provision we put into this amendment really to satisfy the senior Senator from Texas and people like the distinguished ranking member on the Budget Committee—we put this in here to say the \$2 billion in this bill that we propose to cut cannot be spent for anything else except deficit reduction—and you just got through applauding us for that, am I correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. I did.

Mr. BUMPERS. Does that mean you will vote against the point of order?

Mr. DOMENICI. If that comes to the Senate on this particular amendment, I will.

Mr. BUMPERS. Vote against it?

Mr. DOMENICI. To those that say it is subject to a point of order—I say to the Senator that he was not here, but I congratulated him on two counts.

Mr. BUMPERS. I was watching, Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. The part that you have actually saved the United States—whether your amendment passes or not on this program, you

have saved billions of dollars. I congratulate you, because this program was not what it is today until you started your amendments to try to kill it.

I merely suggested I think it is in good shape, it is fixed and determinative, and it has a given amount of money and goals, and I do not know why it ought to be asked to save more than what the President requested and what the new Administrator requests.

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM].

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, first I would like to compliment the Senator from Arkansas for his leadership in this area. He has been on the floor over a period of years and waged the battle for many of us, and we owe him a great debt of gratitude.

Second, I would like to compliment the manager of the bill, the Senator from Maryland. There is no more dedicated Member of this body than is she, and she has fought for human services programs and education issues having to do with working people.

It so happens on this particular issue we are in disagreement, but the fact is she is a magnificent Senator. And I was pleased to follow my colleague and friend from New Mexico on whose committee I used to serve, on the Budget Committee, because there has been no stronger voice for cutting out fat in the budget, no stronger voice for deficit reduction, no person who has been on the floor more hours, more time than he in trying to balance the budget. Therefore, it is with a great sense of concern that I hear him here today opposing the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

As a matter of fact, the Senator from New Mexico indicates his point of view. He wants this program but not some other programs, and I gather they are human service programs because he said something like he hopes that other parts of this bill, other areas in this HUD bill, can be restrained. I think that is really what the issue is.

There are some people on the other side of the aisle that would like to cut and cut and cut programs having to do with the quality of life in America, with the opportunity of people to get adequate medical care, with the opportunity for people to get food and drugs, and I mean pharmaceutical drugs, and the opportunity to send their kids to school, their opportunity to be able to provide clothing for them. But when there comes along a project that means it is good politically for them in their community, forget it. Forget it. We take a walk. Now we are no longer for budget cutting. Now it is in the Nation's interest to move forward.

It is amazing to me, absolutely amazing to me, that the very same Senators who argue day in and day out that we

need to cut spending to get the deficit under control are suggesting that we ought to spend an additional \$2 billion building the space station next year; and there will be additional billions and billions after that, as has already been described by the Senator from Arkansas.

It is always this same crowd, the ones who want to graze their cattle on Federal lands, who want extra minerals for free, who grab big porkbarrel projects like military bases and the so-called superconducting super collider for their States. They are the ones, the very same ones, that we meet on the floor. They have the loudest voices. They write the articles. They are the most best speakers when it comes to talking about how terrible the deficit is. "But be sure it does not cut the deficit in my backyard," say they.

All the while they try to cut nutritional programs for poor families and medical care for senior citizens, they stand up here and fight for the super collider. They fight for the largest defense spending. They fight for the space station. But do not cut anything that is in their own backyards.

Here they are again today, the very same people, the very same spokespersons trying to sell the space station as a wonderful achievement, and turning to the Senator from Arkansas and giving him credit for bringing about a scaled-down, \$22 billion bargain.

I say that it will cost \$72 billion before it is over, \$72 billion before it is over. And I must say that I have difficulty in understanding how we can, on the floor of the U.S. Senate, vote to provide \$100 million for the Russians in order to join in this program. What kind of thinking is that?

I understand the whole question of foreign aid. I understand the question of goodwill to your neighbors. I understand a lot of things. But I do not understand providing \$100 million in this bill to the Russians. We already spent \$11 billion and today there is not anything that looks like a space station except pictures.

As a Congressman from Ohio who chairs a similar committee dealing with the subject over in the House says, we are spending \$8 million a day for the space station, and we do not have any space station. It is a fact that this project has taken on all the odious characteristics of a jobs program, Mr. President. To me this is incredible.

So often here people are not willing to support a jobs program, some particular kind of program that describe itself as a jobs program. Some program that may cost a very modest amount per employee in a jobs program. But they are willing to spend whatever it takes for a space station, and those people get paid 2, 3, and 4 times as much as those that we provide for in direct jobs programs.

Jobs for defense and aerospace contractors and in this case a situation

with little scientific merit, and we are willing to pay the money and say we have to do it because it is good for that community, or good for that community, whatever the case may be.

There is no national security need for this program, none whatsoever. It is simply an outdated luxury, a laboratory in outer space. It is an incredible waste of money.

Will it tell us anything about Mars or the solar system, or the galaxy or outer space? Not in the lifetime of anybody that is in this body at the present time.

No, it is an opportunity to keep the astronaut-manned space exploration in business. And I think it is time to call a halt for this needless waste of the Federal dollars.

The Air Force cannot give up on its manned bomber, even though it is obsolete. And NASA cannot give up on its manned space station, even though it, too, is so obsolete.

This project has cost the taxpayers billions upon billions of dollars; and what do we have to show for it? GAO says it will cost \$40 billion to finish. The Senator from Arkansas indicates it will cost \$72 billion, and I am prepared to accept his figures on that score.

But whether we are only just a minimum of \$40 billion, \$72 billion, what difference does it make? We have money to blow. We do not need to worry about the deficit. The deficit is not very material. Unless it comes to human service programs. Then it becomes extremely material.

According to the GAO the cost of this project will actually be \$100 billion through the year 2027 after figuring the cost of maintenance, transportation to and from space, and the cost of money. We are going to have to cut funding in other science programs. We are going to have to cut veterans care. We are going to have to cut housing and environmental protection. All programs to keep funding NASA in the VA-HUD spending bill are going to have to be cut as much as \$13 billion over the next 5 years to pay for the space station.

I say to my colleagues who are supporting this and who are always in favor of deficit reduction: Have you no shame? Have you no shame that you can speak out of both sides of our mouth? Are you not embarrassed by your position of talking always about cutting and then coming out here and spending \$2 billion for the space station? Would you not prefer to have this vote taken in secret, or maybe not have a rollcall vote? Would it cause you a little bit less embarrassment?

But the amazing thing is those who are going to vote for it, they do not seem to be embarrassed. And I have difficulty in comprehending how intelligent people cannot be embarrassed in making this vote where they have been talking about deficit reduction, deficit

reduction, balancing the budget over a period of months.

I believe that this space station program is a ripoff. I believe we ought to kill it once and for all. I believe we ought to agree to the Bumpers amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN].

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, last evening I took the floor and advised my colleagues that there were, of course, a number of priorities we had to discuss as Members of the Senate, and while exploration of space is very important to all of us we have to start drawing some distinctions and making some discriminating choices. I told my colleagues we were holding hearings this morning in the Governmental Affairs Committee at which we learned that environmental cleanup will cost the Federal Government about \$500 billion. A half-a-trillion dollars will now be extracted from the pocketbooks of the taxpayers of this country. That works out to roughly \$2,000 per person for the American people.

So when we start evaluating where we are going with our programs we have to be somewhat discriminating. If we were in a robust economy, if we had billions of dollars to spend, we could say let us spend the extra money to explore space through this space station laboratory. But I think we have to come back to Earth to look at the nature of the problems we are confronted with here.

Last night we heard many interesting arguments for the space station. They were interesting because of their surreal character.

The proponents argued that the space station is needed to advance our research against cancer. I think that is fair enough. Cancer is a terrible affliction and anything we can do to help find a cure for cancer we ought to do. So if that is the purpose of conducting research in space, in order to find a cure for cancer, let us support it. But the question is, if this is for research into cancer, why does the American Association for Cancer Research oppose the space station as being of "little scientific or technical merit"?

Last night they argued the space station is needed for groundbreaking research on crystals. Fair enough. I think the next logical question is, Why is the space station opposed by the American Crystallographic Association, association of American scientists who study crystals?

It was argued last evening that the space station is needed for research on semiconductors, the heart of modern electronics. The question is, Why is the space station opposed by the Institute for Electrical and Electronics Engineers?

The proponents last evening argued we have to proceed because Germany

and Japan have invested in this station and their scientists are counting on it. Fair enough. The question is, Why do the primary professional societies of physicists in Germany and Japan oppose the space station?

Last evening the proponents argued it was needed for research in life sciences and microgravity studies. Again, fair enough. But why has the National Research Council declared the station "does not meet the basic research requirements for life sciences research (or) microgravity research"?

Why did Science magazine call it "90 percent public works, 9 percent public relations, and 1 percent science"?

The simple fact is, we have a surplus capacity for space-based research with Spacelab and Spacehab laboratories on the shuttle and the program to give the shuttle long-duration capability. We cannot even use the capacity we already have.

The simple fact is that starting up this new space station program is going to squeeze out funding for NASA programs that are worthwhile. This very bill cancels a space-based x-ray telescope because of the rising costs of the space station.

All the arguments that were advanced last evening do not seem to hold up to analysis when nearly every scientific group that is responsible for conducting the research in those various fields is strongly opposed to the space station. But let us go beyond the merits of the argument and look at its affordability.

While space station proponents cannot tell us exactly what the new station is going to look like or how much it is going to cost, they give us the comforting assurance it will cost less than space station *Freedom*. Small comfort to the American taxpayer.

We cannot afford the \$70 billion it is going to cost to construct this new version of the space station any more than we can afford the \$120 billion that was allocated for *Freedom* itself—space station *Freedom*. We cannot afford to take this money from the pocketbooks of our children, which is precisely what we are doing here. We are robbing our children of their future.

NASA cannot afford it. As I pointed out last evening using this chart, here are the numbers. The Clinton-proposed budget for NASA, that is the red line. The green line is NASA's program plan. And there is at least \$10 billion difference, perhaps closer to a \$15 billion or \$18 billion difference. If the space station proceeds, the only way they can eliminate that difference is by cutting out programs that are far more worthy.

Last evening I was accused by the Senator from Texas of quoting the humorist Dave Berry as an expert on science. In fact, if you look at the RECORD, I quoted real scientific experts from the National Research Council to

the American Association for Cancer Research, all of whom oppose the space station. And I cited Dave Berry as an expert on the preposterous. That is why I cited Dave Berry.

What is preposterous is the fact that interest payments on the Federal debt will equal 57 percent of all the Federal income tax taken from the American workers. The American people worked from January 1 to July 27, and every cent they paid in Federal income tax went just for interest on the debt. Not for any of the programs that help to sustain this country's economy.

Now we are being asked to spend even more of those hard-earned dollars on this. After spending \$11 billion on space station *Freedom*, we are now going to have to pay another \$160 million to terminate *Freedom* and then another \$2 billion to start a new program. After, as I pointed out last evening, my colleague from Texas said this redesign process was "robbing proponents of any real ability to make a credible, reasoned argument in favor of continuing the program." But here they are making a noncredible, unreasoned argument in favor of the program.

Then we add the Russian card. We now see played the Russian card. The Russians are being brought on board and so proponents now want to add another \$100 million. It sounds like a mere bagatelle, when we deal with a \$6 trillion economy, and \$300 billion deficits. What is another \$100 million to add on for the Russian participation?

I can understand the concerns of the thousands of people in Texas and elsewhere who work on this program, but my concern is with the tens of millions of taxpaying workers who see half of their Federal income tax going for interest on the debt and much of the rest being squandered on unjustifiable programs.

My concern is for the American children who may see two-thirds of their Federal income tax go for interest on the debt because we keep piling up these astronomical deficits, year after year.

My concern is for those scientists who are doing the research on cancer, crystals, semiconductors, chemistry and physics—scientists who almost uniformly say that proceeding with the space station is going to waste money that could be better spent on real research to fight cancer, advance science, and improve our economy.

Mr. President, for years the proponents have justified space station *Freedom* with the Delphic declaration that it was "the next logical step." Now NASA itself is terminating space station *Freedom*. And the next logical step is to stop throwing money into a black hole in space.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maryland, the Chair of the committee.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I know the hour is growing late, and we have had substantial debate on the space station. It is now my desire to propound a unanimous consent agreement, to see if we could establish a time certain.

I am therefore asking unanimous consent that we vote at time certain, at 4:30 p.m. today, and that the remaining time be equally divided, 15 minutes proponents, 15 minutes opponents. The ranking minority and I would control the time for the proponents; I believe the Senator from Arkansas would control the time for the opponents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Several Senators addressed the chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. I would like to object. I am anxious to accommodate the Senator from Maryland in getting a UC. We have right now, of course, Senator DORGAN who wants 3 minutes, Senator WELLSTONE 3, Senator EXON 5, that is 11, Senator SASSER wants 5, I want 5.

Let me suggest that we vote at 4:45. Does Senator WARNER want some additional time?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Yes. And we would of course need to protect Senator WARNER's time. He has declared that.

Mr. GRAMM. A vote at 4:45 would still work.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I believe Senator BYRD.

Mr. BUMPERS. I do not know how much time Senator WARNER wishes. He wants 5 minutes?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Senator WARNER has agreed to 10 minutes.

Mr. BUMPERS. He wants 10? That is 21—that does not leave Senator SASSER or me, either one, any time to wrap it up.

I suggest we make it 5 o'clock.

Mr. COHEN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. COHEN. I am advised that Senator WARNER has not indicated whether he is prepared to vote at a time specific. I would like to have an opportunity to—

Ms. MIKULSKI. With all due respect, I know the Senator from Virginia and I have been engaged in conversations about this issue. I am trying to accommodate. It will be my intention to move in a parliamentary procedure that will be nondebateable. It is within my rights now as the manager of the bill to move to table right this minute. It is not the desire of the manager of the bill to be sharp-elbowed or brusque. Last night, we debated until 10 o'clock, which was 4 hours. We are now in our ninth hour, I believe, of discussion on the space station. I really must insist, because of other amendments pending

of equal importance, or certainly of significant importance, that we must vote on this amendment before 5 o'clock. I am trying to arrive at a framework. If there is not a framework, I want the Senators then to be alert to the fact that I intend to move to table within the hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland withdraw her unanimous-consent request?

Ms. MIKULSKI. I will once more propound the request and, out of a spirit of accommodation, will ask that there be a vote at a time certain, at 5 p.m.; that in the hour that is now here, that there be 1 hour of debate equally divided between the proponents and the opponents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I just wonder whether one of my colleagues will be kind enough to spell me, since I will be presiding between 4 and 5, so I will have 3 minutes to speak on the floor.

Mr. BUMPERS. I promise the Senator from Minnesota 3 minutes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Also as part of my unanimous-consent request, that there be no other intervening amendments to be in order prior to the disposition of the Bumpers amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WARNER. Reserving the right to object and I apologize, I stepped off the floor momentarily. Could I ask the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, in our previous discussions in private, I indicated the need for some more time for the Senator from Virginia. Am I assured that under this proposed agreement that the Senator from Arkansas, as the manager of the time for our side of this debate, that I could have, say, 12 minutes?

Mr. BUMPERS. The Senator did not provide for that. I promised the Senator from Nebraska 5, Minnesota 3, North Dakota 3, Senator SASSER 5. That takes more than our 30 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, under those circumstances, the Senator from Virginia will reluctantly have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland has the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Because of the objections, we are now going to rout the very spirit of what we are trying to do. Because of other pending amendments, we must really move to other amendments after 5 o'clock. Recognizing the Senator's desire to speak, will 10 minutes be agreeable to the Senator?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I will accept the 10 minutes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. What does that all add up to?

Mr. BUMPERS. The Senator from Virginia wishes 12 minutes?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Ten.

Mr. BUMPERS. North Dakota 3, Minnesota 3, Nebraska 5, Tennessee 5. That is 26 minutes on this side. Three, that cuts us to 24. That leaves me 5 minutes to wrap up. So that ought to do it.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Is there objection?

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

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Arkansas. I have been listening to this debate. I also want to thank my friend and colleague from Maine for his remarks which I thought were exactly on point. I understand another colleague, with whom I have worked with very closely ever since I have come to the U.S. Senate, my friend from Virginia, will be supporting the Bumpers amendment.

I rise in support of the Bumpers amendment. I wish that I had more time to explain my reasons for this. But let me try and capsule as best I can, Mr. President.

The vote that we are about to take on the Bumpers amendment is much more than whether or not we should have the space station. In the view of this Senator, it is a crucial vote with regard to whether or not we are sincere in this body by making the commitments that all of us have made in one form or another, especially during the recent debate on the deficit reduction bill that ended up in a tie vote in the U.S. Senate, broken by the Vice President.

I would say to the President of the United States, I think he is wrong for supporting this particular program. But everybody has a right to their opinion. I have not heard a good case made for the continuation of the space program on the floor of the Senate. I have supported that program in the past. I will not support it now. If we are going to get serious about doing something to reduce the deficit and then begin, hopefully, to tackle the national debt—and I compliment my friend from Arkansas for saying that the savings in this program would go to reduce the debt, that is what it is all about.

I will simply say, Mr. President, that last week we had three votes on a measure that has generally had the support of this Senator from Nebraska. That was the funding for the endowment for the arts. I voted against that. While I am for the arts, I happen to feel that if we are sincere in wanting to cut down the expenditures of the Federal Government, it seems to me we could eliminate the funding for the arts without causing too much concern to the average middle-class person in America.

It seems to me that if we will follow the advice clearly enunciated by the Senator from Arkansas with his amendment and the argument for that, we would say once again while it would be nice to have a space station if we could afford it, Mr. President, we cannot afford it. And if we cannot stop a program like this, and if we cannot stop the super collider that I understand is likely to be voted on sometime in the next 10 days, if we cannot stop programs like that, vast amounts—billions and billions and billions of dollars—then I say that we are never going to get anywhere in trying to reduce the expenditures of the Federal Government that the people of the United States of America are demanding.

I say to the President of the United States, I wish you were helping us on this. Since you are not, we want to help you, Mr. President, to keep your pledge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BUMPERS. I yield the Senator from North Dakota 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this space station is almost a perfect Government spending program if you have either a short memory or a fat wallet. This is a Government project that cannot do what it was advertised to do. The project will cost 10 times more than it was supposed to cost.

What does the Congress do in response to that? Does it kill a program that cannot do what it is supposed to do? Is it going to cost 10 times more than it should have? No, it nurtures it around talking about redesign. The fact is we have spent the first months of this year huffing, puffing, snorting, perhaps even bellowing in this Chamber about "cut spending first." Now we have a chance to see: Were those just slogans or were they promises?

On a project that cannot do what it is supposed to do, and costing 10 times more than it should, will we cut spending first or will we do as Congress so often does and say, "Let's not make tough choices?" If you are a Member of this body who really believes that we have a serious deficit problem in this country, you must ask yourself; who really believes we are spending a billion dollars a day we do not have, often on things we should not build; who really believes it is in our children's interest to get this problem under some control? Then at least step up to the plate on this project, one that we do not need, one that should not be built and especially one that should not be built with borrowed money, and decide to kill it.

I hope my colleagues will join me and stand up and make a tough choice today to support the Bumpers amendment and kill this project.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BENNETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Utah, and also ask a Senator who might be an opponent of the bill to, subsequent to the Senator from Utah completing his debate, relieve the Senator from Minnesota, so that he can participate in the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, earlier today we were asked, those of us who have been talking about cutting spending, if we have no shame and if we have no embarrassment.

I rise with no shame and no embarrassment to support the space station because I ran for the Senate on the announcement that I would support the space station, and I ran for the Senate on the announcement that I was in favor of cutting the deficit.

People would say, how can you reconcile those two? And I would remind them of the statement of the old bank robber, Willie Sutton. People said to Willie Sutton, "Why do you keep robbing banks?" as he kept getting caught and going to jail. And he said, "Because that's where the money is."

The money is not in the NASA budget. Yes, there is some, but the NASA budget is now under 2 percent of the total. The money is in the entitlements.

I said in the campaign, and I repeat in this Chamber, if anybody wants to offer an amendment—at some point maybe I will overcome my freshman status and try it myself—to do something about the entitlements, I will do it, and that is where the money is. But I made it clear that I was in support of space, and I think it is important for me to tell you why I think the space station is important.

We hear a lot about our children's future, and we are taking money from our children to talk about the space station. I submit that we are doing this for our children. If we look at medicine today, we find that virtually everything that is practiced in medicine today came as a result of progress that was made in space.

Now we are talking about the next step. What do we mean by the next step? Let me try to put it in historic context very quickly, quoting from a speech Dan Goldin made in Utah just over the weekend.

At one point we were all helpless before the elements of nature, and then we learned to control temperature with the invention of fire. That changed life tremendously. And then they learned to change the composition of tools, the coming of the Bronze Age, and we were able to create new tools. And that changed life tremendously. Then with the Industrial Revolution we learned to

put pressure into the manufacturing process, and that changed life tremendously.

What is the next constant? It is gravity. And in the space station we will have the opportunity for the first time to deal with manufacturing processes, medical processes, all other kinds of things absent the presence and pressures of gravity.

The implications are enormous. I think for us to turn our backs on this opportunity would be as difficult as if we were to turn our backs on the industrial revolution.

Finally, the one comment that I have heard is, "But we do not need a manned space station. We do not need humans in space."

I conclude with a story told by my predecessor, Jake Garn, who was known as a supporter of the space station. One of the experts, presumably, that the Senator from Maine talked about came to Utah to talk to him and try to convince him that we could do everything in space with robots.

The two of them talked until they came to a standoff. Then in conversation this distinguished gentleman said, "You know, Senator, it is beautiful here in Utah. I love Utah. I love to come here to ski. This is wonderful. I wish I could live here." And Jake said, "Why don't you move here." "Oh," he said, "I can't do that. My lab is in Boston. I have to stay in Boston near my lab." Jake said, "You don't need to be in Boston. Get a lot of robots to run your lab. If we can run and control a lab in space with robots, we can certainly control a lab in Boston with robots."

No, Mr. President, there is no substitute for the human observation factor. If we are going to learn to deal with the absence of gravity and reap the rewards from that opportunity that will come, we are going to have to do it with human beings in an environment free of gravity. It is the next great scientific frontier, and I for one do not want to turn my back on it.

Last night we heard the Senator from Ohio quote one of the most distinguished and famous Members of this body, Daniel Webster, who stood before this body in 1852 and said, "We cannot afford the lands West of the Mississippi. They have no benefit for us or our children. We cannot afford to purchase them. They are filled merely with savages and wild beasts."

Well, I for one, as one of the children and grandchildren of those who went West of the Mississippi, am grateful that the Senate overrode Daniel Webster, and I do not want to be reminded by my grandchildren that I was a Daniel Webster and turned my back on this new frontier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DORGAN). The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Who yields time?

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Minnesota 3 minutes. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. President, 3 minutes is not a lot of time so let me just make three points. When I hear about a project of dubious value projected to cost \$100 billion over the next 20 years, first of all, I think about priorities.

I remember a conversation with a woman who was telling me that her children sleep on the floor because they do not have a bed. I do not see how, when we do not have the money for that woman to make sure that her child can get off the floor and on the bed, we are going to spend this kind of money on a station in space.

So for me it is a matter of priorities right now. When I think about hungry children, and I think about health care, and I think about jobs, and I think about communities and unsafe streets, and I think about national security, I really think real strength begins right here on Earth and not with a space station of dubious value.

My final point, Mr. President, is that I have been very careful in the Defense bill, in the Interior bill, and this bill, to take seriously what we have been saying to people about deficit reduction. The farmers in Minnesota say you cannot eat your seed corn; you have to plant your seed corn. We are eating our seed corn with a deficit and an interest on that deficit that is robbing us of our capacity to invest in ourselves.

To finish, I say to the Senator from Virginia, with a Yiddish proverb, "You cannot dance at two weddings at the same time." You cannot keep telling the people in the country that you want to reduce the deficit and then vote for this kind of program. This is a test case of whether we are serious about deficit reduction, and that is why I proudly support the Bumpers amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, how much do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has 20 minutes and 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. BUMPERS. I yield the Senator from Virginia 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank all colleagues. This has been a good debate. It is the type of debate that the Senate, I think, can justifiably take pride in because both sides have had adequate opportunity, and it has been a good, thorough debate on all points

except one point, and I draw the managers' attention to it.

We are going to vote but we do not know what the total cost is going to be. As the Senator from Ohio said, it runs all the way from roughly \$40 billion to \$100 billion. We do not know. And I think we are not being responsible to vote not knowing what this is going to eventually cost the American taxpayers at a time when, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota says, he cannot face his constituents and answer their questions about where the needed dollars are going to come from for the essential elements of maintaining human dignity and human life and a lifestyle that Americans are entitled to.

Today, at lunch the administrator came in. I wish to publicly apologize to him. I think I may have been on the border of being rude, but I was upset because during the course of the luncheon this was passed out. It is entitled, "Why the Space Station Makes Sense," by Daniel Goldin. I had a minute or two to look through it. I was looking for one thing, page after page at Government expense—one thing.

What are the costs? Not one word referring to costs. Go to the last page "at taxpayers' expense," page 12. Talking about the imperatives to have the station. That same imperative that once was defined by Norman Cousins as "the commitment to human growth." Several paragraphs down, William Jennings Bryan once said:

Destiny is not a matter of chance; it is a matter of choice. It is not a thing to be waited for; it is a thing to be achieved.

I am waiting for the costs.

Last night, in an eloquent speech, someone quoted President Kennedy in the golden years of this great country: "Let us go to the Moon."

And, indeed, we did go to the Moon. But at that same time, I ask you, what was the national debt that the President and the taxpayers were dealing with? Far less than \$1 trillion. And what is the national debt that we are confronting America with today and tomorrow, at interest costs of \$290-some billion a year, roughly equal to the total cost of our defense budget, slightly below the total cost of Social Security: \$4.4 billion.

Do not quote to this Senator President Kennedy's dream at a time when the dream of America is to bring about some fiscal reality to this country. That is what this debate is about, fiscal reality. You would think it was Alice in Wonderland last night: The sky is falling in. We are not going to have money to solve problems for cancer; we are not going to have money to solve problems for this, that, and the other thing.

That is not the America we know. The America we know will turn to the solutions of those problems. It is not dependent on the space station.

Costs: Mr. Goldin apparently did send a letter dated September 20, yesterday, addressing costs, and it is in the hands of the managers. I got it just an hour or so ago. It is a remarkable document, not for what it says, but for what it does not say. He says the costs are \$19.4 billion, but fails to refer to the fact that \$11 billion has already been expended. There is no specific reference to the \$14 billion additional for operating costs; no mention of whether the shuttle costs are included or not included; no mention whether the civil servant payroll of all the people working on this program is included or not included.

It is unclear what is in, and it is unclear what is left out, and we are flying blind as we come to the floor to cast our votes in a matter of a few minutes.

Yesterday, it was the Russian card thrown on the desk at the last minute. Today, it is a cost estimate that is incomplete.

I would like to conclude by bringing to the attention of our colleagues a report that was issued today by the Concord Coalition, headed up by a very distinguished colleague, a warm friend on both sides of the aisle, Senator Tsongas, who came to the Senate with me, a Member of my class, and Senator Rudman.

It is worth reading, colleagues. This whole report, some 75 pages, rests on two pillars. Pillar number one, this body, has addressed already; marched up the hill and down the hill. But the Concord report says you have to face it. I read: "A comprehensive entitlement means test," that is what it rests on. That is one pillar. Then the next pillar:

Fifty domestic spending programs would be eliminated or reduced to produce \$29 billion in annual savings by 2000.

What is the first program the Concord report lists? The first—not the second, not the third—out of the 50; the first? I repeat:

Fifty domestic spending programs would be eliminated or reduced to produce \$29 billion in annual savings by 2000. These include programs we can no longer afford; number one, the space station.

An unbiased, objective, carefully thought through, analytical report by two of the most distinguished men who have been privileged to serve in this Chamber in the last several decades.

I conclude by saying that I thought long and hard through the night of my future in the Senate, whatever period that may be, and what is my responsibility and why am I up here fighting as vigorously as I know how for fiscal responsibility when my State is one of the five principal beneficiaries of the very dollars we are talking about—thousands of jobs in my State.

But I do it with the clearest of conscience, I say to the Senator from

Texas and the Senator from Utah, with the clearest of conscience, because I believe we are going to be faced with a means test and a lot of other tougher votes unless we face up to the fact that we, as individual Senators, have to make decisions which adversely affect in some way the citizens in our own State. If we do not do it, there is no hope.

I count myself among those on this side of the aisle who have year after year stood up and followed, again with a clear conscience, those leaders on this side of the aisle to cut the budget, to have a line-item veto and to balance the budget.

If I only had a penny for every speech I have gone back home and given on the balanced budget, I practically could retire, because I sincerely believe in it. But to balance that budget, you have to have cuts.

So I say to my good friend from Utah, and there are others on this side of the debate that are standing here with a clear conscience, that I want to be counted among those who have stood for fiscal responsibility for 14 years—and who will stand today to make a decision which is painful and tough politically—because I do not want to be listed ever in my career in the U.S. Senate as being apocryphal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. MIKULSKI. I yield to the junior Senator from Texas 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you Mr. President. I thank the Senator from Maryland, who has done a wonderful job of managing this bill, and the senior Senator from Texas, who is helping her.

I think it is important to put into perspective the key argument that we have been hearing in the debate that has lasted for some 10 hours now; that is, all of us want to bring the deficit down, but how are we going to do it? There really is a difference in the way I would make those cuts.

For instance, I have introduced amendments and plan to do so again to cut the general overhead of Government across the board 5 percent, to give us \$3 to \$10 billion a year in savings.

I think that is the responsible way to go about cutting the deficit. Thereafter, each program should be looked at to determine how much further the program can be cut. Some can take 100 percent and be wiped out; others can take zero percent.

I think we have to look at the priorities. The distinguished Senator from Virginia says he does not know how much this space station is going to cost.

He knows that we are voting on \$1.9 billion, and he knows that there are

people in this room that voted for \$16 billion to be spent on one-time-only expenditures, building swimming pools, that sort of thing. This is where we can focus our differences. Do we want the kind of spending that is one time only, that will give jobs maybe for 10 months or 18 months, or do we want to spend our money where it is going to reap benefits twentyfold and fortyfold and hundredfold, as space research has already shown that it will do?

There are people today who are walking and who are healthy because we have had space research and because our forefathers and mothers had the ingenuity and foresight to make those investments.

The issue is whether we are going to invest in our seed corn to have the benefits of new jobs created by new industries, created by research that we have invested in; or are we going to spend one-time-only dollars? I think that every American would want us to spend the money where it is going to grow. The mother whose child is sleeping on the floor wants more than anything for her child to have a future, and that is what investment in basic research is going to do.

In addition, the space station really will help disease. I know Senator BUMPERS yesterday said that we are now taking credit for the superconducting super collider and the space station to try to cure breast cancer. I, for one, would pay for both of those to find a cure for breast cancer and osteoporosis, but the fact is, it is the space station that is going to contribute to solving breast cancer and osteoporosis. It will do so because there are conditions in the space station that will allow us for the first time to find out what that third dimension of growth is that will allow us to find the cure for those women's diseases that we have been unable to cure all these years. That is one of the reasons that I am supporting the space station.

Mostly, I am supporting the space station because it is the kind of investment that we need to make. I am a budget cutter. The Senator from Utah is a budget cutter. The Senator from Texas is a budget cutter, and so is the Senator from Virginia. But we have very different priorities. And, I am proud to say that I want to put the money where it is going to create a future for children, and that is what every mother and father in this country who is struggling wants.

The last point I want to make, Mr. President, is that there is an issue we have not talked about very much, and that is, what kind of partner is America going to be? We have talked about Russia and what is going to happen in Russia. Regardless of what happens in Russia—and I have great faith that democracy is going to prevail in Russia. I know all of us wish the Russians well

in this time of turmoil in their country. But, what we are talking about is what kind of consortiums are we going to be able to have in the future that will cut our costs in America but allow us to have the research that will create the new technologies of the future? If we will be a good partner, and if we will stand up for stability in America, and continue the projects that we start, we will be the kind of good partner that other countries will want to invest with, like our good partners, Japan, Europe and Canada who have all invested in the space station with us.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. SASSER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELLSTONE). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, what we are seeing here is the unfolding of the typical Washington spending drama. What we have here is a space station conceived to cost a certain amount of money, and the Congress is sold on it at a low-ball figure. In this instance, I believe it was \$8 billion, if memory serves me correctly. This project has been through redesign after redesign after redesign, all to try to minimize the enormous cost overruns that this project was thought to generate. We are now at the point where the lifetime cost of the space station is \$120 billion.

But like all of these Washington spending dramas, once they get started, they never stop; you cannot kill them. It is just like the hydra: You cut off one head here, but it keeps coming. That is the way this space station is.

If people want to cut spending, they can vote to terminate this space station. If they want to make speeches about cutting spending or balancing the budget, then they ought to go back home and just speak to the rotary club. It is interesting to hear today on the floor that the space station is an investment. The term "investment" is coming from some of the same Senators who were saying just a few weeks ago about the President's program that "investment is just another name for spending." That is what they were saying a few weeks ago.

As the President's deficit reduction plan was on the floor of this body, two of our colleagues were out in front of this Capitol holding a press conference with Ross Perot, and they were saying that this deficit reduction plan is faulty, because it does not have enough spending cuts. Well, we said at that time that we were going to give them the opportunity to vote for more spending cuts. We were going to give them more than \$255 billion worth of spending cuts.

So I joined with Senator BUMPERS. The first of these was an effort to cut \$400 million out of the star wars initiative. We should have cut \$1.4 billion out, but we were not sure we could get the votes to cut \$400 million. By two

votes, 50-48, we were successful in cutting spending by \$400 million in star wars. Interestingly enough, those who said we needed more deficit reduction, more spending cuts, when the deficit reduction bill was on the floor a few weeks ago, voted against cutting \$400 million off of star wars.

So here we are back with the space station. They started out saying: Well, we would vote to terminate the space station, but it will not really reduce the deficit, because the money will simply go into other projects. You chaps on the Appropriations Committee will put it someplace else.

So we said: OK, what we will do is we will reduce the caps to make it determinative. We will lock it in when we terminate the space station, and the funding that will be saved will have to go to deficit reduction.

Well, now they are coming back and they are saying: Well, yes, we want to cut spending, but we disagree with where you are cutting the spending.

Mr. President, all of us here have, about cutting spending, but some of us have voted for it. All of us have talked about cutting spending in the abstract, but some of us have proposed specific spending cuts, and we have voted for them.

My colleagues have an opportunity here in just a few minutes to save \$120 billion over the lifetime of this project. Let us see if you are going to do it. Let us put our vote where our mouth is, and if we are not prepared to vote for these spending cuts, then please let me say to my colleagues, please, please stop making these speeches about spending cuts and wanting to cut. Have you no shame? I say that to some of you. Either vote for the projects and be quiet about it, or do not make these long lengthy speeches saying "I am for cutting spending" and then not voting to do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I yield myself 7½ minutes from our remaining time.

Mr. President, how wonderful the human mind is. How great selective memory is.

I remember standing on this floor and offering an amendment to cut from the President's so-called stimulus spending package money for such items as the ice skating rink warming huts in Connecticut, Alpine slides in Puerto Rico, and that amendment was rejected. And many of those who would have us now eliminate spending on the space station thought those huts and slides were worthy projects.

When we considered making taxpayers pay for our election campaigns, I with others offered an amendment to eliminate such spending, and many

people here today who say it is time to cut spending said at that time, no, let the taxpayers fund elections.

I could go on and on and on, but how selective this spending restraint is that the only areas in a \$1.5 trillion budget that some would cut are expenditures on defense and expenditures on science and technology.

First of all, I am proud of the fact that in working with the President and working with the distinguished chairman of this Appropriations Subcommittee we have cut \$4 billion from the space station. I am proud of the fact that under the leadership of this administration we have been able to induce the Russians to end their solo MIR-2 program and join us in a united world effort. That is a positive development, and I want it to go forward. I am proud of the fact that we have been a good enough partner that the Japanese, the Canadians, and the Europeans have put \$2 billion into this project and they stand ready to put in \$4 billion more if we live up to our end of that contract.

So what is the issue here? The issue is this: 25 years ago America spent 5 percent of the Federal budget on civilian science and technology R&D. We invested 5 percent of the budget in the future by funding the technology needed to create jobs, to raise living standards, and to help America dominate the world as we have.

Now 25 years later, as spending has exploded, as we have reached a situation where this Congress seldom says no on any spending proposal, we have now reached a point where we have written a budget that spends only 1.9 percent on science and research and technology, and yet there are some here who say even that is too much.

So, there are those who would spend money on ice skating rink warming huts; who would spend money on Alpine slides in Puerto Rico; who would spend money to fund politicians running for public office. But they say we do not have enough money to invest in science, technology, and space and spend on our future.

This great country of ours has been the dominant force on the planet for 50 years for two, and only two, reasons of any real significance.

First of all, we have had an incredible system which has let ordinary people like us with extraordinary freedom do extraordinary things. And yet, everyday on the floor of the Senate, we vote to limit that freedom and to expand the power of Government and to threaten this goose that has consistently laid the golden egg for America.

The second factor that has made our system and our people the envy of the world is that we have dominated science and technology. We have plowed back money into pure research that has generated science. High energy physics, which started under a

football stadium at the University of Chicago, now provides 20 percent of the GNP of the United States. The space program has revolutionized industry, has revolutionized medicine.

So the question is having cut the science budget, relatively speaking, by over 50 percent in 25 years in a \$1.5 trillion budget, can we afford to invest in the science and technology that will mean better jobs for America, higher living standards in the 21st century? And I say yes.

We have partners who have put up money. They are now waiting to see if we live up to our commitment. We have now been joined by an adversary that we kept back from the gate for 45 years to let the superiority of our system emerge. I say that partnership is revolutionary in terms of world history. I say we should bring them in to help us build a better space station so that we can do more because they do more.

But the question is: Do we turn back now or do we go forward?

So I am sorry. When I hear my colleagues stand up and chastise the Senator from New Mexico for being for the space station, when they themselves have voted against cuts in what I perceive to be the most meaningless programs that have come before the Congress, I am not impressed.

The bottom line is that the time to have cut spending was in the budget, and we had some 70 amendments to do that, and virtually every one of those amendments was rejected.

So, we have decided on our total spending level. The question is a very simple question: Are we going to invest that money in the next generation, in science and technology, and in the future of our children, or are we going to invest it in the next election with another social program that promises a great deal and often delivers very, very little?

We must realize that for those in America who are in need, ultimately it is not the Government that is going to solve their problem. It is going to be technology, science, and opportunity that will produce the resources to assist them or let them get on the playing field with better tools and help them, in the process, earn their self-respect, earn a good living, and earn what we want for all of our citizens. Science and technology are indispensable to that vision for America's future.

So I urge my colleagues—do not kill America's premier science program. We have reduced it. We have cut it. We have brought in partners. We are expanding the number of nations participating. We are sharing the costs. We have stripped it down. We have tried to save money. But ultimately the question is: Do we go forward or do we stop?

I believe, and I am confident, that America will be a richer, freer, happier

country 25 years from now if we defeat this amendment than it will be if we say approve it.

If we adopt this amendment, if we kill the space program, does anyone believe, that in the ultimate legislative process, that less money will be spent? My guess is no. But less will be invested and America will be poorer, and that is why we need to move ahead with this program.

I urge my colleagues to stay with the committee and support our \$4 billion of cuts. We cannot afford a Cadillac. We rejected it in committee on a bipartisan basis. We are working with the President and the Vice President on a bipartisan basis. But we can afford a Chevrolet in science and technology when we, as a nation, have benefited more from science and technology than any other nation in the history of the world.

I reserve for the chairman the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arizona 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, this program has been program plagued since it was unveiled by President Reagan. In 1984, NASA estimated the cost would be about \$8 billion and would be completed by 1992.

Today, it is overdue and the costs are out of control. Today's NASA estimate, if you can rely on these figures, exceeds \$30 billion. In truth, NASA has no true estimate of costs at all. In light of the recently announced United States-Russia collaboration, no one knows what this program is supposed to accomplish. Talk about putting the cart before the horse. This program sets a new standard for premature action.

GAO projects the costs could exceed \$40 billion to build and the lifetime costs, a staggering \$118 billion. This cost is unthinkable given the myriad of unmet needs domestically—homeless people sleep on the Capitol Grounds, veterans are turned away from VA medical centers and cemeteries, and the deficit mushrooms.

President Reagan put the space station on the national credit card. President Bush put the space station on the national credit card. And, I say to my friends, the time has come to pay the bills. We are \$11 billion in the hole on this program and the financial bleeding has not stopped. This year's request is for \$2.1 billion and \$2.1 billion for each of the next 4 years.

There is something very wrong with our priorities. The budget cutting is not over, and funding this space station will force us to cut another \$13 billion over the next 4 years.

I am the senior Democrat on the Veterans Committee and my colleagues and I on the committee have been

forced to deal with the consequences of the decision to pursue this white elephant in space. I even offered an amendment in 1987 to delay the space station in order to protect veterans health care. I barely escaped the Chamber with my life and managed to get a mere 12 votes.

I said at that time we could not afford this ill-defined program. I said that veterans health care and other programs would suffer if we did not get control of this program. Well, everyone hates to hear it, but I cannot resist saying I told you so when the truth hurts so much.

Sadly, it is the veteran and his survivors who have been paying the biggest price to date. Today, every widow who cared for a service-connected severely disabled veteran cannot get remarried for the rest of her life without losing her CHAMPUS-VA health insurance and survivor's benefits. That is unfair—if you are the survivor, to keep yourself from losing conceivably the only lifeline left between poverty and desperation, you must remain alone in the time following the most tragic loss one can experience: That of a loved one.

This is only one example: There are many more. But the question should not be how many more, but what exactly will happen in the future to benefits like these? Will they disappear all together because of the \$13 billion more we will have to spend on a space station that most likely will not be completed before they die?

In sum, Mr. President, it is time we get our financial house in order on Earth together before we embark upon this great adventure to new worlds. I believe in dreams, but I am not a daydreamer. This program does not make sense and we cannot afford it.

Mr. President, this program has been a big mistake. This program is going to exceed \$40 billion now and maybe \$118 billion. We do not even know. And now we are asked to put in \$2.1 billion this year. It is time to pay the bill and cut our losses at the \$11 billion that we have already sunk into this program.

I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, how much time do both sides have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has 2 minutes and 35 seconds.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I have to object. That cannot possibly be. I had 20 minutes a while ago, I let Senator WARNER have 10, Senator SASSER 5, and just now 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator—

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has 7 minutes and 31 seconds.

If the Senator will yield for a moment, the Chair will say to the Senator

from Arkansas that I did read the clock correctly and the Chair is prepared to account for that time.

Mr. BUMPERS. Please do so.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I want to reserve for myself 5 minutes for closing but I am happy to give the Senator from Arkansas 2 minutes.

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank the Senator very much. That will give me 4½ minutes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I have been a wise steward of my time.

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas is talking about a good, solid Chevrolet. We do not know whether we are going to get a Cadillac or a Yugo. We are going to be voting \$2.1 billion for a project. We have not the faintest idea what the design is going to be. We have not the faintest idea what the cost is going to be. We have not the faintest idea what kind of research is going to be done. The Russians have had a MIR up for almost 8 years. They would be delighted to sell us the results of all their experiments for a few million dollars.

We were going to cure cancer with the shuttle. Do we remember those arguments, when we were building the shuttle? We were going to do microgravity research on the shuttle. We were going to grow protein crystals. We were going to cure cancer.

And here we are now, 9 years after we first heard Ronald Reagan say the space station will cost \$8 billion. And the same people who stand on the floor today and tell us the country is going down the tube if we do not spend this money have not even had the courtesy to say I am sorry for all those misstatements I made the last 9 years. I am sorry for the \$11 billion we talked you into spending which now lies on the scrap heap.

Not so much as an "I am sorry."

The Senator from New Mexico said if this Nation is anything it is a nation of technology. If this Nation is anything, it is a nation that is broke, and heading for bankruptcy.

The Senator from Texas during the reconciliation debate said I do not like those cuts you are proposing 3 and 4 years down the road. They never take place.

Senator, we can cut that to 45 days. And 45 days ago everybody in the U.S. Senate said we have to cut more, cut spending first.

I have been in the Senate almost 19 years and I have seen one program torpedoed and I did it, the Clinch River Breeder in 1983. The only program the U.S. Senate has killed since I have been here in 19 years. The political clout is always with spending, not spending cuts. Is it any wonder the people of this country are clamoring for term limits?

I disagree with it, but God knows I understand their frustration. To hear all of that rhetoric for about 3 weeks about spending cuts, we get a chance to cut star wars, the space station, the superconducting super collider, ASRM, the Trident 2 missile. We get a chance to cut all those things and we cannot get enough votes to fill a thimble around here.

I am not going to argue the merits of this thing because it has no merit. Dr. Park, the President of the American Physical Society, 40,000 physicists, says there is absolutely no evidence that we will develop new medicines. Yet the proponents say we are going to cure cancer, emphysema—name it, this thing is going to cure it.

Almost \$300 billion a year in interest, and headed north. I have never heard so many convoluted arguments in my life for voting for \$100 billion more in spending.

There is \$11 billion down the tube. Dr. Bluemergen up in Harvard said, "Microgravity research is of micro-importance." Dr. Parks says, "There is too much disturbance by people on the space station to do microgravity research. You can do microgravity research right here on Earth and save yourselves \$100 billion."

Mr. President, the American people, they do not really understand what is going on here. They do not understand how important spending is politically. But they know there is something wrong. That is the reason only 18 percent of them have any respect for the U.S. Congress.

The House, in an amendment I will offer on the advanced solid rocket motor, the House killed it by 378 to 43—killed it. And I am going to offer an amendment here in a minute to kill it, and I will not get enough votes to count.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BUMPERS. We are just biding our time here, waiting for the apocalypse when we do what we are about to do here. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. MIKULSKI. How much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes and 6 seconds.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am opposed to this amendment because it would lower the discretionary appropriation caps in both budget authority and outlays for each of fiscal years 1994-98.

The Senator's amendment would terminate funding for the space station and would reduce discretionary spending limits for each of fiscal years 1994-98 by the amounts that would have been needed in each of those years to fully fund the space station program.

Mr. President, I cannot support this kind of piecemeal attack on the statu-

tory discretionary caps. Congress just completed action on a reconciliation bill which the President signed into law on August 10. That measure set discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 1996-98. Similar caps for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 were enacted as part of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

These discretionary budget authority and outlay caps for fiscal years 1994-98 provide very tight constraints on discretionary spending. Let me put this restraint in perspective.

The conference report on the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994 set the discretionary spending allocation to the Appropriations Committees at \$500,964,000,000 in budget authority and \$538,757,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1994. In its March baseline, the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] projected enacted discretionary appropriations to be \$517,005,000,000 in budget authority with estimated outlays of \$547,489,000,000 for fiscal year 1993. The budget resolution level for 1994, therefore, is \$16,041,000,000 in budget authority and \$8,732,000,000 in outlays below the 1993 level.

The effect of this amendment is not only to reduce funding for the space station, but also to reduce the statutory caps by that amount. For fiscal year 1994, this amendment would reduce both the cap and the budget allocation by \$1,446,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,015,000,000 in outlays. Over the 5-year period of fiscal years 1994-98, the caps would be reduced by a total of \$9,846,000,000 in budget authority and \$9,006,000,000 in outlays.

As I have stated many times before, the deficit problems facing this country have not been caused by excessive domestic discretionary spending. The problem has been primarily the unrestrained growth in the entitlement programs plus the failure to enact the revenues to pay for those programs. If it requires the continuation of caps on discretionary spending as the price for getting control of the growth in entitlement spending and tax expenditures, then I have been willing to take that tough medicine.

But, I cannot and will not support amendments, such as this one, which are attempts to make even further reductions in these constrained discretionary spending limits on an ad hoc basis.

The practical consequences of adopting such amendments will be to open up the budget and appropriations processes to an avalanche of attacks on discretionary spending, the result of which will be even greater difficulty in adequately funding the President's and congressional priorities for infrastructure, education, environmental clean-up, law enforcement, and on and on.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I will be very brief.

Americans have always explored distant frontiers. We have always pressed

into the unknown, sometimes in the face of great adversity and great cost.

I come from Alaska—a State sometimes called the Last Frontier. My State was once considered a distant, forbidding, and hostile frontier. The costs of its exploration were once considered high. But the payoff was worth it in the end.

With that perspective in mind, I have supported the space station in the past. I have viewed it as a means to expand our frontiers, to undertake cutting edge science, to maintain a competitive edge in our aerospace industry, and more recently, to promote international scientific cooperation.

But I have been troubled by the delays, the redesigns, and the inability to see tangible progress. Today, we really don't know for sure precisely what we will be funding if we move ahead with the program.

I am also concerned about our failure to fund smaller science programs, and the degree to which scientific megaprojects such as the space station might be diverting funds from badly needed research projects here at home. I have a few projects in this bill that were not funded, despite unanimous agreement within the scientific community and the administration that they deserved to be funded, so this obviously concerns me.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I will today vote in support of the space station. But this may be the last year I do so, unless we nail down the design and better understand the costs.

The space station can be a great achievement—a tribute to our ingenuity, our drive, and our ability to strive toward new frontiers. But it can also become a money pit mired in a bureaucratic morass. For me to continue my support in the future, I need to be convinced that this program is the former rather than the latter.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. And while I recognize that much of the discussion presented thus far has focused on the national aspects of this program, I feel compelled to raise two important international points in support of space station *Freedom*.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have strong reservations about any unilateral action to terminate the space station program. America's investment in space station *Freedom* is not just an investment in the American space program—it is an investment in the international space community. More importantly, it is a commitment to a new level of international scientific coordination which we must honor and we must finish to completion.

Since 1984, the United States has been working in concert with the members of the Canadian, European, and

Japanese space agencies to develop a baseline for joint space operations. For the first time in our history, the United States sat down with engineers and scientists from the international community to design and integrate the world's first multinational space station.

Consider for a moment, the synergistic benefits of such an effort. Each international partner bringing crucial and innovative technologies to the orbiting laboratory, each with perhaps new approaches to the problems that we seek to solve in the weightless environment of space. And now, as our joint planning efforts are nearing completion, a new and even more exciting chapter is unfolding as we prepare to enter this new frontier. A new partner has asked to join the team.

On September 2, 1993, the President announced an unprecedented effort between the United States and the Russian Space Agency. The focus was an exploratory statement which would bring components of the existing Russian space station MIR in line with the anticipated components of space station *Freedom*. Think of it—a new jointly constructed station with components that could possibly double the amount of usable laboratory space orbiting the Earth.

This new level of cooperation could bring the cumulative knowledge and experience of the world's two greatest space programs together in space for the purpose of peaceful scientific research. Imagine the emotions of the first Russian space team members as they place themselves inside an American space suit built by the constituents of my home State of Connecticut and prepare for flight. What an enormous turn of events.

Mr. President, as I listened to the debate today, I found myself agreeing with the comments and sentiments expressed by my good friend and colleague from Iowa, Senator HARKIN. The recent developments with our Russian partners clearly indicates a new level of international commitment for the space station program. What better testament to the goal and expectations of the space station effort then to welcome this important new partner to the team.

In conclusion, I have to wonder at the irony in the very name of this important program, Mr. President. "Freedom." What a perfect name for the first outpost to this exciting new frontier. What a perfect moniker for a such a monumental peace endeavor to study our living planet.

The events of the past 7 years have truly changed the face of the globe. What were once foes, are now international partners for the peaceful study of space. Our commitment is crucial, Mr. President, and it must not change. Our international partners deserve nothing less. I therefore, respect-

fully urge my colleagues to reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, I rise in support of the space station program.

I have long been a supporter of the space station program. The reasons are simple. I believe that undertaking difficult challenges like space station is why we have a space program. I also believe that space station is critical to our leadership in human exploration of space. Space station is the next logical step in our quest to learn more about the universe in which we live. Space station will provide invaluable information to scientists and engineers on humans' ability to live and work in space. That information and experience will be critical for any future missions to the Moon or Mars.

Space station will also permit research that might well lead to new drugs, cures for diseases, and advanced materials. I am also particularly proud that McDonnell Douglas from my home State of Missouri is building the framework for this international space laboratory.

Like past space missions, space station is expected to generate important spinoffs in electronics, engineering, biomedicine, aeronautics, and other areas. Many technologies that we take for granted—such as microcomputers, pacemakers, artificial limbs, advanced water filtration, and communications satellites—are byproducts of past space missions. I believe that the space station will produce similar breakthroughs that will improve our quality of life as well as provide a needed boost to U.S. competitiveness.

I believe it is particularly unwise to give up on space station at this time. First of all, cancellation would be a tremendous waste. It would waste the enormous amount of money, time, and effort that has been spent on the program. So far, the United States has spent \$9 billion on this project. Our international partners have contributed \$2.5 billion. Furthermore, NASA has already constructed a mission control center at the Johnson Space Center and processing facility at the Kennedy Space Center to support space station. This is not the time to turn back.

NASA just completed a redesign of space station in response to very legitimate concerns about the cost and management. Earlier this year, based on the recommendations of a blue-ribbon panel, NASA redesigned the program to reduce costs and streamline management, without sacrificing scientific content. NASA seems to have accomplished that. The new design, now called space station *Alpha*, is expected to reduce station costs by \$4 billion over the next 5 years and \$18 billion over the two-decade life of the program. Mr. President, let us allow

NASA the opportunity to carry out its redesigned program.

We also must not forget space station is an international project. Space station is the largest international science program ever undertaken. Japan and the European Space Agency are each developing a lab module for the space station. In addition, the Canadians are developing a robotic arm. Together, these three main space station partners have spent billions on the project. Increasingly, big science projects are becoming far too expensive and complex for any one country to undertake alone. We must honor our commitments to our foreign partners if we expect their cooperation on future joint space and science missions.

Cancellation of space station would also prevent us from seizing the opportunity to bring the Russians into the family of international partners. Earlier this month, the United States and Russia signed a space pact which seeks to merge our space station activities. The agreement gives us the opportunity to take advantage of the Russians' vast experience with space stations. Since 1971, they have successfully placed seven space stations into orbit. Their current space station, MIR, has been operating since 1986.

NASA is studying ways to include various elements of the Russians' space station program into the current design. To that end, NASA is looking to use the crew rescue vehicle, the navigation and propulsion system, and the docking system currently being used on the Russian space station. These contributions would eliminate the need for costly development and testing by the United States in these areas. Russian participation will also provide Russia with hard currency to help stabilize the troubled Soviet economy. In addition, this will ensure that the talent and energy of their scientists and engineers are properly focused on peaceful endeavors.

I also believe that our commitment to space station is critical to maintaining our Nation's leadership in aerospace. Aerospace is one of the few industries in which the United States has maintained a trade surplus—\$31 billion in 1992. The industry employs more than 2 million nationally. Canceling the space station now would mean the layoff of the 50,000 aerospace workers in 39 States who are working on the space station. This is not to mention the indirect economic harm to communities and small businesses that depend on the business of space station personnel.

We cannot afford to lose these people. They are the foundation of our technology base and are critical to our national security and global competitiveness. Maintaining their skills is especially important, now that the defense industry is undergoing dramatic cutbacks. Last year alone, 200,000 defense-

related jobs were lost, and, by 1995, defense industry employment will decrease by 1 million. If space station is canceled, these workers may have nowhere to go since the defense sector is in the midst of a massive build-down.

Perhaps the most significant benefit of the space station is its potential to stimulate an interest in math and science among our young people. Many analysts have predicted that the United States will face a severe scientific manpower shortage in the next decade. Simply put, the United States will not have enough scientists, engineers, and technical people to staff our space program, our military program, or our high-technology industries. To address this problem, we must encourage more young people to pursue technical careers. Many of today's scientists and engineers were inspired by the exploits of manned missions like Senator GLENN's first orbital flight and Neil Armstrong's walk on the Moon. Space station holds the promise of similar inspiration for our youth.

Mr. President, for these reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for our Nation's future and support our space station program.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the subject of the space station. I have put a great deal of thought into this issue, and it is with some reluctance, but a growing sense of conviction, that I announce my decision to oppose funding for the redesigned space station.

Mr. President, I count myself among the Senate's strong supporters of scientific research initiatives, and I have long felt that NASA deserves credit for developing some of our Nation's most promising new technologies. But everything must be put on the table if we are going to have meaningful deficit reduction, and I am taking a hard look at some of the projects I have supported in the past.

There are many strong arguments for building a space station. I have voted for full funding previously because I believe there is much to be gained scientifically and medically from this type of research, and that the space program has the unquantifiable benefit of encouraging school children to take an interest in science. In recent years I have had lingering concerns about the station's cost in light of reduced scientific capability. But, Mr. President, this vote is not about big science versus little science, or the relative merits of manned versus unmanned space exploration. It is about the need to cut Government spending.

I will oppose funding for the space station because I feel that as a country we simply cannot afford it, and I believe strongly that it is time to exercise greater fiscal responsibility. More to the point, it's time for me to say no to something I would otherwise support because I cannot justify the ex-

penditure. As I have said in the past, it is easy to say no to your enemies. The hard part is saying no to your friends. The cost of the redesigned space station *Alpha* is \$2.1 billion for fiscal year 1994, and \$10.5 billion over the next 5 years. NASA estimates that this will save \$4 billion over what *Freedom* would have cost during this period, but I still cannot reconcile this with the need to make substantial progress in reducing the deficit.

Mr. President, we also have a responsibility to look ahead and consider the future budgetary implications of this project. NASA has projected the total cost of the *Alpha* station at over \$16.5 billion by 2001, and I believe this represents a good faith effort to come up with realistic cost assessment. I commend them for the management streamlining and bureaucratic consolidation that went into the redesign proposal, and for resisting the temptation to propose an unrealistic estimate to comply with the President's original budgetary guideline.

But it is very difficult to accurately project the ultimate cost of designing, building, and operating a space station, and I am afraid that it will end up costing substantially more. Remember, we spent nearly \$9 billion on the space station in the past decade, with few tangible results. Congress bears some responsibility for funding the station unevenly, and for continuously calling for modifications, but it is also the nature of these projects that adjustments and cost overruns are inevitable.

Mr. President, I wish to make clear that the recent disappearance of the Mars Observer had no bearing on my decision to oppose the space station. It is a monumental undertaking to send this type of craft into space, and occasionally setbacks will occur. I remain committed to many of NASA's objectives, and I am particularly optimistic about the potential educational benefits of NASA's research on telecommunications and interactive technologies. Even without the space station, Mr. President, there is some \$12.5 billion in the VA, HUD appropriations bill for NASA.

I realize that terminating the space station will affect thousands employed in the aerospace industry. This was one of the most difficult aspects of my decision. Clearly, it will be necessary to allocate considerable resources to the type of retraining and conversion initiatives required to downsize the military. I also understand that withdrawing U.S. participation in building the space station will have ramifications for our international partners, and that this may be a bitter pill for them to swallow. The intergovernmental agreement we entered into contains a withdrawal clause, however, and we will have to explain that due to budgetary constraints we cannot continue our present level of involvement.

Again, Mr. President, I know this will not be easy, but I think the time has come to begin making tough choices. It may be a small step on the long road of deficit reduction, but we are going to have to start somewhere. I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, since I arrived in the Senate, I have twice voted to support the space station. I have long believed that efforts like the space station deserve support. Such efforts challenge the boundaries of science and the imagination. And I have long believed that a nation like ours, that has the wherewithal to explore space, can overcome the challenges of improving our lives here at home.

But times have changed. The Federal deficit has limited our ability to do all the things that are valuable to do. I do not like this fact—but it is the truth. Now, the American people expect us to make the hard choices necessary to reduce the deficit. I am prepared to make those choices.

Today I will vote for eliminating further spending for the space station. This decision does not come easily. I recognize the sacrifices that will result. But the fact is that if we are serious about cutting Federal spending and reducing the deficit, we simply cannot now afford this effort.

Mr. President, I am not singling out the space station for elimination. Earlier this year, I announced a package of spending cuts totaling \$65 billion above those proposed by the President. My vote today is another step toward making those cuts a reality.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, on similar issues in 1991 and 1992, I voted against funding for the space station in order to allocate those Federal dollars to other purposes which I considered more important. Similarly on today's vote, I consider deficit reduction more important than the expenditure of \$2.1 billion for the space station.

As noted in my floor statement on September 9, 1992, I believe our space program has made significant contributions to our Nation and the world, and I believe the future of new technologies may well be enhanced by advances in space.

We can continue to make significant advances in the exploration of space without the very heavy investment in the space station. I am advised that using NASA cost figures from June 1993, the new design will cost about \$72 billion to build and operate over 10 years. The total costs, including interest, will raise the cost to as much as \$110 billion by the year 2013.

During my 12½ years in this body, Senators have spoken more about the need for deficit reduction both on and off the Senate floor than on any other subject. The hard part arises when it comes to voting on specific programs where it is customarily easier to defer

deficit reduction to a later date than to vote down an attractive program.

In my judgment, we are past the point of deferring deficit reduction. Therefore, difficult as this vote is, I believe that we should not expend substantial sums at this time on the space station.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I yield myself the entire remaining time, in the closing minutes of this debate.

Mr. President, we have had extensive debate on the space station and as I conclude this, we have talked about cost. We have talked about jobs. We have talked about cuts. And the scientific advances.

Mr. President, what I want to talk about is the future. Every scientific idea, every technological advancement ever proposed was minimized and trivialized in its time. I believe that historical fact is unfolding now in this debate on the space station. Nearly 100 years ago a Frenchman by the name of Louis Pasteur talked about a field called bacteria. He used the word "germ" which is now part of our vocabulary and our thinking about life-preserving devices. He was ridiculed and he was trivialized for wanting to save the sheep of France using a new technological advancement called a microscope.

And when the scientists of the time looked down they said, "This cannot be true. If you cannot see it, do not believe it. We do not believe what we are seeing."

Now the rest is history. Yes, he was ridiculed but he discovered a vaccine that not only saved the sheep population of France, it saved the economy of his beloved homeland. He did it through that microscope which has now saved countless lives, and he created an opportunity to save the economy of his country.

Then, in our own country there were a bunch of guys down in North Carolina who said, "We think we can fly."

They said, "What do you want to do that for? If God wanted us to fly, he would have given us wings. Do you remember those guys in Greek mythology; they strapped on the wings, flew off into space, and their wings melted. Hey, what do you want to do that for?"

But the Wright Brothers persisted and persisted and, yes, that short distance they flew in Kitty Hawk led to a flight into the future, created an aerospace industry that has made our country strong economically, and gave us the technology to win World War II, fighting Desert Storm, and has kept our country strong.

Suppose they had listened to the naysayers.

Then when it came to opening up the West, there were others who came along with the technology called the steam engine. They said, "Hey, steam engine? My gosh, what are you going to do, chugga-chugga-chugga-chugga?"

Where is that going to take us? It does not mean anything. All it is, is a lot of smoke and probably some mirrors. What we need is a good Conestoga wagon. If it was good enough for my mother and father to go west on, a Conestoga wagon, by God, it is good enough for me. Maybe we need a new fat horse to get us there faster. Maybe we need a 6-wheel wagon and that will get us there better."

But, no, again, the American entrepreneurial spirit said we are going to move ahead. The Garrett family in Baltimore helped bankroll the B&O Railroad. It opened up the west and helped the economy of Baltimore, it helped the economy of the Midwest, and it opened up a frontier of the Great West the way Frederick Jackson Turner had talked about.

Suppose we were still building Conestoga wagons. Suppose we had totally dismissed the telescope, or the microscope, or any of those new technologies?

Here we are now in the last days of the 20th century, on the brink of the 21st century. America has to decide what it wants to be in the new world order. Just as we have been a military superpower because of our technology, we must continue to be an economic superpower because of our technology, and the future lies in space. The future lies in life sciences, which will be done in space. The future lies in information technology which is crucial to space. All of the elements and components involved in the building, manufacturing, launching and maintenance of space are crucial to other of the 13 critical technology areas, and it is in high technology that the United States has led the way.

Bold people with entrepreneurial ideas have backed up what they needed to be able to do and invented new technology. That led to new products; that led to new jobs; that led us to being an economic superpower.

As a Member of the U.S. Senate, I have fought for science and technology, whether it has been the funding of the National Institutes of Health, whether it has been increasing the National Science Foundation budget, or a whole array of other activities. That is why I support this space station with passion and in fervor and, therefore, I move to table the Bumpers amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FEINGOLD). The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, 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 on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table amendment No. 905. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 272 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Bennett	Gorton	McCain
Biden	Graham	McConnell
Bingaman	Gramm	Mikulski
Bond	Grassley	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Gregg	Murkowski
Breaux	Harkin	Murray
Burns	Hatch	Nickles
Byrd	Hatfield	Packwood
Campbell	Heflin	Pressler
Cochran	Helms	Riegle
Coverdell	Hutchison	Robb
Craig	Inouye	Roth
Danforth	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Daschle	Johnston	Shelby
Dodd	Kassebaum	Simpson
Dole	Kempthorne	Smith
Domenici	Lieberman	Stevens
Durenberger	Lott	Thurmond
Feinstein	Lugar	Wallop
Glenn	Mack	

NAYS—40

Akaka	Exon	Mitchell
Baucus	Faircloth	Moynihan
Boren	Feingold	Nunn
Bradley	Ford	Pell
Brown	Hollings	Pryor
Bryan	Kennedy	Reid
Bumpers	Kerrey	Sasser
Chafee	Kerry	Simon
Coats	Kohl	Specter
Cohen	Lautenberg	Warner
Conrad	Leahy	Wellstone
D'Amato	Levin	Wofford
DeConcini	Mathews	
Dorgan	Metzenbaum	

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 905) was agreed to.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Appropriation Committee's decision to fully fund the administration's request for \$1.496 billion to be set aside for the Superfund Hazardous Waste Cleanup Program. But I also want to underscore the concerns of the committee, on which I sit, that the Environmental Protection Agency spend those dollars responsibly and frugally to maximize cleanup and eradicate the waste, fraud, and abuse which has plagued the program over the past 12 years.

A chairman of the Senate Superfund Subcommittee, I have already held six hearings this year on the reauthorization of the Superfund. During those hearings, GAO released a report which I had commissioned investigating Superfund cleanup contractors. That report found taxpayers being billed for

tens of thousands of dollars' worth of pearl necklaces, Movado Museum watches, Christmas parties, liquor, and season tickets to sporting events. The EPA inspector general also reported to me that the Superfund Program has suffered, like many other EPA programs, from major fiscal and information management problems that spring from an agencywide culture which has historically given low priority to good management practices. I have since introduced legislation and commissioned a no holds barred study by the inspector general to get to the bottom of these management problems and turn around the programs.

The hearings have not been without their good news. EPA has completed work at over 183 sites out of the 1,200 on the Superfund national priorities list, and wrested over \$7.5 billion of cleanup work from the polluters. EPA has performed over 2,500 emergency removal actions to protect the public health and screened some 25,000 sites for possible Superfund cleanup work. EPA and the Justice Department have obtained a 9-to-1 return on each enforcement dollar spent by the Federal Government. And the full funding of the President's request will allow work at dozens of sites—including 10 to 15 sites in my home State of New Jersey—to proceed with final construction of the cleanup remedy in 1994 after years of studying and preparation by the Agency.

But the fact remains that it is absolutely imperative for the new administration to take aggressive and systemic measures to manage the Superfund Program more responsibly. EPA needs to fix its act so that even more sites can be cleaned up with our limited pool of Government resources. EPA should not take the full funding of the President's request as a license to continue the mismanagement practices of the past.

At my request, the committee has therefore placed an 11-percent cap on the program management or overhead costs incurred by the Superfund cleanup contractors that GAO investigated. The committee has also commissioned a report from EPA to identify within 60 days a timeline for correcting the serious fiscal and contract management problems that my hearing has uncovered. We have also placed a ceiling on EPA's administrative expenses at \$240 million, a decrease of \$52 million from the budget request, to force the Agency to trim fat from the running of this program.

These measures, together with the legislation that I introduced and no doubt other steps that we can take as we reauthorized the statute, will help to fulfill the considerable potential of this program.

COMMUNITY INVESTMENT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my

colleagues a provision included in the VA/HUD appropriations report language which sets aside \$100 million of section 8 housing certificates for the purpose of creating the community investment demonstration project.

In order to encourage pension fund investments in traditionally high-risk public housing projects, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has requested this set-aside as a means of subsidizing pension fund investments in multifamily housing projects. In a report by the inspector general of the Department, six areas were identified as especially troubled in the agency which included the section 8 rental assistance program and the multifamily housing projects.

The assets of pension funds in the United States today total in the trillions of dollars and have become an attractive source of capital for a variety of projects. Many see this pot of money as a lucrative source of funding for infrastructure projects.

I am very concerned, Mr. President, about the long-term implications of the use of public and private pension funds to meet political and social goals. First and foremost, I am concerned about any government influence which could create a conflict between what is good for retirees and what may be good for social policy. In addition, I have reservations about the wisdom of creating any new Federal guarantee or subsidy, which would create new liabilities for the Federal Government if the housing project participating in this pension demonstration fails.

Recently, there has been increasing attention focused on how the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation [PBGC] is plagued by underfunded liabilities and would not be able to meet its obligations if we experience major pension fund failures in this country. If the Federal Government is going to be involved in repackaging investments in low-income housing projects to make them more attractive to pension fund managers, it must also be prepared to absorb the risk.

In light of the discussion surrounding the troubles at the PBGC, as well as the size of our Nation's deficit, I would suggest, Mr. President, that it would appear to be ill-timed for the Federal Government to be developing new approaches to subsidize risky investment practices.

I believe that this pension fund demonstration project as provided for in the VA/HUD appropriations report does not responsibly consider the full implications of this project for retirees, and to the Government.

The VA/HUD appropriations bill report it states that "the committee has set aside 3,000 certificates pursuant to the Department's request for a pension fund partnership demonstration." It continues by saying, "it is the committee's belief, based upon the Depart-

ment's own legal analysis, that no new legislative authority is required for these actions."

I find it troubling that a project with such policy implications warrants no more than single sentence description, with no guidelines on how the project will be implemented or safeguards on how the pension fund or the Government or the plan participant will be protected.

The House recently considered the Community Investment Demonstration Act of 1993 which addressed this specific proposal. Controversy which accompanied the bill led to additional restrictions being placed on the project and an added emphasis on Employee Retirement Income Security Act [ERISA] compliance. I am pleased that many of the House provisions which strengthened the safeguards on the demonstration project are in another housing authorization bill now pending before the Senate.

That is the proper way to proceed, Mr. President, not the offhanded approach taken in the bill before us today. This proposed project merits a healthy debate on the Senate floor. It has far-reaching policy implications for pension funds, their retirees, as well as the Federal budget deficit, since we are committing Federal funds to subsidize the investment of these pension funds.

I have great confidence that my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee will recognize the need for guidelines in this project and I hope that the restrictions included in separate housing legislation will be adopted. It is critical that as we explore pension fund infrastructure investment issues, we do so with careful deliberation and not establish a dangerous precedent by such open-ended appropriations as contained in this committee report.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a question pending before the Senate which is the first excepted committee amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Parliamentary inquiry. First, may I have order so I can hear the Chair?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, what is the pending order before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending order is the first excepted committee amendment.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I cannot hear you, Mr. President. The Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question pending before the Senate is the first excepted committee amendment.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Which is what?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Page 42, lines 16 through 24.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Has the Chair announced the vote on the Mikulski motion to table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.
Ms. MIKULSKI. Has the motion to lay on the table been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.
Mr. WARNER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. At what point in time will a Senator be able to send an amendment to the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The second-degree amendment would be in order to the excepted committee amendment which is pending.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I think it would help the colloquy between the Senator from Virginia and me if other Senators will take their seats so we can hear each other and understand each other, and come to an accommodation with each other.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would like to, at this time, explain the amendment that I desire to send to the desk because it is germane to the matters that we have just discussed relative to the space station.

The committee, and I think in a very wise way, Mr. President, fenced all funds beyond the expenditure of \$1 billion, and left to the discretion of the committee the responsibility to review this program. I will read the pertinent paragraph. It is on page 145 of the committee report, Calendar 194, on each Senator's desk.

Bill language has been included to allocate these funds accordingly. In addition, the committee has included language that limits NASA in obligating more than \$1 billion prior to January 31, 1994, for the space station program. This will enable the committee—

I repeat: This will enable the committee—

to assess the final design configuration of the station before agreeing to release the remaining funds appropriated in the fiscal year 1994.

The purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is to replace the committee with the full Congress and say that implicit in my amendment, this program is so important in terms of the additional and future expenditures as to demand the attention of every Member of this Chamber. No disrespect, no lack of confidence is expressed in here, either directly or in any other manner, imputed to the Appropriations Committee. But I want the Congress of the United States to determine whether or not \$1 more than the \$1 billion just authorized by this vote shall be expended for this program.

This program has been a moving target. According to my calculations, it has been delayed by 10 years, a full decade, from the commitments made to the Congress and the people of this Nation in 1984. We do not have, in my judgment, the costs. The lack of information is appalling.

We have debated those points. I do not wish to take a lot of time on this amendment. I have in essence stated all I wish to say.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be laid aside, and that the Senator from Virginia be allowed to send his amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRADLEY. Reserving the right to object, I would simply ask the distinguished manager of the bill, is this the way the distinguished manager of the bill would like to proceed?

Ms. MIKULSKI. First of all, Mr. President, the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order.

Ms. MIKULSKI. It had been my intention that when we had concluded the debate and vote on the space station, that would have brought to closure the issue of the space station, and then we could move on to other legislative matters. And there was an understanding that we would move to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

Now the Senator from Virginia wishes to offer an amendment that really is questionable about whether it is legislating on appropriations. We just saw this amendment in the closing hours of the debate on the space station. I wonder if the Senator from Virginia could withhold his amendment, reserving his right to offer it later in the evening, and that in no way would preclude him, and have the Senator from New Jersey go ahead with his amendment, and the Senator from Virginia can discuss the matter with the Senator from Texas and myself.

Mr. WARNER. I find that to be a very reasonable request, Mr. President, by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, and I shall momentarily accede to it. I want to convenience the Senate and the managers in every way.

I wonder if I might get the manager's attention to ask if this amendment could be considered following the amendment to be offered by the Senator from New Jersey. I think within that space of time, I believe perhaps three quarters of an hour is to be devoted to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Having discussed the schedule for the evening, it was the intention to move with the Bradley amendment and conclude this by 6:30 or sooner, and move to the ASRM amendment, and we anticipated taking—it was the minority leader's request because of the extensive debate on ASRM, that it would allow the debate to go so that Senators could have a dinner break, and so on. Would the Senator consider following that routine?

Mr. WARNER. I ask that one other fact be taken into consideration. The Senator from Virginia requires only 5 minutes. I would agree to 5 minutes for the Senator from Virginia, and what-

ever the time the managers would wish on the other side. I can state my case very quickly.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Reserving the right here of the ranking managing officer, it might require a rollcall vote.

Mr. WARNER. I understand that it will in all probability. I am willing to indicate that it would be my desire to have a rollcall vote. But I would allow the managers to time that so as to convenience the Senate and the managers, such as could be coupled with another vote at any time desirable to the managers.

So we are talking about 5 minutes for the Senator from Virginia to present the amendment and the time required by the managers and others.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I would not preclude, that but we have been faithfully consulting with the minority leader and majority leader. This would alter the course of events that we had outlined, and I really would need time, as a courtesy to both leaders, to see what their thoughts are on the subject.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I will accede to the wishes of the managers. I withdraw the unanimous-consent request, and I judge from the spirit of this colloquy on this matter that the Senator from Maryland can be, as always, very fair.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I will be fair and insist upon the Senator's right to offer his amendment if he so intends and wishes to do so.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be laid aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 907

(Purpose: To reduce the appropriation for Selective Service System salaries and expenses)

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. 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 New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN, proposes an amendment numbered 907.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. 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 71, line 21, strike "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000".

Ms. MIKULSKI. Will the distinguished Senator from New Jersey yield for the propounding of a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BRADLEY. Yes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limit of 30 minutes for debate on the Bradley amendment, with the time

equally divided and controlled in the usual form, with no intervening amendment in order prior to the disposition of the Bradley amendment.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object for the purpose of asking the distinguished manager of the bill if that agreement has been cleared on this side of the aisle?

Ms. MIKULSKI. I believe it has.

Mr. BRADLEY. I say to the distinguished Senator that I talked to the Senator from Texas about that.

Mr. COCHRAN. This is a 1-hour time agreement with 30 minutes on each side?

Mr. WARNER. Further reserving the right to object, the Senator from Virginia wishes to address this amendment for a period for not to exceed 7 minutes. Am I assured that that time can be allocated in opposition to the amendment?

Ms. MIKULSKI. I was willing to have an hour.

Mr. President, I am going to amend my unanimous-consent request and ask that there be no more than 1 hour of debate on the Bradley amendment, to be equally divided in the usual form, and that no other intervening amendment be in order prior to the disposition of the Bradley amendment.

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

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I thank the chairman and the distinguished ranking member. I think the time is sufficient, and it might not even take the amount of time allocated.

Mr. President, on September 10, I came before the Senate with two principles by which to judge the value of Federal spending. First is that the spending provides something in the general interest and is essential to American public life, and if so, that the taxpayer funding is used in the most cost-effective way so that this specific public purpose can be met.

We all gave a lot of speeches during the consideration of the budget. We all said we were going to cut the budget when we came back in September, and we were going to vote for more spending reductions. We did not have enough spending reductions. So it was with that in mind, anticipating that there would be many more cut amendments—and in fact there have—that I laid out those two principles, that it would be in the general interest and that the taxpayer funding is used in only the most cost-effective way so that this specific public purpose can be met.

At that time, I also promised to propose amendments to cut spending that violate these principles. Today, the amendment before us is part of the fulfillment of that promise to offer amendments that would cut spending if they did not meet those two principles.

The amendment that is before the Senate now is to reduce funding for the Selective Service System by \$20 million, from \$25 to \$5 million, with the intention that this money be used to terminate the system.

Mr. President, the Selective Service System no longer provides something that is in the general interest and essential to American public life. The fact is the Selective Service System is a dinosaur in the post-Soviet world made obsolete by two welcome developments: the creation of all-volunteer Armed Forces and the end of the Soviet threat.

Our all-volunteer force is a remarkable success story backed by reserves that are capable of handling the types of conflict we are likely to see—the Somalias, the Bosnias, and, yes, the Desert Storms of the foreseeable future.

Desert Storm proved that our volunteer force backed by reserves can put a half million men on the ground and support them without resorting to conscription. Indeed, Desert Storm also demonstrated that even were we to resort to conscription, our overloaded training facilities would be unprepared to handle the flow.

At the end of Desert Storm, 6 months after mobilization, there was still a backlog of thousands of reservists awaiting training. Such reserves would have priority over any conscriptees flooding the system. Now that we have voted to close so many military bases, this problem of not having adequate training space would only get worse.

The fact is, Mr. President, that we do not need a flood of draftees for any conflict we are likely to fight in the foreseeable future. I do not ask you to take my word on this. The Pentagon's own 1993-99 defense planning guidance scenario set found that only one of seven scenarios lasted long enough to require or allow for conscription. This was a scenario involving a reunified, rearmored Soviet Union with missiles aimed, as they were for 30 years, at the United States. Such a conflict is clearly not even on the horizon. Were this scenario to develop as much as we regret it, we would have a long lead time both to try to counteract the development by diplomatic and economic means and to develop a system to identify our 18-year-olds without paying millions of dollars per year in the meantime.

Indeed, this is what we have done in the past. The United States initiated registration in 1940, a year before the World War II draft became necessary. After the war, the Selective Service was disbanded and reconstituted in 1948 when the cold war took hold.

In this day, Mr. President, of drivers' licenses and Social Security records, I find it hard to believe we could not identify 18-year-olds in a cheaper and more timely manner than maintaining this system.

The same is true for the Selective Service System's other main activity which is developing plans for health care personnel delivery system capable of providing the skilled health care personnel a mobilized forces would need. The other residual functions of the Selective Service training draft boards, maintaining records, planning for contingencies could be managed within the shutdown funding or would disappear entirely.

Some may argue that \$25 million per year is a cheap insurance policy in a dangerous world. I cannot agree. Twenty-five million dollars may seem a small figure to us in Congress who become use to talking in terms of billions and increasingly in terms of trillions. I do not think that spending \$25 million per year just to come up with a list of 18-year-old men is a good use of the money.

Indeed, Mr. President, the Selective Service System is not even performing that task well. A November 1992 study by the U.S. Armed Forces Integration Agency uncovered severe overstaffing, poor morale, and overgrading in the work force. It found employees reading newspapers and magazines and freely admitting that they had no meaningful work to perform. As a result, the study recommended a cut of almost one-third of the work force. The study also found that work normally done by employees in grades 7, 9, 11, and 12 was being done by employees in grades 12, 13, 14, and 15; in other words, higher paid workers doing lower skilled jobs.

The study also found that workers were using technology that was badly out of date; for example, using a key-punch system to enter names.

Mr. President, I guess it should not be a surprise then that the study also found that morale in the Selective Service System was extremely low. The Selective Service played an important role during the cold war, but the cold war is over and keeping this outdated relic is a luxury that we should not afford. It is time to end Government by inertia, phase out the Selective Service System.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 22 minutes and 14 seconds.

Who yields time?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, how much time do the opponents have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I yield myself 5 minutes and I understand on this side, Senator THURMOND wishes to speak.

Does the Senator from Mississippi wish to speak on this?

Mr. COCHRAN. No.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, let me yield myself 5 minutes on the amendment.

I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from New

Jersey. I believe we need to maintain a viable Selective Service System, but I also believe that regardless of what one thinks about the future of this Selective Service System, it should not be decided on the appropriations legislation. It should be decided through an authorizing framework in which legislation is introduced to eliminate Selective Service and which there would be a wide range of hearings on whether it should be continued, and we would consult with the Joint Chiefs, the Department of Defense, the appropriate Armed Services Committees and then come to a sound, sensible, rational conclusion based on ample debate on this and not coming in through the appropriations process through a back door to defund it.

Selective Service is highly ready and capable of placing the first draftees in military uniform within 13 days of being given the legal go ahead. If the entire Selective Service System is terminated, it would have to be rebuilt from scratch if ever needed again. Even in a crisis this would take at least a year or more.

With today's 97-percent registration compliance rate, any future draft, if needed, would be the fairest and most equitable in history. Experience shows that the public will not long tolerate the draft if it believes it to be unfair.

Today, young men are saying registration is no big deal. They consider it a civic responsibility and for some, in many families, a rite of passage.

Decisions regarding the future of Selective Service are national security policy decisions. Any major changes should not be made exclusive through the appropriations process, and the only reason it is on VA-HUD and not on Armed Services is that it is an independent agency. The Army, the service which utilizes 90 percent of all men drafted from 1948 until the draft ended in 1973, is vehemently—vehemently—opposed to any change in the status quo for Selective Service particularly through this arbitrary back door way of doing it. The Joint Staff and the other military chiefs support it as well. And virtually all national patriotic and veterans' associations have recommended the Selective Service be retained.

The lasting impression made by every man by the act of registering creates a better climate for the military recruiter—an important consideration. It also says that in this country you have certain obligations. For every opportunity, there is an obligation. For every right there is a responsibility. And registration to serve your country through military service in the event of a cataclysmic situation where the President would return to the draft is one of those rights.

The Selective Service is in the process of making internal management changes to reduce personnel and in-

crease operating efficiencies, and I must tell you they need it, they really do need to step up to the new world order. But I believe they will.

And also we have asked the respective authorizing committees in Armed Services to review this and make a recommendation to the U.S. Congress for next year.

But with the 11,000 community volunteers and the small full-time staff, the agency makes available enormous emergency capability for a relatively small annual budget. DOD, as I said, would be looking into it, and I really, though I respect the Senator from New Jersey tremendously and know his concern about waste and his desire to eliminate unneeded Government agencies, this is not like the tea-tasting commission, Mr. President. We do not have to drink tea. If you are 18-years-old, you are a male in the United States of America, and you are a citizen, you have to register.

If you want to change that, then let us do it through the authorizing committee. Do not do it through the Appropriations Committee.

The honor, the integrity, the history, and the tradition of the Selective Service would deserve no less than at least a fair hearing and ample debate.

Mr. President, that concludes my argument thus far.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Carolina.

Who yields time to the Senator?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Is the Senator from South Carolina a proponent or opponent of the amendment?

Mr. THURMOND. I am in favor of the Selective Service System.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Then I am the person to yield you time, and I would be delighted to yield to the Senator from South Carolina 10 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, in the fall of 1940, as the war clouds rumbled across the globe, President Roosevelt signed the Selective Service and Training Act. Today, we are fortunate to no longer need a draft; however, the Selective Service System still provides the Nation with an inexpensive national defense insurance policy.

The registration system managed by the Selective Service is an unqualified success. Nearly 99 percent of the Nation's draft eligible men, ages 20 through 25, are registered. Additionally, because of the agency's ongoing program and continuous mobilization planning, the system is ready to resume a draft at a moments notice, should the Congress and the President decide that conscription is needed in an emergency.

While the peacetime registration program is an important and highly visi-

ble part of the Selective Service Agency's mission, its primary mission is mobilization readiness. At present, Selective Service is capable of placing the first draftees in uniform within 13 days of being given legal authorization. The high compliance afforded by peacetime registration guarantees that any future draft, if needed, would be the fairest and most equitable in history.

Mr. President, the Selective Service provides another, less visible service; it reminds our youth of their obligation of citizenship. As the Nation's young men attain the age of 18, they gain the greatest privilege of citizenship, the vote. At the same time, they register with the Selective Service, a reminder that their right to vote was gained through the sacrifices of others. Registration is a responsibility they should undertake with pride and one that brings them over the threshold of manhood.

Mr. President, the administration recommended \$30 million for the Selective Service. The Appropriations Committee provided \$25 million. Senator BRADLEY now wants to cut that to \$5 million, which is unreasonable. If the Senate agrees to the Bradley amendment it would be a travesty. The Selective Service provides an enormous emergency capability for a relatively small, annual budget. For over 50 years, it has provided critical functions in the areas of peacetime draft registration, mobilization and, most recently, a health care personnel delivery system. Since it is impossible to forecast the military challenges which lie ahead and the Nation is drastically reducing the size of its military services, it is imperative that we maintain the capabilities of the Selective Service System.

Mr. President, we all hope and pray that our Nation is never again involved in a crisis of such magnitude that a draft becomes necessary. However, we must maintain the capability of mobilizing America's manpower should it be needed. The Selective Service System provides that capability, a hedge against the unknown.

Mr. President, I urge my Senate colleagues to vigorously oppose any attempt to eliminate the Selective Service System. It is our Nation's insurance policy for future mobilization, and like any insurance policy, if we want the benefit, we must pay the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on the Selective Service System written by retired Gen. Maxwell Thurman, the former Vice Chief of Staff of the Army and commander in chief of the Southern Command, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 31, 1993]

SAVE SELECTIVE SERVICE

(By Maxwell R. Thurman)

The House of Representatives took a giant step backward in its constitutional obligation to "provide for the common defense." Fortunately for the nation, the Senate has an opportunity to set matters right.

In late June, the House voted to cut \$24 million from the 1994 budget of the Selective Service System, leaving \$5 million to shut down the agency.

An amendment to the Veterans Administration, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill would have restored \$20 million, but was defeated by five votes.

Although an Aug. 17 story on the Federal Page of The Washington Post practically celebrated the House action, there are two overreaching reasons why the Senate should restore the money.

First, Selective Service is needed to undergird the national military strategy review now underway in the Clinton administration.

Second, and more important, it is consistent with the ideal of selfless service to our great nation.

What is clear—even though Defense Secretary Les Aspin has not completed his "bottom up" review of strategy—is that the size of the nation's military will continue to shrink.

An educated guess would be that 11 aircraft carriers, 20 tactical fighter wings and 10 Army divisions—rounded out by reserve component units—will be preserved.

This means fewer forces in being—active, reserve or National Guard. The impact of these cuts on future national security occurs this way. With fewer forces, the pool of soldiers who have completed their military service but are obligated for recall in an emergency will shrink. And the question might be: So what?

The Persian Gulf War illustrates the point. If Iraq's Saddam Hussein had used his chemical weapons or effectively massed his Scud missiles, American and coalition force casualties would have been dramatically higher.

These men and women, who had completed their active service, were available for duty in the Persian Gulf as replacements if there had been large-scale casualties.

Thank God, we didn't need them.

The smaller the structure, the less room we have for error in force calculations. Weapons of advanced technology and mass destruction are available to third-, fourth- and even fifth-rate armies. We know that nine countries are now capable of delivering nuclear warheads. That number is expected to rise to 25 by the year 2000.

A functioning Selective Service is an important backstop should our forces suffer unexpected casualties in a future conflict. The ability to rapidly call young men to duty for training could, indeed, deter wrong-headed despots from using weapons of mass destruction against our forces.

Could we expand our military in times of crisis without Selective Service or peacetime registration?

Today, with the agency fully funded and with peacetime registration, the first draftee could be serving in uniform within 13 days of authorization to return to a draft. If peacetime registration ends and all other elements of Selective Service remain in place, then the first draftee could be serving in uniform in 42 days. If the entire agency and all its programs are terminated, it could take a year or more to get the draft going again.

Selective Service would have to be reinvented, and all of this would take valuable

time—something not always available in a crisis.

The second reason to keep the Selective Service registration is grounded in full citizenship.

At 18, young men now register to vote. With the right to vote comes a larger responsibility to serve the republic. Enrollment in Selective Service is one of those responsibilities, but it's a vitally important one—to rally to the national defense if necessary.

Ninety-seven percent of America's young men comply with the registration law.

On Aug. 12, 1941, less than four months before Pearl Harbor, the House of Representatives voted to extend the draft by a single vote. I hope this Congress has similar courage and farsightedness.

Vote to keep the Selective Service System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time is yielded?

Ms. MIKULSKI. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Virginia for 5 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, our distinguished Republican leader addressed the Senate today in the context of a wire report we received about the worsening instability in the Soviet Union, the former Soviet Union in Russia.

There are further reports of a possibility—and it is not confirmed—of an airplane being shot down, a Russian airplane over Georgia. I cannot confirm that.

But it is that type of report that descends on the United States at this unexpected hour which justifies, in my judgment, the continuation of the Selective Service.

I remember so well the summer of 1950. I had just finished my first year of law school. I was happily expecting to go on to the second year when, out of the blue, North Korea went over the border and into South Korea. And, in the summer of 1950, very quickly, my Reserve unit was called up, and I and others volunteered to go on active duty. I remember it vividly, just as if it were yesterday.

Those types of things happen. And, fortunately, we had in place a draft. Fortunately, there were sufficient reserves to come in and augment the Regular forces at that critical point in our history. Therefore, I think it is a very modest expenditure to keep an important insurance policy in this Nation.

Furthermore, I have had the marvelous privilege and honor to raise a son and work with his generation. And while his generation is a year or two beyond really the callup age at this time, I watched those youngsters grow and I watched them tolerate my stories about World War II and Korea. And while they are somewhat contemptuous of the Selective Service, down

deep in the hearts of that younger generation is a feeling that, if necessary, they will respond, will respond in the time of need in the same manner as our fathers and our grandfathers and our great grandfathers.

I think when a young person registers, that young person says, "I stand for America. I stand to help America if our freedom is ever challenged."

Everything we are doing today, like the health bill, is directed toward individual Americans accepting more responsibility for the future of this country. I commended Mrs. Clinton yesterday when she came before many of us here in the Senate and the House and talked about the health bill. But the theme underlying the administration approach, as it should be, and the theme underlying the Republican bill introduced by our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, is more responsibility on the individual to care for himself or herself and to accept the burden associated with additional health care, not only for themselves but for others. That is a burden of responsibility as a citizen. That is the very essence of Selective Service. Stand up and be counted. You are ready to serve your country in time of need.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has introduced a welcome amendment and I commend him for taking this action. Knowing Senator BRADLEY's commitment to the wise use of scarce Federal resources, I think that the Senate should take seriously his comments that the Selective Service System, which registers young men for the draft, is outdated and a waste of taxpayer money.

I rise today in support of this amendment.

Mr. President, since 1980 we have thrown away at least \$20 million a year on this program. During the House debate this past June, some supporters of Selective Service claimed that the program was a relative inexpensive way to ensure that our Armed Forces were never vulnerable to the lack of manpower. I have to ask, relative cheap to what? What Federal program—except perhaps defense programs—does not go wanting for additional resources. Could this Senate not find a better way to spend \$28 million a year? On health care? On student loans? On disaster relief for the Midwest?

It seems to me that Selective Service is about as valuable as tidal wave insurance in Iowa.

Every decision Congress makes represents a choice. In this era of high budget deficits, we do not have the luxury of funding programs which have no mission and, according to auditing reports, function rather haplessly.

This program is intended to provide 100,000 inductees 28 days after mobilization. Desert Storm showed us that such a rapid influx of inductees was not necessary. And DOD war simulations apparently do not call for a draft unless the Soviet Union is miraculously recomposed and rearmed. I don't think anyone here expects that to happen nor do I believe that the Selective Service System is a deterrent to such an occurrence. If someday we do face such an ominous threat I have full confidence that Congress, the President, and the military leadership will revisit the need for registration.

But we do not face such threats now. Military pay and benefits have been enhanced to ensure that we recruit some of our Nation's best and brightest young people for each branch of the armed services. Our Reserves are given the tools and training necessary to be the vital backup to our Active Duty Forces.

Absent a need for 100,000 inductees, spending this money every year is not good stewardship. The Selective Service System is so riddled with problems that the Appropriations Committee itself, in its report issued only a few days ago, questions its ability to do its job adequately and efficiently. The report reads:

If the Selective Service System is to continue * * * the Committee believes that the Agency must change, and change dramatically. The Committee has been disturbed by repeated reports that the Agency is overstuffed, suffers from widespread poor morale among its employees, and seemingly has little self-discipline to correct its own internal problems.

These are the words of the Senate Appropriations Committee, describing the program being defended by opponents of the pending amendment.

In light of these mission and mismanagement issues, the argument that the Senate should not make this decision today falls flat with me. Since 1948, when the system was first set up, decisions on draft registration have been made in the context of either Executive orders or appropriations bills. President Ford ended draft registration in 1975. President Carter decided to restart registration in 1980 and it was the Appropriations Committees which implemented the new program by approving funding. So don't let the smoke-screen fool you: Congress has every right and every responsibility to make decisions on this and every issue which costs precious dollars. Many millions of dollars.

I believe that this amendment can be successfully defended and promoted on a fiscal responsibility platform. The Selective Service System is an expen-

sive program which has no relevant value to our military readiness. It is as simple as that.

But the debate, I believe, can and should go much deeper. For we have not been promoting draft registration for the purposes of military readiness. Since 1980 draft registration has been a symbol rather than a tool. President Carter made it clear that he was reinstating registration as a warning to the Soviet Union. He described the draft as a further demonstration of our resolve as a nation. I suspect that this is why many veterans groups support the continuation of registration and I do not question their sincere interest—which is also ours—in keeping America safe and strong.

But I believe we should not equate symbolism with strength any more than we should link forced registration with patriotism. I have great confidence in the American people and their commitment to the security of the Nation. If that security is immediately threatened, we will respond. After the attack on Pearl Harbor, over 300,000 men volunteered for service. I do not doubt that such a response would occur again if the need arose.

And yet compulsory military service goes against the very foundation of our Nation. Families and individuals fled Europe to escape tyranny. Our system of government does not give warmaking authority solely to the Executive, to ensure that any military action not in response to a direct threat to our Nation has the support of the American people.

Compulsory military service not only threatens individual liberty. It also violates the right of conscience for those who are opposed religiously or morally to war. To one who has fought consistently for the rights of sincere conscientious objectors, it is a great irony that such a burden has been inflicted upon conscientious objectors by draft registration.

Some argue that the Selective Service System is a painless, cheap, and efficient program. For young men who seek to declare themselves conscientious objectors it is none of the above. Those who feel they cannot register for moral or religious reasons find themselves facing up to 5 years in prison and up to \$250,000 in fines.

Mr. President, we have the information and the reasons to terminate Selective Service: We know that conscientious objectors are faced with a burdensome and possibly punitive process. We know that the System is poorly managed and wasteful. And we know that no foreseeable threat requires the continuous collection of the names and addresses of our Nation's 18-year-old young men.

Mr. President, I would like to make a few additional comments. As a former military adviser to a university in the time of the Korean war when we had

the so-called Selective Service Act in place and were recruiting young people to fight in that war, I want to emphasize, it should have been called the discriminatory service act. Because that is exactly what the word selective means. It has always been discriminatory.

If you could qualify for college you had an exemption. That was the kind of discrimination that this whole act has represented. It is the most odious form of recruitment ever known to the Western World, and why our ancestors came from Europe. They came to escape the kind of conscripted armies the kings and dictators of Europe employed over centuries.

We go back to the Civil War and find the reaction against the draft, because that was so un-American. When President Lincoln adopted the Selective Service Act, riots broke out in the big cities of the North, the so-called liberal North.

Further, as far as this business of an insurance policy, that is a specious argument. In no way does a national emergency use a Selective Service Act to guarantee the manpower and the womanpower necessary to pursue military action, because you have to train them. You do not throw raw recruits into the front lines or into battle. You have a long delay. It is not an emergency measure. It is not an insurance policy in that sense.

Our insurance is the Reserves and the National Guard of this country. That is the reserve. That is the insurance policy for military requirements.

When we had the Persian Gulf war, some of the first people into battle were the National Guard troops of the United States. When I listen to the proposals to reconfigure the military today, I am jealously guarding the role of the National Guard. We must maintain the citizen Army. That is the way the American tradition is. Not an odious draft, which is involuntary servitude.

I was down at the White House today for the signing of the National Service Act. And the President of the United States and all those who spoke referred to the fact that our young people are willing and anxious to move into service to our Nation. As a veteran of World War II, and not as a draftee, as an enlistee in World War II, I was one of millions of young Americans responding to our country's call.

Further, if it had not been for the Selective Service Act we would not have had the longevity of the Vietnam war. Why did the war that was never declared by Congress last so long? Because the Presidents, from President Kennedy to President Johnson and President Nixon, had an unlimited supply of manpower and womanpower to throw into that war. This is another check and balance on the war powers of the President under our Constitution.

In no way in my view does a Selective Service play a legitimate role in the defense of this country in peacetime or in the beginnings of wartime, because we rely upon the Reserves and the National Guard for those emergencies in the beginnings of any war. If there is going to be longevity then the Selective Service may have to, especially in an unpopular war, recruit people by this kind of mandatory service.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the discriminatory character of this program and the need to end it now. This present status was a result of our efforts earlier in the Congresses years ago to end the Selective Service Act. They persuaded the majority of the Senate and the House to sustain it on this modified restricted basis. This is the time to call a halt. This is the time to save that money and get rid of this blot on our public record of having the kind of involuntary servitude requirements continued on the books.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FEINSTEIN). Who yields time? The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. Madam President, the eloquence of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, as usual, puts the point directly to the Senate. Do we need the Selective Service System? The answer is no. The world has changed. The world has changed. The pages of history have turned. We no longer are facing a monolithic, ideologically hostile, heavily armed, nuclear-tipped Soviet empire whose missiles are aimed directly at us. That is no longer the threat.

The issue is do we need to have the right, do we need to have the ability, do we need to have a Selective Service System in place that does nothing but keep a list of 18-year-olds?

We have an active duty force of 1.5 million. We have a reserve force of 1.1 million.

The point was made, the Selective Service System says they can deliver 100,000 draftees, if that event ever occurred, in 28 days. But how would they be trained? We could not even train the reservists that were called up for Desert Storm.

The issue really gets back to, do we want to spend \$20 million maintaining a list of 18-year-olds? Could we do it in a cheaper way? Could we do it with a little lead time? If things began to deteriorate dramatically in the Soviet Union, could we reinstitute? The answer to all those questions is yes. Yes. We could. But inertia carries us forward, inertia that we need to pay \$20 million to have people performing their job who the report that was issued by the Army Integration Agency Study Team says, "had no meaningful work to perform."

Do we need to spend \$20 million? Or should we spend the \$20 million?

Mr. BENNETT. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRADLEY. I will be pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from Utah, for whom I have the greatest respect, as he shares with me one of the unique attributes—of being a tall person.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator. I come to this issue without baggage of any previous knowledge so I would appreciate it if the Senator could enlighten me. Let us assume that we agree to the amendment of the Senator and then at some time some threat arises. Does the Senator have any idea how long it might take, or how much money it might cost, to reconstitute something along the line of the Selective Service System 4 or 5 years from now if that should be required?

Mr. BRADLEY. A list of 18-year-olds can be compiled very quickly from drivers' licenses and Social Security records. They ought to be computerized in States across this country. How long would that take? It depends on the urgency of the moment. It is not a problem physically impossible to accomplish in very short order.

Mr. BENNETT. Would the Senator assume that it can be accomplished for something less than \$20 million?

Mr. BRADLEY. I do.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, if I might be allowed to comment, I attended a briefing by Colin Powell, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, in which we were talking about various military matters. He pointed out to us the changing nature of the world in a very dramatic fashion. He said:

For most of my years as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, I had to assume that the planning time to respond to a threat was 14 days. The military experts told us it would take 14 days for the Soviets to mobilize and move through the folded gap into some kind of attack on Europe.

At the present time, he says our threat assessments are based on the assumption of 3½ years. That is how much the threat has changed, from 14 days of prior notice to 3½ years of prior notice. I find, as I listen to the debate, I am somewhat persuaded that in 3½ years, we would save approximately \$90 million. We could probably buy a pretty good list at the end of 3½ years for somewhat less than that.

Does the Senator agree with that assessment?

Mr. BRADLEY. Madam President, I would certainly agree with that.

Let me say to my distinguished friend as to the prospect of having to fight a land war in Europe against a monolithic Soviet military, a ground war would not be something that would hit us overnight. As you know, the Russian forces are pulling out of Germany. That will be completed next year. They are pulling out of Lithuania; they are pulling out of Poland.

They are pulling out of where they were deployed, in which they represented a threat. That no longer ex-

ists. If there were internal changes sufficient to bring this about, we would have plenty of lead time.

We are going to have a bumpy road. It is going to be an uncertain road as to what happens in Russia. Every time there is a development, our response is, "Well, we have to prepare for the Soviet Union circa 1979." I think that we would be making a serious mistake.

The point is \$20 million. Do we want to save \$20 million, or do we not want to save \$20 million? You get a list of 18-year-olds, and that is it.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator both for his amendment and for his explanation.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his comments. I think he is very correct in pointing out that this would save a considerable amount of money, and we should save it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. MIKULSKI. As the manager on the opposing side, I yield to the Armed Services Committee chairman 5 minutes.

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Back in 1980, I led the effort in Congress to reinstate the registration. The world environment was very different back then. We faced a numerically superior Warsaw Pact in Central Europe. Our contingency plans called for the United States and our allies to be prepared to fight a very large land war against the Warsaw Pact with warning time that was very limited and response time that was very limited. We were debating whether it was a matter of a couple of weeks or just a few days.

For example, we had plans at that time to have 10 divisions on the ground in Europe ready to fight within 10 days of the decision to mobilize. Under those circumstances, obviously, we had to have a mobilization capability that would allow us to increase the size of our military forces very rapidly. That meant maintaining a training base in the Defense Department to accept and train large numbers of inductees in the event of mobilization. It also meant that we needed a Selective Service System that could provide large numbers of inductees to this training base shortly after the decision to mobilize.

Before the reinstitution of registration in 1980—and that was under the Carter administration, as I recall—it would have taken the Selective Service System at least 6 months to deliver any inductees to the military training base. In other words, that is when the first ones would arrive, and it would take even longer to deliver large numbers of inductees. Under most of the planning scenarios at that time, we were to face severe and probably crippling shortages of manpower in our military forces by the time the military training base could respond with trained inductees.

Reinstituting registration corrected this very serious shortfall in our military mobilization capability by allowing Selective Service to deliver our first inductees to the military services 13 days after mobilization, and 100,000 inductees within 30 days of mobilization.

There is a different situation today, and the Senator from New Jersey makes that point and makes it strongly. There is no huge Warsaw Pact army threatening the NATO Alliance on the ground in Central Europe. Warning time for large conventional war in Europe is currently measured in years, not in days or a few weeks.

Last year, our committee anticipated that the requirement to continue registration should be reviewed. In last year's defense authorization bill, we directed the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the President by April 30, 1993, concerning whether we had a continued requirement for registration under the Selective Service System. This provision also required the President to follow that report with any recommendations to the Congress by May 31 of this year.

Unfortunately, and particularly unfortunately because we are having to debate this today, the Defense Department has not met this reporting requirement. They have not sent their report to the President. We do not have the President's recommendations.

Before Congress makes a final decision on terminating or continuing registration, I think we ought to hear directly from the senior military and civilian officials of the Defense Department on this question, particularly since we have just had the Defense Department under the new administration complete a bottom-up review which changes the scenario by which we posture our force requirements. There are a lot of questions that have to be answered.

My main objection to this amendment is that it is premature until we hear from these people who are in charge of making these kinds of detailed plans. It may be the Senator from New Jersey is correct. It may be we do not need registration, but there are some key questions I think need answering.

First of all, with the disintegration of the Warsaw Pact and the increased warning time of any likely large-scale land war requiring mobilization, do we need to continue registration? That is the Senator's question, and he asserts that we do not.

He may be correct on that particular question. But Secretary Aspin's recently completed bottom-up review bases our force levels, our future force levels, on the requirement to respond to two major regional contingencies occurring nearly simultaneously; something like a Persian Gulf-Iraq war and something like a Korean war; or

even some other conflict, for instance, something in Yugoslavia or other places. Would we have to reinstate Selective Service in order to fight and win two simultaneous major regional contingencies?

I note that the House Appropriations Committee, in their report—and that was done before the bottom-up review—basically said, and if I have a copy of that quote, I think it is very relevant—quoting from that report, and I believe this is a direct quote:

Desert Storm was the largest mobilization of U.S. forces since Vietnam, and it was done without using the Selective Service System. In the post-cold war environment, there are no credible threats that could require mobilization of U.S. forces larger than Desert Storm.

Madam President, could I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. GRAMM. I yield the distinguished Senator from Georgia 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Texas.

Madam President, the premise on which the House took this action is a flat-out contradiction of everything they found in the bottom-up review. Our whole force posture is based on two simultaneous regional conflicts. The House took this action, the House Appropriations Committee, based on nothing more serious than the Persian Gulf conflict. So, I think we need to get some more answers to the questions.

Do we need to have registration? We have not yet decided how many forces we are going to deploy, if any, if there is a peace agreement in Bosnia. The President has indicated somewhere in the 20,000-25,000 range. Well, people say, that is not many. But you have to have a rotational base. You probably have to have at least 50,000 to 100,000 troops in order to keep 25,000 deployed.

If there is a Middle East settlement between Israel and Syria—we have already heard the Secretary of State talk about U.S. forces being part of a U.N. contingency operation there—I do not know how many would be there. But we are talking about large numbers of troops being deployed in positions from which they will not be able to be moved in any kind of conflict. We have to take that into account.

Do the relatively modest costs of maintaining the Selective Service System at current levels of readiness outweigh the risks to our national security of putting the system in deep standby?

Madam President, in effect, this is an insurance policy. It is a more remote policy than we had before. Five years ago there was a much more likely set of circumstances under which we needed this.

The real question is, Is the risk so remote that we no longer need to spend

the money? I, for one, am not comfortable in making that judgment on the floor today. I know the Senator from New Jersey has made his arguments. He made some valid arguments, some with which I will take issue. But I believe we would be much better served, particularly since this is already in, I believe, the House appropriations bill, to leave this provision like it is in the Senate, to move on to conference, and to demand that the administration give us answers to these key questions.

The Senator from New Jersey is correct. These questions need to be answered. We cannot justify even the relatively small amount, considering the overall Defense budget, of \$20 million a year unless there is a case made for it. That case has not been made, but I believe it is premature to simply abolish the whole system at this juncture. So, I would vote at this stage against the Bradley amendment.

I thank the Chair for being patient.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BRADLEY. Madam President, how much time remains on the side of the proponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time remaining is 9 minutes 53 seconds.

Ms. MIKULSKI. And on the opponents' side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the opponents' side, 6 minutes 46 seconds.

Mr. BRADLEY. While the distinguished Senator from Georgia is in the Chamber, I would like to confirm with him on the bottom-up review, what did the bottom-up review say about conscription, if anything? It is my understanding that there was not a large section of the bottom-up review that even dealt with the issue of conscription.

Mr. NUNN. The Senator is correct. As I mentioned, the report that was due on this subject in April has not yet been delivered. I can understand that because they probably wanted to conduct the bottom-up review first. But I think there are a whole set of questions that flow out of that analysis directly relating to this question that we need answers for that we do not now have.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the Senator. I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Chair.

As I said in my colloquy, I come to this issue with no background and am trying to learn about it on the floor.

My reaction to the things I have heard in this Chamber is that we might be well disposed, in spite of the comments made by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, to pass the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey because it would seem to me

that the Selective Service System being kept in place—and I would be happy to have the distinguished chairman correct me if I am wrong—runs the risk of being somewhat archaic, coming out of the experience of the Second World War. I was called up under this system, and it may well be that if, indeed, we have need of a list of 18-year-olds, with modern computer technology, it can be compiled much more rapidly and much more intelligently with the new system created when the threat arises rather than maintaining \$20 million a year in the present circumstance.

I just have trouble with this. I do not feel very strongly one way or the other. But as I listened to the arguments, it seems to me to make sense to terminate what we have now and if, indeed, the Secretary of Defense comes along and says, no, we need some kind of system to keep a list of 18-year-olds, let the Secretary give us a recommendation for a system based on today's technology and the computer lists that are available in the various States for drivers' licenses, et cetera, so that we could move more quickly and more efficiently in a new circumstance.

I would be happy, Madam President, to be enlightened on that issue by any of the Senators on the floor.

Mr. NUNN. If the Senator is posing that to me, I would say that he makes good points. Those are good questions. The problem with this amendment at this time is, if it goes in this bill now, it will not even be a conferenceable item, so there will not be any reason to hear from the Department of Defense. This system will be abolished unless the President vetoes the bill. And if the President vetoes the bill, it will probably be for other reasons. So I have a hard time saying we are ready to make this kind of decision. Maybe the Senator from New Jersey is, but I am not ready to make this decision.

For instance, it is entirely possible with new computer technology that we could alleviate the burden of 18-year-olds having to register but keep the computer capability so that we keep updated files of addresses. And there may be a way to do that even through a drivers' license system or some other system which would be less expensive and less burdensome, although I do not think this is a large burden on 18-year-olds. So I would say to the Senator that that is one of the options.

But the problem of starting over on Selective Service is not possible politically. If this system is abolished now, believe me, no matter what system anybody comes up with, there will not be a substitute. You will see protests all over the country. Right now, nobody in the 18-year-old category has even written me saying this is a burden.

One virtue of this system is that it lets young people know that there are

contingencies under which they might have to serve this country. In a period of time when we have alleviated the draft for young people, when there is no real burden, most young people—particularly upper middle-class young people, high economic groups—are not even serving in the military unless it is as officers. Our enlisted corps is increasingly made up of people in middle and lower economic groups. And I commend them for serving, but I think there is an argument that should be made that there ought to be, at least in the minds particularly of our more prosperous young people who are not interested in the military these days, some kind of contingent liability for service to the country. I am simply saying let us take our time on this and know what we are doing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY. Madam President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes 34 seconds on the Senator's side and 6 minutes 46 seconds on the other side.

Mr. BRADLEY. Madam President, I would again like to remind the Senate for what this money is being spent. It is being spent for an agency, the purpose of which is outdated, in my view. As I heard the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, his lips were saying, no, no, not now, but I think his eyes were twinkling and saying, yes, maybe in the future. Time will tell. But I know what is happening to that money now. A U.S. Army Integration Agency study in November 1992 found:

The extent of the overstaffing existed to the point that on several occasions employees of the agency informed members of the study team that they had no meaningful work to do.

Employees who were at grades 12, 13, and 14 were doing work that should have been done by 7, 9, and 11 grades. This is a waste of taxpayer money being expended against a ghost possibility. You could achieve the same list of 18-year-olds in a more modern, efficient way by using driver's licenses and Social Security. This is a new world.

We have all made speeches about cutting the budget. This is the perfect example of an agency that has outlived its purpose. How many times have you had town meetings where you said, "I want to cut the budget." Somebody says, "Well, did you ever eliminate anything, Senator? Did you ever eliminate a program, Senator?" Some people say yes. Most people say no.

This is your chance to eliminate a program, the Selective Service System. It should be eliminated. This amendment will eliminate it. And I hope we get a majority vote to eliminate it.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I yield myself such time as necessary of the remaining time.

Madam President, we are debating whether or not we should have a Selective Service. That is not the point of what we are doing on appropriations. The debate on Selective Service and should it continue should be done through a regular authorizing framework, not a back door line-item x-ing out of a program that has been part of this Nation's fabric and has been the organizational structure to call men to arms at a time of war.

I will not go easily into the night with voting on terminating Selective Service through this back door line-item no-matter-how-well-intentioned amendment. If you want to eliminate Selective Service, introduce legislation that terminates it. Then it goes to something called the authorizing committee. They are very jealous of their jurisdiction. They tell us they set the policy. We the appropriators should be the quiet guardians of the purse.

Now I find myself defending whether we should have a Selective Service or not. I personally believe we do need a Selective Service, but that is not the subject of the debate tonight. We should defeat the Bradley amendment and follow the orderly rational procedure of authorizing and appropriating, and since there is a great demand by the authors for there to be a firewall, then let us have that firewall and then debate what should happen to Selective Service now that the Berlin Wall has come down.

But we really should not end Selective Service in such an ignominious way at 6:30 at night on the Senate floor, when we are about to put \$36 billion into the Veterans' Administration, to pension, to disability, to dealing with the backlog in disability, for veterans' health care, for prosthetic devices. All of those who answered the call for service, yes, we are going to do that for the vets, but we will save money by eliminating Selective Service. I think Selective Service, the men who served and those who will continue to serve, deserve at least the ordinary regular processes of the U.S. Senate.

I urge the defeat of the BRADLEY amendment and move to table it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to table is not in order until all time has been used or yielded back.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. BRADLEY. Madam President, I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to table the amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY. 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 on agreeing to the motion

of the Senator from Maryland to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **FORD**. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. **ROCKEFELLER**] is necessarily absent. I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. **ROCKEFELLER**] would vote "yea."

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

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 273 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Akaka	Durenberger	McConnell
Bingaman	Faircloth	Mikulski
Bond	Ford	Murkowski
Breaux	Glenn	Nunn
Brown	Gorton	Pressler
Graham	Graham	Pryor
Bumpers	Gramm	Riegle
Byrd	Hatch	Roth
Coats	Heflin	Sasser
Cochran	Helms	Shelby
Conrad	Hollings	Simon
Coverdell	Hutchinson	Simpson
Craig	Inouye	Smith
D'Amato	Johnston	Specter
Danforth	Kassebaum	Stevens
Daschle	Kempthorne	Thurmond
Dodd	Lott	Wallop
Dole	Lugar	Warner
Domenici	Mack	
Dorgan	McCain	

NAYS—41

Baucus	Grassley	Metzenbaum
Bennett	Gregg	Mitchell
Biden	Harkin	Moseley-Braun
Boren	Hatfield	Moynihan
Boxer	Jeffords	Murray
Bradley	Kennedy	Nickles
Burns	Kerrey	Packwood
Campbell	Kerry	Pell
Chafee	Kohl	Reid
Cohen	Lautenberg	Robb
DeConcini	Leahy	Sarbanes
Exon	Levin	Wellstone
Feingold	Lieberman	Wofford
Feinstein	Mathews	

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 907) was agreed to.

Mr. **GRAMM**. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. **MITCHELL**. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. **MITCHELL**. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following be the only floor amendments remaining in order to H.R. 2491, the VA-HUD appropriations bill; that they be subject to relevant second-degree amendments; and that if they are not offered by 5 p.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, September 22, they no longer be in order. The amendments are:

An amendment by Senator **BUMPERS** regarding Stafford loans; an amendment by Senator **BUMPERS** regarding

solid rocket motors; an amendment by Senator **BRYAN** to delete the SETI program; an amendment by Senator **SIMPSON** that is relevant; an amendment by Senator **DANFORTH** regarding flood insurance; an amendment by Senator **HELMS** that is relevant; an amendment by Senator **BROWN** regarding CDBG's; an amendment by Senator **GRAMM** of Texas that is relevant; an amendment by Senator **MIKULSKI** that is relevant; an amendment by Senator **D'AMATO** regarding GSE oversight; an amendment by Senator **STEVENS** regarding Alaska clear air; an amendment by Senator **SIMON** regarding asbestos; an amendment by Senator **NICKLES** regarding national service; an amendment by Senator **MCCONNELL** regarding EPA; an amendment by Senator **DECONCINI** regarding protection of intellectual property; an amendment by Senator **WARNER** regarding the space station; an amendment by Senator **BYRD** that is relevant; an amendment by Senator **HATFIELD** that is relevant; an amendment by Senator **METZENBAUM** that is relevant; an amendment by Senator **MITCHELL** that is relevant; an amendment by Senator **RIEGLE** and Senator **LEVIN** that is relevant.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection?

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. **METZENBAUM**. Madam President, I do not intend to object. I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry of the majority leader.

As I understand it, he says that amendments have to be offered by 5 o'clock but, as I understand it, with all those amendments that there are there may not be an opportunity to call up the amendment.

Does the leader mean that as long as the amendment is submitted at the desk and asked to be called up, that that would be sufficient? Or would a Senator be precluded if he or she were not able to have time to offer the amendment?

Mr. **MITCHELL**. The Senator is correct. The Senator would be precluded if an opportunity does not arise to offer the amendment.

But I would point out to the Senator the problem we have in the Senate is exactly the opposite. We cannot get Senators to come over and offer amendments. That is the problem. We also have Senators who do not want to stay here in the evening, and we cannot get started on the business until the afternoon.

So, there is not any alternative to this procedure, except staying here late this evening and every evening.

Mr. **METZENBAUM**. I would have to object just on the basis of the procedure, because I can very well imagine what will happen. I came out here the other day to offer an amendment on

the Armed Services bill. Were it not for the fact that I was permitted to have unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment, I would have been precluded from offering that amendment.

I would say to the leader I totally respect the effort that he is attempting to make, but I think that any procedure that would preclude any Member of this body from offering an amendment when he or she is ready to offer the amendment and cannot find an opening in order to offer the amendment, is a very bad way to proceed, and I would have to object on that basis.

Mr. **MITCHELL**. May I say to the Senator, the Senator has two amendments listed here. Why does not the Senator stay here and offer them now and not have to worry about being precluded?

Mr. **METZENBAUM**. I say to the leader I am not speaking only with respect to my amendment. I think this is not a good way to proceed, to preclude Members of this body from having an opportunity to offer their amendments. I am concerned if we start down this road—maybe we have been down the road before—I do not believe that any Member of this body ought to be precluded from offering an amendment because he or she cannot get the floor.

I think if there were some procedure where any Member could offer the amendment without debate by 5 o'clock tomorrow and then have an up-or-down vote on it, I think at least that protects the Member's position.

Absent that, I think it becomes a very unreal kind of procedure.

Mr. **MITCHELL**. Madam President, the concern which the Senator expresses has existed with respect to every unanimous consent agreement obtained for at least the past 14 years that I have been in the Senate when there is a limitation on amendments.

Any Senator not on the list is automatically precluded from offering amendments right now.

I appreciate the Senator's concern for the welfare and ability of Senators other than himself on the list to offer amendments, but they are all very capable of standing up here and expressing themselves if they want to.

My question is, if the Senator has an amendment and he is concerned about offering it, he has the opportunity to stand up here right now and offer the amendment. There is no chance of it being precluded.

(Mrs. **MURRAY** assumed the chair.)

Mr. **METZENBAUM**. Madam President, I understand the Senator's point.

One of the reasons I have those amendments reserved is, in the event there is some amendment that is offered and then passed and it may be necessary to revisit the subject, I would have an opportunity to call up that amendment and have a vote on it.

But I believe, Mr. Leader—and I have tremendous respect for your efforts and

what you are attempting to do—but I believe any time you preclude Members of this body from having a chance to vote on their amendment when they are waiting in line to get it called up, I think it is a bad way for the U.S. Senate to proceed and, therefore, I object.

It is not because of the Senator from Ohio's amendments. I just think we are suddenly providing a different kind of procedure.

Maybe you have done it 20 times in the past. But the fact is, I was under the impression all week that you would have an opportunity to get your amendment called up when there was a limited number of amendments. Under these circumstances, I think it just does not make good logic.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I simply want the RECORD to reflect the fact that every single unanimous consent agreement which identifies amendments automatically, by its very terms, precludes any Senator whose amendment is not on that list from offering an amendment. So the concern which the Senator has has occurred over and over again almost daily.

If we cannot get unanimous-consent agreements, then I say to my colleagues we are going to be in session much, much longer hours and many more days than we are now.

Mr. METZENBAUM. The majority leader misunderstands me.

Mr. MITCHELL. No, I understand you perfectly well.

Mr. METZENBAUM. You are saying that anybody who does not call up his amendment. I am saying that you may not be able to call up your amendment. And if you cannot get the floor to call up your amendment then, by this unanimous-consent agreement, you are precluded from offering that amendment. One amendment could hold the floor for all the time until tomorrow at 5 o'clock and no amendment would be in order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I want to say that this is a classic example of debating over a theoretical harm which has not occurred, when we have used this practice in the past, to preclude a practical solution to a real problem.

Now we have done this before and the fear that the Senator expressed has not occurred.

On the other hand, if we cannot get this type of agreement, then we satisfy the theoretical concerns, and the practical reality is that we are going to stay here late tonight, we will be here much later, and a lot of Senators will be inconvenienced, Senators in whose behalf the Senator from Ohio now purports to speak.

Mr. METZENBAUM. The majority leader realizes we have a somewhat similar procedure when we have cloture. Postcloture amendments can be called up afterward without any debate, but at least you can get your amendment considered.

This procedure precludes the consideration of amendments where Members want to call them up.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is nothing to preclude a Senator on this list from coming over and offering an amendment right now. I am inviting Senators to do so.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Not if there is an amendment pending. And if there is an amendment pending, then that Member cannot.

I came to the floor the other day when the Armed Services bill was up, and had Senator EXON not been gracious enough to permit me to offer my amendment, I would not have been able to do so.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio be recognized to offer any amendment he wishes that is on this list to do so now.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I do not need unanimous consent to be recognized to offer an amendment now. I just said to the leader my amendment is there in the event an amendment is adopted and I wish to amend it subsequently.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I will just say, it is darn near impossible to get anything done in this Senate with the rules and the attitudes that Senators have about the way we proceed. It is just about darn near impossible.

Senators want to have 3 or 4 hours of morning business in the morning. Senators want to leave at 6 o'clock in the evening. Senators do not want to be in session on Monday. Senators do not want to be in session on Friday. Senators want this, want that, do not want this, do not want that.

If we cannot proceed with unanimous consent agreements that enable us to organize and schedule the business in an orderly way that adapts to the convenience of the overwhelming majority of Senators because of a theoretical concern—that admittedly may occur, but also admittedly in real life has never occurred—then I just say to Senators that there is not any alternative.

The Senator has a perfect right to object. The Senator has noted he is going to object.

Therefore, I will say to the Members of the Senate that we are in tonight, we are in for several hours tonight, we are going to be in and stay in as long as it takes to make good progress on this bill.

We are going to finish this bill by about this appointed hour tomorrow. We can either do it in a way that inconveniences almost every Senator or we could do it in a way that makes it more convenient to the Senate.

Mr. METZENBAUM. May I suggest to the leader that there is a solution—and perhaps the leader would not be willing to consider the solution—and that is that any Member who has an amendment on the list and wishes to

call it up at 5 o'clock would have a right to do so without debate.

That protects the right of the Member to get his or her amendment called up. It does not delay the progress of the Senate. It does not require the Senate to be in session tonight. But at least the Member is entitled to have a chance to have his or her amendment voted on.

Mr. MITCHELL. What is the matter with the Senator having to come to the floor now to offer the amendment? Why does anybody have to wait until 5 o'clock tomorrow to offer an amendment?

We spend most of our time here exploring Senators who say they want to offer an amendment to come and offer their amendment. Why does any Senator want to wait until 5 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. METZENBAUM. I do not know why any Senator might want to do that.

I will say to the Senator, I am not sure I will offer my amendment. The reason I have reserved the place is in the event there is an amendment adopted that I believe needs a subsequent amendment after it has been adopted for clarification or for some modification, that I protect that position.

And I am not the only Member of this body who has done that. There are a number of Members who have unspecified amendments that have a position listed.

I do not know what harm would be done, Mr. Leader, in saying that any Member who had an amendment pending would have an opportunity to offer it.

Mr. MITCHELL. The harm is this. We already have Senators who will not come and offer amendments. Senators say, "I have an amendment to offer. It is very important."

We are on the bill. The manager stands here hour after hour, time after time, begging Senators to come over and offer their amendments.

"Well, it is inconvenient." "I have to go get a haircut" or "I have got to go pick someone up at the airport," or, "My dog has a stomach ache and I cannot come over and offer my amendment."

Now, what the Senator is doing is suggesting a mechanism which creates an even greater incentive to wait until the last minute.

Do not inconvenience the Members of the Senate to come here tonight and offer an amendment when we are considering the bill, when there is ample time to debate it. Wait until the very last moment, and then we guarantee you, no matter how unwilling you are to come over and do anything any other time, no matter how you may say, "Well, I have this amendment, but I do not want to come offer it now, because it is really inconvenient for me.

I will wait until the last minute and it does not make any difference because I am guaranteed, as long as I get there at 1 minute to 5, that I can offer my amendment."

So that way, we are furthering the tendency to encourage Senators to wait and not come over and offer their amendments, wait until the very last minute.

Now, maybe we will have to end up doing what the Senator from Ohio has suggested, because the rules of the Senate are such that we cannot do anything if one person objects. And that gives every Member of this Senate the ability to exercise a veto over anything we do. And probably we will accept that, because we do not have any other choice.

I just say it is tough enough to get anything done here, and this just makes it tougher, for no good reason other than to satisfy some theoretical concern, which, when weighed against the practical realities with which we must deal, I do not ascribe great weight to it.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Will the leader not recognize that the procedure that he is following, or wants to follow, would preclude one or more Senators from having an opportunity to call up their amendment if the situation on the floor is such that that Member cannot get the floor?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes. I acknowledge that, certainly. And will the Senator not acknowledge that if any Senator wanted to seriously offer an amendment to this bill, he could come over and offer it right now?

Mr. METZENBAUM. Of course. Right now.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is my point. Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I withdraw my request. We will proceed with the bill. We will see if we can work this out. In the meantime, Senators are on notice we are in session tonight. There will be votes unless and until some further statement is made.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 908

(Purpose: To require the approval of Congress of the expenditure of certain space station funds.)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator intend to amend the first committee amendment?

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the pending amendment be set aside and we proceed to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the committee amendments are set aside.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] proposes an amendment numbered 908.

On page 60, line 9, after "1994" insert the following: ", and any funds above such \$1,000,000,000 may only be obligated with the approval of Congress."

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a second degree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not have a right to offer an amendment to his amendment at this time.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the first amendment.

Mr. GRAMM. On your amendment you ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. WARNER. The amendment that is at the desk. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Madam President, 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.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair. I thank the managers.

Madam President, I spoke to this amendment earlier. I do not wish to prolong unduly the debate which has been a very good one—I said that earlier—on the space station. My concern is that the committee report on Calendar No. 194, page 145, reads as follows:

Bill language has been included to allocate these funds accordingly. In addition, the committee has included language that limits NASA from obligating more than \$1 billion prior to January 31, 1994, for the space station program. This will enable the committee to assess the final design configuration of the station before agreeing to release the remaining funds appropriated in fiscal year 1994.

Madam President, this amendment is a very simple one. It states that rather than the committee making this assessment at some point in time prior to January 31, 1994, that the Senate as a whole, that the House as a whole, that the Congress as a body shall determine whether or not future authorized dollars by the previous amendment should be appropriated to this program. That is all.

I say to my distinguished colleague from Texas, who possibly has in mind a second-degree amendment, I shall repeatedly bring forth one amendment after another until I get an up-or-down vote on this question, because in the judgment of this Senator, I think this program should be reviewed very intensely by the Senate. It will be my hope we continue oversight on a continuous basis because here in the course of the debate on the space station we have learned facts that I find astonishing, that I find unacceptable, in terms of timely action by this body.

We do not have, in my judgment, before us at this time such firm cost estimates for the completion of this program to justify action by this body. Nevertheless, the body did take action.

It is interesting, if you look at a breakout of the votes here, there are 36 Republicans who voted for the program and 23 Democrats. That is a heavy responsibility. This program now has a very close identity with the Republican Party. This party deliberately delivered the margin of vote to assure the program go forward as directed by the committee. I say that with no disrespect to anyone. A fair battle was fought on the amendment. It is over. It is behind us. But I think it is incumbent upon us to engage this body in such further deliberation as necessary to have one single dollar in addition to the \$1 billion, and that roughly is \$900 million, almost another \$1 billion—before \$1 of that sum is released. I think it merits the deliberation of this body, its careful attention, and I would anticipate another record vote.

In that way we have fulfilled our responsibility, our continuing responsibility, toward this program and toward the heavy burden we are casting on the taxpayers to continue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, I am not sure I understand.

Is this a procedure where we would have to have another affirmative vote in the Senate before any of that money could be spent even though the report was made back?

Let me just give an example. On the Armed Services Committee we fence things and put hurdles in, objectives to be met all the time. We have done that. We did it on B-2. We have done it on several different programs. But the idea on that was not to bring it back for a second vote in the Senate. The idea every time there was to make sure the administration was reporting everything to the committee because we had been misled a few times, reporting everything to the committee and have to report it.

Then, at that point, Members who were either for or opposed to whatever the issue is have a full right to come to the floor, put in legislation, try to alter that. But I would say to my friend from Virginia, if we are to start on appropriations bills and say because we do not like a certain procedure and because we happen to lose a vote on the floor we are then going to come back and require a second vote before anything is released, that is just legislative WPA in the Senate.

The Senate has expressed its vote. It was 59 to 40. Accept it. Why would we have to bring it back again and have another vote on it? I am all for having the report made back here and then if there is objection to the way things are

going or it does not come out the way we hoped, we always can bring it back and legislation can be submitted to undo what is being done. But I think we are treading down a path here of just making a lot of excess work for ourselves if every time we have some objection to a thing that passes here on the floor on an appropriations bill, we require a second vote on it. So I would have to oppose it, regretfully.

Mr. WARNER. I respect my good friend from Ohio. He served with me for many years on the committee. But I ask him to review the language. Where did he see here the word "report"? Where is the fencing report we carefully put in the Armed Services Committee? Will my colleague kindly read the language? Or I will read it for him.

Mr. GLENN. If the Senator will yield for a comment, I have not actually read the language. Maybe it does not require a report. But, certainly, I can guarantee the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Arkansas, and others are going to be following the progress of the planning for the spending of that money very, very carefully, as they should. Then if there is objection—

Mr. WARNER. I do not know how I follow it, to be honest. There is no obligation for them to report that I see here. There is a report inferred, I might say in all fairness. The sentence simply says "This will enable the committee to assess the final design configuration."

That implies some further evidence will be coming before the committee. But I draw to my colleague's attention, January 31, 1994—the Senate meets for a very few days in January and, hopefully, for a very few days in December. It could be the outcome of this is decided by one or two Senators on behalf of the entire body involving \$900 million.

I say to my good friend, I am not prepared to yield that discretion, primarily because of the inadequacy of the facts that were presented to this body in support of the amendment that was just acted on.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Will the distinguished Senator from Virginia yield?

If the distinguished Senator will yield the floor to me, recognizing his right to reclaim the floor?

AMENDMENT NO. 909 TO AMENDMENT NO. 908
(Purpose: To require the approval of Congress of the expenditure of certain space station funds)

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I will be happy to yield, but before doing so, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] proposes an amendment numbered 909 to amendment No. 908.

Strike all after the first clause and add: "any funds above such \$1,000,000,100 may only be obligated with the approval of Congress."

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I thank the Chair and I thank the distinguished managers.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I recognize what the Senator from Virginia is trying to achieve. He wants to ensure fiscal accountability and that the redesign of the space station, an American-led space station with Russian participation, is adequate to the three criteria that the ranking minority member and I have articulated: That it do significant science; that it be fiscally achievable; and that it meet the needs and the criteria of our international participating partners. That is not unreasonable.

What I do not want, Madam President, is to bind the hands of this committee, subject to another vote on the space station, without going through the regular appropriations process. However, what I am prepared to do is, we anticipate that this report will be done by Thanksgiving; and I will assure the Senator that we will not unfence until we have had a hearing exactly on the nature, the content, and the fiscal aspects of this new design. Then, at that time, we can decide if it is so significantly different from what we think we have agreed to tonight, that we might have to return to the body.

I would not want to bind us to a vote, but I am prepared to agree to a hearing because I think that the questions the Senator from Virginia has would be the same questions I would have in order to be able to listen to what the design is. But I really encourage the Senator from Virginia to not have us come back to do a second vote when the normal appropriations process is done except on one item.

I am ready to agree to a hearing. Would that satisfy the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I thank the manager, the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

I regret to say that I would not find that an acceptable substitute for the goals of the Senator from Virginia, as manifested by the amendment at the desk. I say that with great respect.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I understand that.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, one of the things that we do to try to see that the will of the Congress and the intent of the law is carried out is to set up a fencing mechanism so that those who are implementing the law have to come back to those of us who write the law and show that, in fact, they have carried out the intent of Congress.

What the distinguished Senator from Virginia has done is sought to magnify

a fence that we were trying to use to achieve the purposes that he is supportive of, and now he would like us to have to come back to Congress and bring a bill to the floor of the Senate, which could be filibustered. We could technically have to get a supermajority in order to move ahead with a project that 59 Members of the Senate have just voted in favor of.

Also, this amendment, if adopted, would set what I believe is a very bad precedent because it would either force committees to stop fencing money—and therefore we would lose our ability to have effective oversight—or we would have to subject ourselves to the potential of having multiple votes on basically the same issue.

So I think, again, this is a case—and I made the point when we had the previous debate, and I do not intend to repeat all those speeches tonight—but this is a case where the distinguished chairman and I have tried to exercise oversight; we have tried to hold NASA accountable. The mechanisms we have used, which are conventional mechanisms, in fact, are used routinely by the Armed Services Committee, on which the distinguished Senator from Virginia served as the senior Republican. What we are trying to do here is simply to exercise oversight. I am afraid if we accepted this amendment, we would be forced to come back and vote on the whole issue again.

I think the Senate has spoken on this subject. I have no doubt that they will speak again with a very clear voice, perhaps with a larger margin, because now we are talking about really attacking the mechanism which the Congress has used to do its work. And so I do not see that we are going to serve any purpose at 7:30 tonight by debating the whole space station again.

The distinguished Senator from Virginia very ably, with great passion and skill, made his case. We had a vote on it. His position did not carry. He is certainly within his right to offer this amendment, but I think that this amendment disrupts what we are trying to do. I think that it discourages the kind of oversight that we all agreed that this project needs.

Therefore, I am opposed to this amendment, and I hope that it will be rejected.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, if I may make a brief reply to my colleague from Texas. During the course of this debate on the amendment, which has now encompassed 2 days, we have had a most astonishing development in the world. The Senator from Arkansas read from the initial reports regarding some developments in Russia which I find are germane to the consideration of this amendment.

I am not going to go back into it, but essentially:

Boris Yeltsin, the President, moved to take complete control of Russia—

Complete control of Russia. That is control of this program. That is control of this program; one man—

in a constitutional coup on Tuesday, ousting the hardline Congress and announcing elections for a new Parliament in December.

One of the more dramatic chapters of this debate is one when we were advised in S-407 that there would be a briefing—regrettably, only five or six Senators showed up, of which I was one, because I felt duty bound—a briefing about how the space program was an integral part of an overall approach by this administration. I commend the President for this overall approach, and I am going to support him. It is an approach whereby we would involve Russia in this program. The sum of \$100 million was mentioned.

Madam President, that is just in the brief period of less than 48 hours when the Senate has been dealing with this amendment. I ask my colleagues, I do not know what this report portends for the future of Russian participation in the space station. But I guarantee, Madam President, this Senator wants to know before another dollar is released under the proposed fence. That is why I ask this body to reconvene.

Is it too much to ask this body to spend an hour or two in debate on \$900 million? Is that asking too much? This fence delegates to perhaps one or two Senators the responsibility for close to a billion dollars. I say this to my good friend from Texas. He might well be the Senator on this side to make that decision, and he has fought hard for this amendment. He won. He delivered 34 Republican votes. That is a mark of pride.

But I am reminded of my old history professor, I say to my good friend, the senior Senator from Texas. The year was 1946. I came back after a brief tour in the U.S. Navy, matriculated in my father's old school, Washington and Lee University.

The history professor was named Bean, Dr. Bean. He was in his seventies, and he was recognized not only in Virginia, but throughout the Nation, as the foremost expert on that tragic chapter of history from roughly 1860 to 1865. He had a book on his desk, and all students as they walked in, were required to touch the book and then take their seats. I say to my distinguished colleague from Alabama, my contemporary in life, every student touched that book. The title of that book, a book written by one of Robert E. Lee's aides-de-camp, a man who had traveled with Lee through the various campaigns and had taken an opportunity after that tragic chapter to sit down and write a book, I say to my distinguished friend from Texas, was "The Unbiased History of the Civil War, From the Southern Point of View."

Somehow, I feel the senior Senator from Texas might not apply the objectivity, the depth of analysis, and reasoning that might be required to obligate this body, the U.S. Senate, to \$900 million.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I think there has been said all there is to say on this amendment. I believe we are at an impasse on this, and in a few seconds I will be making a motion which I hope will bring this debate to a close and we can begin to start the debate on ASRM.

I know that when we initially talked about the amendment of the Senator from Virginia it was going to take 15 minutes. It has now taken longer than we anticipated. I believe, whatever the arguments, we would only be repeating ourselves. I truly respect the Senator from Virginia and what he is attempting to do. But, Madam President, I now must move to table Senator WARNER's amendment No. 908, and I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to table occur at 8 p.m.; further, that the amendment be laid aside so that Senator BUMPERS may now offer the ASRM amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HEFLIN. I would just like to ask unanimous consent. It will take 15 seconds.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Could we get this agreement first?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the agreement?

Mr. BUMPERS. Reserving the right to object, would the distinguished Senator restate the request?

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to table the Warner amendment No. 908 and ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to table occur at 8 p.m.; further, that the amendment be laid aside so that Senator BUMPERS may now offer his ASRM amendment and that we may proceed on the discussion on ASRM.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the distinguished managers of the bill might consider not only laying aside the vote but having the vote occur at some time which would be most convenient to the majority of Senators. It may well be that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas will require a vote later this evening and that the votes could be put back to back. I speak only to accommodate the Senate.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I insist upon my original unanimous consent request.

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

The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HEFLIN. I wonder if I might make a 10-second unanimous consent request.

Mr. BUMPERS. Certainly.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a legislative fellow serving in my office, Deborah Bailey, be granted privileges of the floor during the consideration of the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations bill.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 910

(Purpose: To provide funding for the termination of the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor project for the purposes of reducing the deficit in the Federal budget)

Mr. BUMPERS. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], for himself and Mr. BENNETT, proposes an amendment numbered 910.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. 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 62, after line 2, add the following: *Provided*, That of the funds provided under this heading, \$100,000,000 shall be made available for termination of the contracts relating to the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor project."

Mr. BUMPERS. Madam President, this is an amendment that deals with a program that is not familiar to several Senators. I understand that when you do not understand an amendment you just vote "no." So I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland, I do not want to belabor the length of time that is going to be required to educate people, but I do think a few things ought to be said.

The first thing that ought to be said is you have an opportunity here to save \$2 billion, and you do not risk one single thing. In 1989 there was a program established to build what is called an advanced solid rocket motor at Yellow Creek, MI.

Now, you all know, of course, that JAMIE WHITTEN is chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a good man, and, believe it or not, JAMIE WHITTEN's district was chosen as a place to build this advanced solid rocket motor.

You should also know that President Bush was very much opposed to it. Vice President Quayle, who had been delegated quite a bit of the space function, was opposed to it. But it was something of a big piece of pork, and so we began building a facility to produce an engine for our shuttles. This was in the wake of the *Challenger* disaster, which I think was in 1986. Everybody remembers the trauma of the *Challenger*.

Now, Madam President, this is a low-scale kind of space station thing, I guess. We have already spent \$1.5 billion. It started out at a little over \$2 billion. The cost is now \$3.8 billion. We

are going to have to spend \$2.3 billion more to complete the project. And, incidentally, my amendment leaves \$100 million to terminate it.

We all believe in safety. We want our shuttles to be safe. We want our astronauts to be safe. Madam President, if you look through the documentation on this, you will find that everybody has been opposed to the advanced solid rocket motor project but it is kind of like Rasputin; it just keeps surviving.

Last year, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly killed this program. I want to repeat that. Last year the House of Representatives voted by a very substantial margin to terminate this project, but not the Senate. And the Senate only had \$50 million in it. It was called "hold" money to keep the project on hold; \$50 million.

So we take our little \$50 million over to conference with the House, which has overwhelmingly torpedoed the program, and guess what? It comes back with \$360 million in it.

That is a piece of legerdemain that I have never understood. When I came to the Senate, I was taught that the conference committee could not exceed the highest number and could not go below the lowest number. Here we put \$50 million in, the House zips it, and we come back with \$300-plus million. The Yellow Creek just keeps grinding away.

You understand they have not produced the first motor, and they are a long way from producing the first motor.

Lo and behold, this year the House was so upset about what happened last year—and I want everybody to hear this—the House killed this program about 3 weeks ago by a vote of 378 to 43. Let me repeat that. The House of Representatives has already voted to terminate this program despite the fact that JAMIE WHITTEN is still a Member of the House of Representatives. They voted to kill the program 379 to 43.

To the distinguished chairman's credit, she has a little over \$100 million in this bill for it. And the reason I am trying to torpedo this program is because we are going to wind up going back to conference with the House. And it is going to come back over here with \$300 or \$400 million on it.

It is a flagrant violation of the rules of the Senate to come back here with more money by far than either body had voted for.

The idea was we would never have another *Challenger* disaster. But, Madam President, we have not had one since then anyway. Did you know that until ALBERT GORE became Vice President of the United States, everybody wanted this program terminated. Here is an opportunity for a few people to redeem themselves if they choose to, and say I voted to cut something.

But if you look at the GAO report, if you look at almost any study that has been done on this thing, everybody

says I do not understand why we are building this thing.

Madam President, today the proponents of this thing, Senator COCHRAN, Senator HEFLIN, are going to show you a letter from Daniel Goldin, who is head of NASA. He does not want it either. But his letter says he does. I assume he does not. NASA never has wanted it. This is the same guy that could not tell you what the space station is going to cost. But he sent a letter over here saying, yes, we sure would like to have it.

You are going to hear arguments that the extra thrust that ASRM will provide the shuttle is going to be necessary for our space station. According to NASA, the latest version of the space station is being redesigned so that all its components can be placed into a 51.6 degree orbit. That is the so-called "international orbit", using a new aluminum lithium tank. And the new tanks will greatly reduce the weight of the launch vehicle and allow the solid rocket motors to lift the shuttle into the higher orbit.

The administration is also seriously considering using Russia's large proton rockets instead of the space shuttle to lift the largest components into orbit. After debate today, and after what is happening in the Soviet Union, in Russia, I do not think that is going to happen.

But Madam President, why do we want to build in that kind of redundancy when everybody agrees that the redesigned rocket will do everything we want it to do, with absolutely no additional cost except some tinkering with the redesign?

Let me tell you one other thing. The environmentalists of this country are on their ear because of advanced solid rocket motor tests. Every test will generate 100 tons of hydrochloric acid. And that is a very serious environmental risk. It may not make any difference to you. But that is one of the reasons the Audubon Society and the National Wildlife Federation, the Sierra Club, the Natural Resources Defense Council, every environmental group in the country is opposed to this motor.

But the real truth is in this GAO report dated November 1992, about 10 months ago. If you really want to know what this is all about, listen carefully to what the GAO says:

While the new design features and automated manufacturing processes hold the potential for a more reliable and safer motor, ASRM's design is as yet unproven and its reliability will not be known for a long time.

As a result two NASA advisory groups have recommended that the agency reconsider its designs to develop this advanced motor and, according to these groups, the advanced motor's high technical and programmatic risks, together with the redesigned motor's proven performance, make development—

Listen to this—

make the development of the advanced motor unnecessary.

Why, in view of the GAO report which quotes two advisory groups of NASA saying we do not need this motor, why would we spend over \$3 billion on that?

Listen to this:

Both the National Research Council and the Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel have questioned whether ASRM will be safer and more reliable than the redesigned solid rocket motor, and have recommended that the program be reconsidered. According to the research council, NASA should rely on the redesigned solid rocket motor since it has proven to be reliable.

The research council also stated that:

It believes the ASRM program contains high technical and programmatic risks.

For example, in a 1991 report, the research council questioned the design of ASRM field joint and welded factory joint. It goes on:

In 1989 the Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel also questioned the need for the new motor since many other elements of the shuttle system could be replaced or modified to contribute more to improving safety.

I am going to close with this. I am not going to debate this all night. I did not get any more votes by debating 24 hours on the space station than I would have gotten if I had not. But I just want to close with this one statement from the GAO and the GAO is quoting basically two NASA panels.

Here is what they say:

When ASRM was first approved NASA had no actual flight experience—

With this redesigned motor.

Through October 1992 the redesigned solid rocket motor has successfully flown 26 missions.

Since the January, 1986 *Challenger* accident, NASA has enhanced its safety organization and increased the number of quality assurance inspections. Following each launch, the solid rocket motors are disassembled and inspected and, to date, these inspections have identified no major problems, according to NASA.

Madam President, please let the record show that I offer this amendment on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas is my good friend, and I regret his offering this amendment which requires us to challenge some of the statements that have been made about the savings that could be realized if this Advanced Solid Rocket Motor Program is canceled, and all funds to be appropriated for it are deleted in this bill. But I am convinced, based on my understanding of the facts, that the claim that \$2 billion would be saved if this appropriation is deleted and stricken from this bill is just simply not supported by the facts. Senators will remember that this program was

created as a result of the *Challenger* disaster, the explosion of the shuttle in which seven astronauts were killed back in 1986.

A concerted effort was begun to figure out why that accident happened and what could be done to prevent a catastrophic failure from happening again. If we are to have a manned space program, we need a safe space program; we need a safer space shuttle; we need a more reliable system. And so engineers and scientists and all of NASA were mobilized and put to the task of coming up with a better rocket motor, a safer, more reliable motor. ASRM was born of that effort.

The Senator's opening remarks about how this is a program that was established in the home district of the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee omits the fact that the site where this program was finally located and constructed had been chosen as the site for the building of a nuclear power reactor and plant for the Tennessee Valley Authority, but because of a re-study of the power generation needs of the TVA; that project, although it was already under construction, was abandoned. Here was the Federal Government with condemned property, a partially constructed facility, up in the northeast corner of the State of Mississippi, very close to the Alabama and Tennessee lines on the Tennessee River in the Tennessee Valley power supply area, and no use for it. The Federal Government had a white elephant on its hands. Hundreds of people in that region had been thrown out of work. It was controversial to start with when TVA decided to build that reactor in the first place. But the Government had made its decision.

Then NASA decided, with advice from a Presidential Commission, to take advantage of this vacant and available site to construct this newly designed rocket motor. It had been put out for competitive bids by contractors from around the country, the best that America had available, and it was decided to locate it at Yellow Creek, MS, because it was financially beneficial for the Government to locate it there. So TVA transferred that property to NASA, and NASA began the construction of this facility. And now it is almost completed.

We are nearing the end of the construction phase, with new motors available for use by NASA to make the shuttle program safer and more reliable. This new motor will reduce the chances for failure from potential gas leaks; it will reduce the ways in which the system could fail; it will make it a much safer and more efficient system.

If this program is canceled at this time, it will actually cost the Government more money than it will save.

The Senator quotes from a GAO report that had some critical things to say. I notice that only one group was

questioned and quoted in that report by the Senator. NASA's side of the story was not quoted by the Senator. NASA disputed those claims by the person who was quoted in that report and said that the ASRM Program is necessary and that it will be beneficial.

The President put \$313 million in his budget for this next fiscal year for ASRM and asked that the program be continued, that it be completed. There is evidence that we put in the RECORD in the Appropriations Committee that very clearly shows that Daniel Goldin, the Administrator of NASA, supports this program.

I will read a portion of the letter, Madam President:

NASA has examined alternative ways of obtaining the increased performance necessary, and we believe the ASRM—either by itself or in concert with other improvements—is the most obvious solution. The ASRM is an important consideration as we assess a space station at higher and lower inclinations.

NASA and the administration continue to support the fiscal year 1994 budget request of \$313 million for the ASRM program.

Our committee has looked very hard at this issue. The subcommittee reported out a bill that calls for an appropriation of \$162.6 million for this program in fiscal year 1994, and it suggests to NASA that offsets be identified so that the full \$313 million can be made available next year. NASA, as I understand it, is undertaking that review.

If we are going to continue to have a manned space flight program, which I think is the appropriate national policy, then we need a safe and reliable system. This is the new, safer system that we have developed. And now to urge that it be abandoned, canceled here at the 11th hour, is absurd.

It is fiscal nonsense to have invested all of this money, constructed this facility, brought in engineers and scientists and workers from all over the country to this location, where a tri-State area of infrastructure has been established to support this program, where education dollars have been spent, schools have been built, and now abandon and cancel this program. You cannot believe the amount of effort, energy, and commitment of resources that has occurred in these three States to accommodate this facility, to support it and make it successful.

The people in this area are proud to have devoted the energy and resources and commitment they have to this project. But to have the U.S. Congress, after all of this effort and all of this hard work, stiff-arm the people who have committed themselves to this goal, to develop a safer and more reliable shuttle motor, that will help us lift larger payloads to accommodate the construction of the space station, as a side benefit, and to do it all for less expense, to do it more efficiently than we would have been able to do so

before, seems to me the height of bad judgment for the Congress to now decide that we have changed our minds, and all because somebody said this was not a good idea after all. Well, it is the best idea we have been able to come up with, and the Senate should support it.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter that I referred to from Daniel Goldin, Administrator of NASA, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, September 8, 1993.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COCHRAN: Thank you for your letter of August 31, 1993, regarding the desirability of the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor (ASRM) program.

As you correctly observe, additional performance will be extremely useful if the Space Shuttle is to deploy Space Station elements to higher inclinations, as was recommended by the President's Advisory Committee on the Redesign of the Space Station. NASA has examined alternative ways of obtaining the increased performance necessary, and we believe the ASRM—either by itself or in concert with other improvements—is the most obvious solution. The ASRM is an important consideration as we assess a Space Station at higher and lower inclinations.

NASA and the Administration continue to support the fiscal year 1994 budget request of \$313 million for the ASRM program.

We appreciate your work in support of this program and stand ready to assist in any way possible.

Sincerely,

DANIEL S. GOLDIN,
Administrator.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I urge the Senate to reject this amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 908

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 8 p.m. having arrived, under the previous order, the question now occurs on the motion of the Senator from Maryland to lay on the table amendment No. 908 offered by the Senator from Virginia. A rollcall vote has not been requested.

The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I request 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 on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

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

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOXER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 274 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Akaka	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Graham	Murray
Biden	Gramm	Nickles
Bingaman	Gregg	Packwood
Boxer	Hatch	Pressler
Breaux	Hatfield	Reid
Brown	Heflin	Riegle
Burns	Hutchison	Robb
Campbell	Inouye	Rockefeller
Cochran	Kennedy	Roth
Coverdell	Leahy	Shelby
Craig	Lott	Simpson
Danforth	Lugar	Smith
Daschle	Mack	Stevens
Dodd	McCain	Thurmond
Domenici	McConnell	Wallop
Faircloth	Mikulski	Wofford
Feinstein	Moseley-Braun	
Glenn	Moynihan	

NAYS—39

Baucus	Dorgan	Lautenberg
Boren	Durenberger	Levin
Bradley	Exon	Lieberman
Bryan	Feingold	Mathews
Bumpers	Ford	Metzenbaum
Byrd	Grassley	Mitchell
Chafee	Harkin	Nunn
Coats	Hollings	Pell
Cohen	Jeffords	Sasser
Conrad	Kassebaum	Simon
D'Amato	Kerrey	Specter
DeConcini	Kerry	Warner
Dole	Kohl	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—6

Bond	Johnston	Pryor
Helms	Kemphorne	Sarbanes

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 908) was agreed to.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 910

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, am I correct the amendment of my friend from Arkansas is currently before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the Bumpers amendment No. 910; the Senator is correct.

Mr. HATCH. I would like to speak on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Madam President, the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is correct; the Senate is not in order.

Mr. HATCH. I would like to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished majority leader.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of H.R. 2419, the VA-HUD appropriations bill, at 9:15 a.m., on Wednesday, September 22, that Senator BRYAN be recognized to offer an amendment on the SETI Program; that there be a time limitation of 1 hour for debate on the amendment with no second-degree amendment in order thereto, with the time actually divided and controlled in the usual form; that when the time is used or yielded back, the Bryan amendment be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate then resume consideration of the Bumpers amendment No. 910; that there be 20 minutes remaining for debate on the Bumpers amendment No. 910, with the time equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that at noon tomorrow the Senate, without intervening action or debate, vote on or in relation to the Bumpers amendment No. 910; and that upon disposition of the Bumpers amendment, without intervening action or debate, the Senate proceed to vote on or in relation to the Bryan amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HEFLIN. Just reserving the right to object, if you come in at 9:15—I am just looking at the time schedule. With the Bryan amendment it would appear 20 minutes, we could vote before 12. Is there some reason why we would delay the vote until 12?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, because I am trying to accommodate several Senators. What my intention is, is that this debate would take us to 10:35. We are now waiting to hear from our colleagues on whether or not a third amendment would be offered and debated in that time period, and then there will be three votes to occur at that time.

MR. HEFLIN. I have no objection.

Mr. BUMPERS. Madam President, reserving the right to object, may I ask one clarification from the majority leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. This is 20 minutes of additional debate on my amendment in the morning, but we will continue on the debate tonight?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is my intention.

Mr. BUMPERS. Anybody who wishes to speak on this amendment tonight may do so?

Mr. MITCHELL. There will be unlimited debate this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I modify my request to also preclude amendments to the language that may be stricken, by the amendments to which I referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Reserving the right to object, Madam President, I ask the majority leader a question. Is there going to be a period for morning business tomorrow?

Mr. MITCHELL. No, there will not.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. No?

Mr. MITCHELL. No.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. That is throughout the day?

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, no, I do not rule out the possibility if Senators would like to speak. If we can organize a period for morning business later in the day, if it is convenient for Senators, I will be pleased to do that.

How long would the Senator like?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Ten minutes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then I have no objection if the Senator would be prepared to be here at 9:10?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Absolutely.

Mr. MITCHELL. This does not preclude that. This just says "when the Senate returns to consideration of the bill at 9:15." I will be prepared to have morning business for 10 minutes at 9:05.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I appreciate it.

Mr. MITCHELL. That would be in a separate order.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the majority leader. I have no objection.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I should modify my request to make clear that there would be no second-degree amendment in order to either of the amendments listed, both the Bryan and the Bumpers amendments.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, let me just make clear, then, the status we are in. The Bumpers amendment No. 910 is the pending amendment. Debate will continue on that amendment this evening.

At 9:15 tomorrow morning the Senate will return to this bill. Senator BRYAN will be recognized to offer his amendment. There will be 1 hour of debate on that equally divided. Then that will be laid aside and there will be 20 minutes more of debate on the Bumpers amendment. Following that it is my hope that between now and tomorrow morning we can get agreement from one of our colleagues who has an amendment that will be offered; that would take us to approximately 10:35, debate that until noon, and then the votes would occur, as currently scheduled, on the Bumpers amendment, then the Bryan amendment, and on a third amendment if agreement can be reached on that.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Again, let me ask the majority leader, I understood originally we would go back to the Bumpers amendment at 11:40, following the Bryan amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. If we start on the Bryan amendment at 9:15 and debate for 1 hour, we would be back on the Bumpers amendment at 10:15 for 20 minutes, from 10:15 until 10:35.

Mr. BUMPERS. Madam President, I hate to be the skunk at the lawn party. We are supposed to mark up the California desert bill in the morning, which is my bill—it is really Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator BOXER's bill—at 10 o'clock.

Is there any way to move? Can you put another amendment in there and postpone my additional 20 minutes for, say, an hour?

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the previous agreement be modified so that the 20 minutes remaining for debate on the Bumpers amendment tomorrow occur between 11:40 a.m. and noon rather than immediately following the debate on the Bryan amendment as previously requested.

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank the majority leader for that.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. Will the majority leader yield? As I understand it, then, this evening there would only be debate on the ASRM and that no amendments could be offered tonight on the bill?

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, it is my understanding that the Bumpers amendment is pending, therefore it would take unanimous consent to set that aside for any other amendment to be offered.

I inquire of the Chair whether my understanding in that respect is correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct; a unanimous consent request would be in order to set aside the Bumpers amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. So I think it is the clear intention of all that what occurred this evening is merely more debate on the Bumpers amendment. Obviously, once a Senator gets the floor, a Senator can speak on any subject he or she wishes. I do not think it is any intention that any amendments be offered.

What we do hope is that the gap between the Bryan amendment, debate on which will conclude at 10:15 a.m., and the resumption of debate on the Bumpers amendment, which will occur at 11:40 a.m., will be filled by another amendment to be offered, with a vote on that scheduled to occur following the now-scheduled votes on Bumpers and Bryan, which will begin at noon.

So I request of the managers that they make their usual diligent effort to try to line up such an amendment—at least one—so that time will not be wasted.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, if the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Maine will allow me just to inter-

ject for about a minute here, if I can have my colleagues' attention. The distinguished Senator from Maryland has been doing a great job in moving this bill forward. Having brought appropriations bills to this floor, I empathize with her in trying to get a finite list of amendments and get the bill completed.

I can tell my colleagues, there is another reason for doing this. The foreign operations bill is directly behind us. We are all aware of what happened in Russia today. I met with the President of the United States this evening and talked about the foreign aid bill, about conversations he had with President Yeltsin and others. I think it is absolutely essential to think of our own national security, to go forward with our foreign operations appropriations as quickly as we can. It does not mean the President is going to send money immediately to Russia or anywhere else in the NIS, Newly Independent States, without knowing what the situation is going to be. But as the leader of the free world and as the one superpower in the world, the President has to have that ability to be able to act.

There is another reason for moving very quickly. We have to pass this bill. It already has about a hundred differences with the House bill. We then have to go to conference—keeping in mind the fact that we are going to break for the religious holiday on Friday—get it conferenced, get the conference report adopted by the House, get it adopted by the Senate and signed into law by midnight September 30, or about two-thirds of the Russian aid, or Newly Independent States aid for all of it—Russia, Ukraine, everywhere else—two-thirds of that is lost.

The flexibility that the President also needs in dealing with the peace process between the Israelis and PLO, that the Israelis want him to have, obviously the Palestinians want him to have, obviously the American people want him to have, that is in limbo at a time when the President wants to move forward. Both the Palestinians and the Israelis are turning to the one country that can bring that kind of leadership saying bring us together on this very difficult road to peace following one of the most historic events we witnessed a week ago with the signing of the peace agreement on the South lawn of the White House.

So what I am saying is, please help the distinguished Senator from Maryland and the distinguished Senator from Texas in getting their bill through quickly because, frankly, if we are not on the foreign operations bill tomorrow, and hopefully either finished tomorrow or in the wee hours of Thursday morning, we run a real risk of not getting that bill through.

So I have had numerous colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, telling me of their support for the foreign oper-

ations bill. I have had numerous colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, tell me of their support for the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. And I will tell my colleagues, time is running out. If we are not completed really within a day, day and a half, we are gone. Much of that flexibility that we need as a Nation and is supported by a vast majority of Republicans and Democrats on this floor is going to be lost.

So I implore Republicans to work with their distinguished leader, and Democrats to work with our distinguished leader. I know the two leaders strongly support getting this bill passed. Please help us on it.

Madam President, I thank you very much, and I thank the distinguished leader and my distinguished friend from Utah. I thank them for their usual courtesy.

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that at 10:15 a.m. tomorrow, Senator NICKLES be recognized to offer an amendment on national service; that there be a time limitation of 1 hour for debate on the amendment, with no second-degree amendment in order thereto, with the time equally divided and controlled in the usual form; and that when the time is used or yielded back, the Nickles amendment be temporarily laid aside; and that the Senate resume consideration and debate on the Bumpers amendment 910, pursuant to the previous order.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of the Bryan amendment, without intervening action or debate, the Senate proceed to vote on or in relation to the Nickles amendment.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, therefore, the Senate will tomorrow morning debate three amendments: Senator BRYAN's amendment, Senator NICKLES' amendment and the pending amendment by Senator BUMPERS, and will vote on those three amendments—the Bumpers amendment first, the Bryan amendment second and the Nickles amendment third—beginning at noon tomorrow.

In view of these agreements, there will be no further rollcall votes this evening. The Senate will remain in session for further debate on the pending Bumpers amendment.

If I may respond to the distinguished Senator from Vermont with respect to

his point, as he and other Senators are aware, I attempted earlier to obtain an agreement that would have permitted us to complete action on this bill by 5 p.m. tomorrow, at which time it was my intention to proceed to the foreign operations bill. Objection was made to that request and we now will explore other alternatives in an effort to complete action on this bill tomorrow at the earliest feasible time, and then to proceed to the foreign operations bill. So we are mindful of the concerns which he has raised, and we will do our best to see if we can get to that bill as soon as possible.

Madam President, I thank the Senator from Utah for his courtesy, and I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I want to support the courageous initiatives taken by my good friend from Arkansas to eliminate the advanced solid rocket motor. I do not always agree with my friend on defense and space issues, but I have never hesitated to admire what I consider to be his solid determination to control spending and reduce the deficit.

Madam President, I want to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for offering this amendment, and arguing for it. I think he is right.

I would like to give 10 solid reasons why the Senator from Arkansas is correct on this topic.

First, ASRM is a make-work program—something the media commonly refers to as pork. It has been attacked as wasteful by reputable groups—virtually every major scientific organization in the Nation—and even such popular media journals as the Reader's Digest. When the House nearly killed it last year, it was resurrected only by a last-minute smoke-filled room type of deal that traded away veterans' housing, think of it, veterans' housing, to find the money for this wasteful program.

Second, ASRM has a 100-percent cost overrun, and is nearly 6 years behind schedule. NASA stated its original costs to be \$1.67 billion in 1988. Today, we are looking at a \$3.7 to \$3.9 billion bill. The ASRM's 1994 launch date has now been pushed to the year 2000.

Third, look at the opposition. The Bush administration, virtually every major environmental group, Dan Quayle, who was President Bush's "Mr. Space." And, every major taxpayer organization and other antiwaste groups. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from 13 such groups adamantly opposing the environmental and wasteful consequences of adopting the ASRM be printed in the RECORD.

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

FRIENDS OF THE EARTH, NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION, NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY, MILITARY TOXICS PROJECT, SIERRA CLUB, CITIZENS FOR A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL COALITION OF MISSISSIPPI, 20/20 VISION NATIONAL PROJECT, NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, SIERRA CLUB LEGAL DEFENSE FUND, COUNCIL FOR CITIZENS AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE, FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS

August 10, 1993.

Hon. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,
Chair, Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, Senate Appropriations Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIR: On June 24 of this year the House voted 379 to 43 to kill NASA's wasteful and polluting Advanced Solid Rocket Motor (ASRM) program. We urge you to cancel this program in your Subcommittee's FY94 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies appropriations bill.

The overwhelming show of support for the House amendment offered by Representative Klug sent a signal that Congress is serious about killing this pork-barrel program this year. A bipartisan companion bill in the Senate (S. 520, sponsored by Sens. Bumpers and Cohen) has already attracted a number of cosponsors.

The ASRM has serious fiscal and environmental problems. The program is already six years behind schedule and 100 percent over budget. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that cancellation of the ASRM will save taxpayers \$1.6 billion over the next five years. For these reasons, groups such as the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, and Citizens for a Sound Economy have all joined in the fight to kill the ASRM.

Environmental groups have also rallied against this rocket program. During testing, the ASRM will emit hydrochloric acid which contributes to acid rain and toxic heavy metals which will irrevocably damage land, wetlands, fish, and wildlife in southern Mississippi. ASRM test will also threaten human health with the release of acid-coated particulates that complicate and create respiratory problems.

Finally, if and when the ASRM is launched it will emit chemicals that will react with and harm the stratospheric ozone layer. In response to these threats, numerous environmental organizations have opposed the ASRM including Citizens for a Healthy Environment, a group formed by southern Mississippi residents determined to fight ASRM testing and protect their families.

Last year, after the House voted to kill the ASRM, the Senate gave the program \$50 million which was parlayed into \$360 million in conference. We are determined to prevent this from happening again this year. NASA's already overburdened budget cannot support unneeded pork-barrel projects like the ASRM. Cutting funding for the ASRM is one of the hard choices that Congress must make if NASA's long-term budget plans are to be brought back down to earth. Please help protect the environment and reduce unnecessary spending by canceling further funding of the ASRM.

Sincerely,

Ralph De Gennaro, Director, Appropriations Project, Friends of the Earth.

Jill Lancelot, Director, Congressional Affairs, National Taxpayers Union.

On behalf of:

Brock Evans, Vice President for National Issues, National Audubon Society.

Cathy Hinds, Director, Military Toxics Project.

Lydia Schultz, President, Citizens for a Healthy Environment, Bay St. Louis, MS.

Sharon Newsome, Vice President, Resources Conservation Dept., National Wildlife Federation.

Dr. Robert Esher, Head, DeLisle Environmental Laboratory, Mississippi State University.

William Kulick, on behalf of: Sierra Club Mississippi Chapter.

Jamie Boyll, President, Environmental Coalition of Mississippi, Waveland, MS.

Suellen Lowry, Staff Attorney, Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund.

Steven Aftergood, Senior Research Analyst, Federation of American Scientists.

Lynne White, Prominent local activist, New Orleans, LA.

Tom Schatz, President, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste.

Robin Caiola, Legislative Director, 20/20 Vision National Project.

Debbie Sease, Legislative Director, Sierra Club.

David Hawkins, Atmospheric/Energy Program Coordinator, Natural Resources Defense Council.

*Affiliation for identification purposes only.

Mr. HATCH. Fourth, and this is an argument that touches a raw nerve for me, Mississippi will not lose a single job, or will not lose significant jobs if ASRM is canceled. My State, Utah, does lose 1,000 to 1,200 jobs even if ASRM is eliminated.

Where will these jobs go? They go to Mississippi to work on what is clearly the preferred alternative, a redesigned SRM that is available, was built more cheaply, and is more safe than the drawing board ASRM alternative.

Fifth, I want a good space program, but ASRM will make our already crippled space effort even worse. That is why President Bush and Vice President Quayle tried to end it.

The Federation of American Scientists said that it creates a dangerous environmental hazard. The National Research Council and the Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel said that it lacks technical merit. And even the voice of the space community, Space News, has admitted that NASA cannot have everything and ASRM should be the first to be eliminated.

Sixth, ASRM has split the Congress. The House rejected it. In House debates, the economics of the program were attacked as simply wasteful. Even the administration's usual supporters were offended by the new tactic of suddenly inserting Russian space interests into our program.

Does anyone know the status of the Russian space program? I do. The launch pads are in desperate shape. Equipment is rusting from non-maintenance. It has been cited by space expert James Oberger as a "nightmare." Even Radio Moscow has called the Russian space program a joke.

Seventh, the Bush administration opposed ASRM. It urged the budget be zeroed for the fiscal 1993 and fiscal 1994

budgets. Even congressional supporters of NASA changed positions after hearing the Bush administration arguments.

Eighth, ASRM is simply bad for the environment. Each ground test will generate over 100 tons of hydrogen chloride gas, damaging to the wetlands and contributing to the acid rain in the Mississippi testing region. The chlorine contributes further to ozone depletion, and the aluminum particulates in the fuel are well-known contributors or sources of respiratory problems.

Ninth, we do not need the ASRM. Successive GAO findings have said it is unnecessary for launching the space station and fulfills no scientific or engineering purpose. The same studies point to the redesigned SRM as being preferable for assuring shuttle safety. In fact, the same study noted that the ASRM program called for such cost-cutting measures as elimination of the rocket's O-rings' leaks check. These were the cause of the *Challenger* accident.

Madam President, a February 1993 CBO report cites a savings of \$1.6 billion from cancellation of the ASRM, while stating further that NASA itself would be willing to rely on the redesigned SRM which the report says "is performing well."

I submit this extract from the CBO report for the RECORD, Madam President. I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[Congress of the United States,
Congressional Budget Office]

**REDUCING THE DEFICIT: SPENDING AND
REVENUE OPTIONS**

(A Report to the Senate and House
Committees on the Budget)

**CANCEL THE NASA DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR THE
ADVANCED SOLID ROCKET MOTOR**

	Annual savings (millions of dollars)					Cumulative 5-year savings
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	
Savings from CBO baseline						
Budget authority	370	380	390	400	410	1,950
Outlays	170	320	360	380	400	1,650

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is developing the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor (ASRM) to replace the redesigned solid rocket motor currently used to launch the space shuttle. Canceling the ASRM program could save \$1.6 billion from 1994 through 1998, relative to the CBO baseline. President Bush's budget request for 1993 proposed canceling the program, but the Congress chose to continue funding.

NASA initiated the ASRM program to improve the safety of the space shuttle and to increase the weight of the payloads it can carry. But NASA's own Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel points out that the redesigned rocket booster is performing well. According to the panel, investments in other parts of the shuttle system—for example, the turbo pumps that provide fuel to the space shuttle's main engines—would enhance the safety

of the shuttle more than would investment in the ASRM. As for increasing the carrying capacity of the space shuttle by 12,000 pounds, only the space station program benefits from the increase in capability. The ASRM would serve the space station program in two ways: the shuttle would be able to deploy the space station in fewer flights, and the risky activity of moving equipment from the shuttle to the space station's modules would be reduced because the modules could be more fully equipped when launched.

The ASRM program can be questioned as an investment regardless of its role in the space station program. It is unlikely that the shuttle system will be operated after 2020. If the program's anticipated cost of \$3 billion were spread over 200 shuttle flights, a number sufficient to fly the vehicle eight times a year between 1996 and 2020, developing the ASRM would add \$15 million to the cost of each flight. Predicted decreases in the acquisition cost of ASRM boosters compared with the cost of redesigned solid rocket boosters could offset part of these increased costs.

A 1991 report on the ASRM program by the National Research Council raised other questions. The report indicated that significant design and manufacturing problems may increase the cost of the program and delay the introduction of the booster. Indeed, a 1992 General Accounting Office report found that between January 1988 and July 1992, the cost of development for the ASRM increased by 95 percent; the rocket's first flight has slipped by more than 24 months. If the development of the ASRM is further delayed, it could not be used to deploy the space station unless the schedule for that also slips. If the booster costs more to develop than NASA has anticipated, its addition to the average cost of a shuttle flight would be even greater than the \$15 million noted above.

The case for the ASRM program rests primarily on its ability to support the deployment of the space station. Additional benefits that could accrue from the program include demonstrating the application of advanced manufacturing technology to launch-vehicle production, and the possibility that the booster could be used in space launch systems developed in the future.

Mr. HATCH. Finally, Madam President, there is a better alternative, as I have intimated. We are already developing alternative propulsion systems that have nearly made ASRM obsolete, or certainly will at the slow rate its construction is progressing. In fact, in hearings on the ASRM the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics has labeled it a dead-end development. Alternative rocket motors are simply better in terms of the economics of propulsion as well as safety. The alternatives are fail-safe and produce low levels of toxic exhaust. And let me add that the RSRM has just this month been hailed by NASA for having "no flight safety issues."

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the NASA letter dated September 14, 1993, be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Marshall Space Flight Center, AL.
Date: September 14, 1993.

Subject: RSRM Process-Product Integrity Audit (PPIA) Results.

THIOKOL CORP.

Attn: Mr. George Alford,
Brigham City, UT.

It is my pleasure to forward to you the enclosed letter from Mr. Jim Ehl congratulating Thiokol for "an extensive, comprehensive, and thorough review" during the Phase II Process-Product Integrity Audit. The results of the Phase II Audit confirmed the findings of the Thiokol "Redline" teams and identified no flight safety issues. The confidence expressed in the Thiokol manufacturing-quality system is attributable to every individual that makes up the RSRM team.

America relies upon the safety and reliability of the RSRMs to support the manned space flight program. To fulfill this expectation, it is absolutely critical that we remain vigilant against complacency and that each RSRM team member continue to improve the efficiency, quality, reliability, and safety within their area of responsibility.

Please accept my appreciation for a job well done in support of the PPIA, and convey my thanks to the entire RSRM team.

VICTOR K. HENSON,

Manager, RSRM Project Office.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I hope that I have demonstrated that ASRM simply has no justifiable place in a space program that needs to be noted for quality and not for convenience. Although I have great sympathy for my friends from Mississippi, I have to say that they are not going to lose if ASRM is shut down. They will gain jobs and they will, I think, benefit from whatever program, especially if the SRM Program continues.

Madam President, I appreciate being given this opportunity to make these points. I know there are others who feel otherwise, but I think these scientific points have to be made and that they should be adhered to and we ought to listen to them.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG and Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. Madam President, I rise today in strong support for the advanced solid rocket motor known as the ASRM.

I think there are several factors that we have to bear in mind as we consider this debate. First, the safety of the shuttle and its current solid rocket motors.

Second, the fact that completing the ASRM will result in over \$100 million in cost savings compared to the continued use of the current solid rocket motor even if this space station program was terminated.

Now, this is something I think we ought to bear in mind as we try to reduce the deficit. Actually, it would cost today, regardless of its relationship to the space station, but just through its use with the shuttle alone, \$100 million more to terminate this program than it would cost to complete it.

If the ASRM is used to launch the space station, we will have a net deficit reduction of \$2.5 billion versus continuing with the present motor. If the ASRM is used to launch the space station as is planned, it would actually cost \$2.5 billion more to terminate the program than it would to go ahead and complete it.

Now, if the space station is put in a higher orbit, such as the 51.6-degree inclination that is now being considered by the President in possible relationship with the Russians, the ASRM is the only rocket motor that can reach that orbit.

But let us not forget that shuttle safety is the primary issue. I think sometimes we have forgotten this and stressed other issues like 51.6 orbit and extra lift. The primary issue is safety, the safety of the astronauts that are aboard the shuttle.

The ASRM was born out of disaster, the *Challenger* explosion, an accident attributed to a design considered unacceptably sensitive to a number of factors including but not limited to the O-ring design. It became clear that the Nation must pursue a second source supplier and a new or an advanced solid rocket motor for the space shuttle.

It was not Congressman WHITTEN or some other Members of Congress who were interested in pork who created this program but instead a Presidential Commission that reviewed the causes of the *Challenger* explosion. That Commission came up with the recommendation that there be a completely new advanced solid rocket motor built, that a redesign was insufficient.

They also said it would take some time to do this. In the meantime, we ought to have an interim solid rocket motor. So NASA developed what is known as the revised solid rocket motor. It was built on the idea of trying to provide changes and improvements but it still had the O-ring in it which was the cause of the *Challenger* disaster.

Congress also became concerned that there was no control over the single source, contractor-owned facility that produced the disastrous old solid rocket motor. The decision at that time was that we would recompute the contract on the rocket motor production and get a Government-owned, contractor operated facility which would give NASA greater control over those aspects of the program affecting safety.

The true result of these initiatives was the advanced solid rocket motor to be manufactured in Yellow Creek, MS, 4 miles from the Alabama border. Of course, I have to admit that I have a parochial interest in this. But far beyond that, the issue of safety is what compels me to speak in regard to this and why I have worked so hard on it.

NASA is currently using the redesigned solid rocket motor known as the

ASRM to launch the space shuttle. The motor was never seen as anything more than a interim measure, a quick fix, to keep the shuttle flying while the real solution, the ASRM, was being developed. The primary cause of the O-ring leak that resulted in the *Challenger's* explosion was fixed but the threat of another O-ring leak remains. There have been certain things that have occurred that show this clearly.

In September of 1992, during a proposed launch test, a leak was discovered in the shuttle's rockets O-ring.

I have before me the Orlando Sentinel which revealed that a recent test showed that there was a leak in the shuttle rocket's O-ring. The problem in the booster rocket is similar to the one that led to the *Challenger's* explosion.

This article goes into details. While it was admirable that NASA and the manufacturer were honest about this problem, it nevertheless points out that there is still problems with the O-ring.

There were two Associated Press news releases which verify the Orlando Sentinel's story. At the proper time in regard to the debate, I will enter them into the RECORD.

The ASRM will provide a more reliable and robust booster which will greatly enhance the space shuttle's launch safety.

First, the ASRM will not have any O-rings, completely eliminating the cause of failure which brought about the *Challenger's* explosion. Other improvements, including fewer joints designed into the motor, the elimination of asbestos insulation—and we are using the present rocket motor today with asbestos insulation in it—and a propellant design that minimizes the need to throttle down the main engines during ascent are also incorporated in the new motor. Each of these enhancements is designed to reduce the sensitivity and increase the reliability of the boosters. This new design should reduce the possibility of having to abort a mission and return to the launch site if one of the Shuttle's liquid fuel main engines shuts down early in launch. For some missions, the ASRM reduces this window of vulnerability by up to half. The present solid rocket motor uses a series of joints, bolts, and seals which the pressure of the firing tends to open. But the ASRM is designed so that the pressure acts to close its joints, thus reducing by 88 percent the potential for gas leaks such as the one that led to the *Challenger's* destruction.

The manufacturing facility at Yellow Creek made use of nearly \$300 million in infrastructure which stood idle when the Yellow Creek nuclear plant construction was canceled by TVA. The economic impact of the loss of that nuclear plant on the local area was staggering. Unemployment grew to double digits. The ASRM Program acquired

this site for \$5 million and began the process of converting it for use as an ASRM manufacturing facility employing nearly 2,000 people during construction and 1,200 permanent employees.

The plant is state of the art, highly automated and fully adheres to the principle of greater competition in Federal procurement. Automated production is expected to reduce human error in manufacturing shuttle motors considerably.

According to NASA, as many as half of the past solid rocket motor discrepancies result from human involvement in the manufacturing process. The new plant will automate a wide range of production facilities including mixing propellants, supplying insulation and adhesives and cleaning motor cases.

The emphasis on this new design is safety. The reason is simple. The shuttle is a unique and vital national system which transports a most precious national asset: the men and women who fly in it in the pursuit of scientific and technological advancement.

Opponents of the program have said, "Well, the present motor has flown successfully." Senator BUMPERS stated that as of October 1992 there were 26 flights in which the present rocket motor had been used and there has been no disaster.

Actually, the shuttle had flown successfully on nearly that number of flights when the fateful 25th mission took place and took the lives of the gallant Americans, including the first teacher in space.

There have now been 33 successful flights since the *Challenger's* explosion. I do not think that there is a great deal of difference between 33 and 25. You cannot, in my judgment, say that 33 successful flights means that now you have a safe rocket motor.

There are those that would conclude that there is no need for an enhancement to a solid rocket motor design after 33 launches, but I am not one of those.

I could not tell our current and future generations of American astronauts that safe enough is good enough. The current system relies on 30-year-old technology in solid rocket propellants. Manufacturing relies heavily on human intervention in the process, an intervention that we have already heard causes 50 percent of manufacturing discrepancies. The current manufacturing processes include the practice of batch mixing in which about 165 individual containers of propellant are mixed in separate facilities to avoid large explosions and then transported to be poured into the motor.

In the ASRM production facility, the propellant would be continuously mixed and directly poured into the motor cases. ASRM provides safety enhancement for both the astronauts who use it and the dedicated employees who manufacture it. A practical and cost-

effective attribute of the ASRM design is that it produces 12,000 pounds of additional lift at a cost per flight set almost one-third less than the current system.

Since ASRM can lift a greater payload, the cost per pound to orbit will be significantly reduced. A payload requiring 13 flights of the shuttle under the current system could be delivered using only 10 flights with the ASRM.

The opponents of ASRM argue that its termination would save scarce funding resources. This is simply not the case. Even if the ASRM Program is not used in conjunction with the space station, if it is not used at all with the space station, the United States will save approximately \$100 million over 10 years by using the new motor on the space shuttle.

I base this statement on the fact that the cost difference between the current flight motor set and ASRM over this period would amount to \$1.4 billion, and the contract termination liabilities are \$300 million, which combined total \$100 million more than the \$1.6 billion needed to finish the program.

In calculating that, you figure that there is between seven and eight flights of the shuttle per year. This number will certainly increase in the event that we do not go forward with the space station. So you fly 8 missions a year at \$18 million per flight, multiplied by 10 years, and you come out \$1.4 billion.

This is a matter of true savings. It would cost more to terminate the ASRM Program than it would to go forward to complete it.

If the cost saving of using the ASRM to put the space station in orbit are considered, the figures become even more compelling. Based upon non-recurring investment costs and 10 years of operating costs, NASA would experience \$4.05 billion in additional expenses if the ASRM Program is canceled.

First, in making up these are contract termination costs, \$300 million.

Second, extra shuttle flights will be needed to deliver the supplies to the space station due to less lift capability per flight of the ASRM, costing \$225 million.

Third, a 9-month slip in the space station schedule will cost \$1.1 billion.

Fourth, additional shuttle flights needed for the space station station operations, will cost \$1.1 billion over 10 years.

Fifth, the unit cost differential between the current flight set and ASRM flight set, which I mentioned previously, at \$18 million per set over 10 years will cost \$1.4 billion.

Compare this to the \$1.6 billion needed to complete the ASRM development and bring it to operational status, and you have a net savings of \$2.5 billion. This cost comparison has been submitted to NASA, and they have verified these cost evaluations.

NASA has also identified a number of indirect costs to be incurred if ASRM is terminated, including the costs associated with the program to eliminate asbestos from the redesigned solid rocket motor.

There are those who would state that the ASRM will not be ready in time to support the launch and assembly of the space station. This is not the case. The completion date of the ASRM project has been slipping due to yearly congressional cuts to the program budget. But even though it has been consistently underfunded, the program is remarkably intact. The manufacturing facility in Yellow Creek is near completion. It is to be completed by the end of 1994.

I have here a photograph showing how much of this has been completed. Here are the buildings which have been built. As you can see, this is a large complex near completion. Here is another close-up picture showing more detail.

As Senator COCHRAN argued in his speech, it would be very foolish now, at this time, when it is so near to being completed, for it to be terminated.

There are other issues pending, such as the level of participation of the Russian scientific community in the space station. If it is decided to allow the Russians to join the program, it is very likely that the station will be placed in a 51.6-degree inclination orbit, which is far higher than had been originally planned. This being the case, the additional lift of the ASRM becomes vitally important. The current rocket motor simply does not have sufficient lift capacity to put the station into this orbit, as this letter from the NASA Administrator indicates.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HEFLIN. Madam President, it states that the ASRM is NASA's obvious choice to provide the extra lift needed to put the station in the high inclination orbit, either by itself or in concert with other improvements.

While we are on this subject, there has been this issue raised about the possibility of an aluminum/lithium tank and some other matters. It has been suggested that the higher space station orbit now being discussed by the United States and Russian negotiators is achievable without ASRM.

I recently had a conversation with Dan Goldin, the Administrator of NASA, and he told me and other Members of Congress at that particular time that the aluminum/lithium tank would not be the method used, as it could not provide the lift.

Some suggest that the ASRM can be replaced by such enhancements to the space transportation system as the use

of single-use boosters, which have no recovery system, or the development of a lightweight aluminum/lithium tank and the operation of the space shuttle main engines at 107 percent of their rated power. However, the cost of a nonrecoverable flight set of single-use boosters is approximately \$130 million, which is almost three times the cost of a set of ASRM boosters.

The aluminum/lithium external tank is only in the initial stage of conceptual development. No development funds have yet been programmed for this purpose. It, too, will have a higher unit cost than the ASRM boosters. The payload gain made possible through the use of such a tank, once fully developed and operational, as now projected even under optimistic scenarios, is to be about half-a-ton smaller than originally proposed.

Finally, the in-flight operation of the space shuttle main engines at 107 percent of rated power is something that has never been done before. It requires exhaustion of the reserve which has been previously designated only for attempts to avoid the termination of the flight.

So, in regard to this aluminum/lithium tank, I feel that to abandon ASRM and pursue the tank alone is a serious mistake.

A vote on the floor to cut the ASRM funding is a vote to accept, without investigation, the unknown costs and significant risks involved in these proposed alternatives to the ASRM.

But regardless of the question of the space station, regardless of the issue of 51.6 degrees deviation orbit, the main issue comes back to safety, an issue that I think we should never lose sight of during this debate.

In addition to the things that I mentioned in these newspaper articles about the O-ring question and whether or not the O-ring would be safe, the present rocket motor does not meet the flight safety requirements of NASA. It is necessary that NASA grant numerous waivers and deviations in order to permit the launch of the shuttle with the current rocket motor.

For example, on January 13, 1993, three permanent and eight flight-specific waivers were required because of the inability of the present solid rocket motor design to meet established flight safety requirements. While improvements have been made to the pressure seal that failed on the *Challenger*, problems still exist in other seals in the present solid rocket motors we are using. Leaks occur on almost every flight. The present solid rocket motor's structure does not meet minimum structural strength requirements regarding buckling during the ignition of the shuttle's main engines. The present solid rocket motor's solid propellant is unable to withstand long-term exposure to high humidity, and thus a safety requirement regarding the risk involved with such propellant is waived

on every present solid rocket motor that is being used.

The solid rocket motor propellant that we are using today does not meet the required structure of safety factors which were intended to compensate for uncertainty and variability in materials manufacturing, loads, and environments. Cracks routinely occur in the present motor propellant and such cracks could lead to critical overpressurization.

Let me mention another thing in regard to taking the recovery equipment off the RSRM to provide additional life. There are safety factors that are very important relative to the issue of inspection after you recover the solid rocket motors. These are the motors that fell off the shuttle into the ocean and we are able to recover them. They are then tested to determine whether or not there are cracks or there are defects that occurred during the flight.

That safety factor had been used in the past to allow us to be able to learn from our experience. If a non-recoverable RSRM is used, this information will be lost and flight safety will be reduced.

I think the Senate has a choice to make. We can terminate this program and rely on the existing rocket motor which has questionable safety, uses outdated technology, and delays the space station program for almost a year, or we can field a state-of-the-art, ultrasafe motor with a high payload lift capacity for less than half the price.

The choice is clear. The ASRM is an integral part of the future of the shuttle system which will probably fly for another 30 years.

I ask Senators to join me in supporting this critical program and defeating this amendment.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, DC, September 8, 1993.

Hon. HOWELL HEFLIN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: Thank you for your letter of August 31, 1993, regarding the desirability of the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor (ASRM) program.

As you correctly observe, additional performance will be extremely useful if the Space Shuttle is to deploy Space Station elements to higher inclinations, as was recommended by the President's Advisory Committee on the Redesign of the Space Station. NASA has examined alternative ways of obtaining the increased performance necessary, and we believe the ASRM—either by itself or in concert with other improvements—is the most obvious solution. The ASRM is an important consideration as we assess a Space Station at higher and lower inclinations.

NASA and the Administration continue to support the fiscal year 1994 budget request of \$313 million for the ASRM program.

We appreciate your work in support of this program and stand ready to assist in any way possible.

Sincerely,

DANIEL S. GOLDIN,
Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, I would expect the Senator from New Jersey to speak. Since he is not on the floor, I wish to make my statement now and trust that he can obtain the floor when he returns.

I listened with interest to the comments of my friend from Alabama. In many instances, I am on the same side of the issues with my friend from Alabama, but on this one I am afraid I am on the other side.

He confessed to a parochial interest because Yellow Creek is very close to Alabama. I must confess to a similar parochial interest because the RSRM is produced in Brigham City, UT, and represents a substantial Utah interest.

Like my friend from Alabama, I will do my best to set aside the parochial interest and address this issue as much on the merits as I possibly can.

It is very correct to say that the ASRM was born out of the *Challenger* disaster. It was authorized specifically, in quoting the Senate authorizing committee, "to provide added reliability and performance with the emphasis on the former and not the latter."

So let us talk about reliability.

ASRM, conceived to provide more reliability, has taken a long time, and in the meantime the solid rocket motor has been redesigned, known as the RSRM. And guess what? In the process of the redesign to make the RSRM safer, it is now the opinion of NASA's aerospace safety advisory panel that the RSRM that we are now using and has flown safely 31 times since its redesign—I am not talking about the flight prior to the redesign—since its redesign the NASA aerospace safety advice panel reports:

On the basis of safety and reliability alone, it is questionable whether the ASRM would be superior to the RSRM which has undergone extensive design changes.

So NASA is saying that the RSRM is probably safer than the ASRM, which removes the whole reason for the ASRM in the first place.

Now, every RSRM launched has been inspected after its use and found by NASA to be in excellent condition. There has been no indication of any kind of the repetition of the kinds of design failures that caused the *Challenger* disaster. With this wealth of testing, we can be sure that RSRM is working correctly, but we have no such assurance with the ASRM because it is new technology. So we are faced with an interesting circumstance. There is new technology that, with scheduling delays, cost overruns, technical difficulties, is untested and unproven, and

competing with a proven record of the RSRM.

It is very clear that on the safety issue NASA is satisfied with the RSRM.

Now, let us come to the question of high performance. I must respectfully disagree with my colleague on the use of the aluminum/lithium tank. After the safety and reliability questions are answered, ASRM shifts the debate and says, well, now, we must talk about increased thrust. Is the increased thrust needed?

By virtue of the redesign that has been made in the space station, which we voted on here today, we are not entirely sure whether the additional thrust is going to be needed or not. But if it is—let us assume that it is—is the RSRM with the aluminum/lithium tank capable of providing the same payloads as ASRM? And the answer is clearly yes. This is not a controversial circumstance. This is not a redesign. This is not a new technology. It simply consists of, take the current RSRM, the solid rocket motors, and put it in a tank with a lighter alloy, which simply means that the shuttle can carry a heavier payload because it is carrying less weight.

The RSRM is a proven technology, a safe technology that NASA itself has said can be enhanced by a lighter tank. The report on the Space Station *Alpha* indicates that not only is NASA satisfied with the use of an aluminum/lithium tank, but Japan, one of our partners in the space station activity, welcomes the adoption of the aluminum/lithium tank.

There is much more that can be said on all of the questions of performance capability. I will defer going over all the numbers and talk very briefly about what I consider to be the core of this circumstance.

If the matter is as compelling as I believe it is, that there is no need for the ASRM, given the safety and performance capability of the RSRM, why is it not canceled?

Well, as far as the administration is concerned, prior to the election, it was.

I want to read for the RECORD, and then submit to the printed—well, I will read it first. It is in better type when I read it. When you submit it, it gets in that little bitty type that nobody can read, so I will read it. This will not take the Senate long to listen to it.

This is a letter dated July 16, 1992, from the Vice President of the United States, at that time Dan Quayle.

And, as we all know, starting with Jack Kennedy, the Vice President has always been given a unique role in the Nation's space program. President Kennedy did it with Lyndon Johnson and the tradition has gone on all the way through. It is addressed to a Ms. Lynne White in New Orleans, LA.

DEAR MS. WHITE: It was a pleasure to meet you at the Heritage Foundation's reception

in Charleston, South Carolina. Thank you very much for your subsequent letter of support and for your kind words.

I particularly appreciate your strong support for the Administration's proposal to terminate the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor (ASRM) program. I know this program provides many jobs, and it is always difficult to take actions which can harm a local economy.

However, the needs which underpinned ASRM are no longer compelling. Safety problems associated with the existing Space Shuttle Solid Rocket Motors have been corrected and the number of projected space shuttle flights has declined. There is still value in the increased performance which ASRM would provide, but alternatives exist.

The bottom line is that the space program doesn't need ASRM. That is why President Bush did not request funds for the program in his fiscal year 1993 budget. And, that is why the Administration is opposing Congressional efforts to continue spending \$500 million a year for this activity.

I applaud your efforts to put a stop to the ASRM program. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

DAN QUAYLE.

Since this letter was written, we have had an election. And since the election, we have had a new Vice President who comes from a state where there are a number of jobs connected with the Yellow Creek facility.

Since the elevation of the Vice President to the position of prominence in the administration that the Vice President always has with respect to space, NASA has magically changed its mind about the ASRM.

Now, Madam President, I have served in an administration. I know who sets the policy in an administration.

I remember very clearly the circumstance where the Secretary under whom I served had a strong position. We went to the White House in support of that position. We made our pitch. I was involved in the pitch. We came back and received word from the White House that the President had decided against us.

There were some in that group who then started to complain and make public statements. Unfortunately, these got in the newspaper. I remember very clearly the meeting that was held where the Under Secretary gathered all of us together, all of us who were in a policy position, and he said:

Let me make something very clear. If you disagree with the President, you may resign. But you may not, in the name of the administration, speak against the position of the President of the United States.

I am sure that same kind of meeting has been held in NASA. If the NASA scientists who disagree with the Vice President of the United States wish to keep their jobs, they must now send us letters telling us that magically the ASRM is suddenly okay.

I happen to believe the letter that Dan Quayle wrote represented the true position of NASA on this issue. I think the lack of enthusiasm for the ASRM on the part of NASA scientists is pret-

ty overwhelming, and they give testimony in its favor very reluctantly and only under pressure from Members of this body.

I see now, Madam President, that the Senator from New Jersey has returned to the floor. I am happy to conclude my remarks, understanding that the time has come for him to make his.

I simply make it clear that, in my opinion, this is a circumstance somewhat similar to someone having an automobile whose air conditioner broke down and was convinced that it was necessary to buy a whole new car. In the process of waiting for the new car, a mechanic fixed his air conditioner. It is now working just fine—and he still wants a new car.

For us to say, all right, let us throw away the old and go to the new when, in fact, we do not need it, would be a demonstration of tremendous waste on the part of this Government.

We sat here on the floor. We debated the space station. There were some heated words said in that period of time.

I am one who supports the space station. I understand the concern of those who are opposed to it, who talked about the budget overruns. Voting to terminate ASRM is a way, if the people are concerned about the budget overruns, for them to make atonement, if you will, on that particular issue. You can be for the space station and still be against pork if you vote against the ASRM.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank my colleague from Utah for his courtesy.

We are all trying to terminate funding for the ASRM but find ourselves on the other side of this issue from our distinguished colleague and friend from Alabama. And it does not surprise me that he enthusiastically supports the program. As a matter of fact, I would be disappointed if he did not. He has a different interest.

But I would tell you that I hope we are going to eliminate funds for the advanced solid rocket motor. It shocks me that we continue discussing funding for programs that are questionable at best, that are most likely to lead nowhere in the final analysis, and when we have had this wrenching debate of some weeks ago when a budget reconciliation passed by the skin of the Vice President's teeth. It was close call, at best.

Part of the question was whether or not we are keeping faith with the American people as we ask them to shoulder more of a burden in the interest of sacrificing to get our country back in a recovery mode. And I think it is quite common knowledge that I voted against it. I am going to do my best to make the program work, I can tell you that, but I voted against it be-

cause I felt that we had yet to take advantage of the savings that should come from reducing expenditures first.

Madam President, this spring, I introduced a bill to terminate funding for the advanced solid rocket motor, the space station, and the super collider. That is quite a triad. I introduced the legislation because they are all very expensive projects with no visible mission.

Termination of these programs would save over \$15 billion over the next 5 years. We should eliminate these unnecessary expenditures and apply the savings toward deficit reduction or to make investments that are important for future economic growth and provide for pressing national needs and, more importantly, to keep faith with the American people.

Today, the Senate can eliminate funding for the ASRM, the advanced solid rocket motor. If the pending amendment is adopted we will save on this one alone \$1.6 billion over the next 5 years. That is still significant money.

Madam President, the ASRM started out with good intentions. In the wake of the *Challenger* tragedy, a Presidential commission recommended that NASA develop a new solid rocket motor to replace the one that failed during the accident. At the time, NASA wanted to ensure that a safe, solid rocket motor was available to launch the space shuttle and have a more powerful rocket motor to launch heavier payloads required by the space station and the Advanced X-ray Astrophysics Facility. Congress approved this proposal in 1988 in the NASA authorization bill.

However, since that time the General Accounting Office found that, between 1988 and 1992, the cost of the project increased by a mere 95 percent, from a total of \$1.67 billion to \$3.25 billion. And during this time in concert with that the completion schedule slipped by over 2½ years. We were not getting value but it was matched by taking longer.

Since that time, the existing improved solid rocket motor has functioned well in over 25 shuttle launches since the terrible day the *Challenger* went down. Because the ASRM program was delayed and the existing rocket motor was functioning well, the Bush administration took another look at the project.

Then, as we heard from our colleague from Utah, the Vice President, then Dan Quayle, Chairman of the Space Council, commissioned a panel to review the need for the ASRM. The Vice President concluded, "The bottom line is that the space program does not need the ASRM."

Therefore, President Bush did not request any funds for the program in the fiscal 1993 budget.

On top of this, the National Research Council and NASA's own Aerospace

Safety Advisory Panel questioned the need for the ASRM. In addition, the potential testing and launching of the ASRM, it was said, could cause significant environmental damage. The potential testing could damage nearby wetlands supporting the Stennis Space Flight Center, and the ASRM could damage the ozone layer if it was used in a launch.

These environmental consequences have created the usual group of organizations opposed to the ASRM. They include the National Taxpayers Union, National Resources Defense Council, Council For Citizens Against Government Waste, the Sierra Club, Citizens for a Sound Economy and Greenpeace.

This is not often a group that has a homogeneous view, but they agree on one thing. This program is a waste of time and money and potentially can cause environmental damage.

Madam President, the experts agree that we do not need the ASRM and we ought to heed their advice. This amendment is truly in the national interest. It eliminates an expensive project that space experts have said is no longer necessary. It achieves significant savings and, in my view, keeps faith with the promises we made to the American people.

I hope my colleagues will support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I rise in opposition, tonight, to the Bumpers amendment. But before I get into some remarks I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that has brought this legislation to the floor. She has had a very tough job. She has faced that job and has handled it in a very fine way and did an excellent job today. I want to thank her for her support for the ASRM. She did support it in the subcommittee that included \$162 million for the advanced solid rocket motor.

When you talk about who supports it and who opposes it, I think it is significant. The chairman of the subcommittee supports it, and the ranking member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Texas, Senator GRAMM, supports ASRM. I appreciate them for their fine work and for their support for the continuation of this project.

Also, I think I would like to note the excellent statement that was made tonight by the distinguished Senator from Alabama. He really did a fine job. He knows what he is talking about. He has been working on the NASA programs and the space program for years as a Member of this body. He was a member of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee and had personal, intimate knowledge of it for years. Of course, his State of Alabama has been very much involved in the NASA space program. But I thought he did just an outstanding job in his remarks tonight.

I do not want to repeat a lot of what he said because he said it so well, and the hour is late.

Let me tell you a little bit about who is for this project, once again. The last three NASA Administrators have been for it. They supported ASRM. They asked for ASRM funding. Administrator Fletcher, Administrator Truly, and Administrator Goldin have been actively, aggressively for it.

This is not a pork project in that it is something that some Member of the House or the Senate stuck in a bill. This is something that NASA asked for, came to Congress and asked for. They supported it through Republican and Democratic administrations, and continue to say it is needed. They selected the site. No Member of Congress, House or Senate, selected the site. This site was selected because there was a piece of land there that was available, it was a good location, it had water access to the testing areas and because, unfortunately, \$300 million of taxpayers' money had already been spent at this site.

There, at that site today, a nuclear powerplant dome stands rusting, unused. So there was a bargain. Here was a site that had some buildings that could be used. It was available. The taxpayers had already spent money on this site. The people of Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee had already made contributions and sacrifices. So this was a logical site. It made good sense to pick this site. That is why it is where it is.

Again, three NASA Administrators have asked for this.

With regard to what happened last year, who was for it and who was against it, I know in telephone conversations as the year went along the Director of the Office of Management and Budget assured me that the administration wanted the ASRM. And the proof is in the pudding. What happened in the end? The conference included \$330 million for the ASRM last year. So we know OMB was involved in that. The Vice President was aware of that. I can tell you they both supported it.

But the irony of it all, tonight we have some of my colleagues on the other side citing a letter from former Vice President Quayle.

Tonight I will tell you that this President, the Democratic President, supports ASRM. He asked for it in his budget, \$313 million. And the Vice President, AL GORE, a member of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, serving on the subcommittee that I serve on that has jurisdiction for NASA authorization, supported ASRM as a member of that committee and as a Member of this body.

I can tell my colleagues when he was a candidate, the nominee for Vice President of the United States took the time to call those of us who are interested in this project, called me in this

room right back here and said, "I want you to know I support it. You can say to anybody it will make any difference to, that I support it." He came off the campaign trail to do that. And he supports it now. He has said that to the distinguished Chair of the subcommittee, Senator MIKULSKI of Maryland. So this administration is for it.

Dan Goldin, the current Administrator of NASA, is for it. His letter dated September 8, 1993, reiterates his continued support. In his letter, he says this is what we need. This is the logical solution to what we need in the future. So it is important that we remember the real history of ASRM and its supporters. As we move to this debate, I think there are some key factors. As I talked to Members of the Senate the things that really seem to catch their attention are things like this picture displayed by the distinguished Senator from Alabama. That is how much work has already been done. Numerous buildings are there. We have already spent \$1.5 billion getting ready to construct this advanced solid rocket engine. Keep in mind now that is on top of the \$300 million spent by TVA, and we are now two-thirds of the way toward completion of this project. And there will be a cost involved, as has been pointed out, of \$2.5 billion if we do not have the ASRM.

So, when Senators and others realize the commitment that has been made, the construction that has occurred, the money that has already been spent, the savings we can have if we go forward with this project, they say, wait a minute—that is very interesting—we should continue and complete this project.

We voted earlier today, correctly, to defeat the Bumpers amendment and to go forward with space station. But here is another amendment to sort of pick apart, piece by piece, our space program. I think the American people support our space program. They want it. They want a safer program. They want one that will go forward and do its job—not only to provide jobs for the people but also provide enhanced technology and science.

So there is support for this project. People want it to go forward. They want the space station, and we voted that. But if we are going to have the space station at the higher orbit it is very clear that there are only really two legitimate ways to get there: One is ASRM, because it is at a higher orbit that present rockets cannot achieve, and the Administrator said the logical way to do it is with the ASRM. The other option is Russian rockets.

When the American people realize we are talking about the jobs of 16,000 Americans, 2,000 in my own immediate area, those jobs being lost so that we can use a questionable Russian rocket to boost our equipment into space, I do not believe the American people would

want that. That is a telling argument for the ASRM.

Madam President, I think there are three points I want to touch on tonight because it is late. No. 1, beyond what I have already said, I want to talk briefly about the capability of ASRM. I want to talk a little bit more about the cost savings and the commitment that was made to the American people and to the people in the area where this rocket will be constructed.

I focus on these issues because the Bumpers amendment would rob the space program of needed capability for international cooperation, cost the American taxpayer more dollars, and break a commitment to this Nation following the *Challenger* tragedy. Safety is an important feature, and Senator HEFLIN talked an awful lot about that and did a good job.

I would also like to set the context for this debate. We have just voted for the space station. The administration just signed a historic agreement with the Russians committing our countries to space cooperation, and yet this would start off right at the beginning to undermine that.

The question is: How best to meet these objectives in the most cost-effective and safest manner? We will show how the ASRM best meets that criteria of capability, performance, cost-effectiveness, and safety. The ASRM provides 30 percent more payload capability with a smaller engine so you get more boost at less cost. ASRM best achieves the higher orbit recommended by the Vest Commission and incorporated in the recent Russian agreements on space cooperation.

Administrator Goldin said:

NASA has examined the alternative ways of obtaining the increased performance necessary, and we believe that ASRM, either by itself or in concert with other improvements, is the most obvious solution.

Again, the current rocket does not have the capability to do the job. We can talk about these aluminum/lithium tanks but it is a theoretical thing. This is something that has not been researched, tested, or developed. We are talking about something way out there in the future.

So when it comes to capability, clearly the ASRM is what we are looking for.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal entitled "An Era of Space Detente, Beware of Bad Bargains."

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 2, 1993]

IN ERA OF SPACE DETENTE, BEWARE OF BAD BARGAINS

(By James Oberg)

Vice President Gore's meetings yesterday and today with Russian Prime Minister Victor Chernomyrdin to discuss space-related is-

ssues are expected to yield greater cooperation between the two countries, particularly in areas such as space launch vehicles and launch facilities. Given U.S. budget constraints and the wide variety of high-quality Russian space hardware and services now being offered on the world market, such proposals are well worth considering. But extreme caution is called for, as the Russians may be trying to sell the U.S. goods they don't reliably possess.

Common suggestions focus on placing the NASA space station in an orbit far enough north to be serviced by the old Soviet Spaceport at Baikonur in Kazakhstan. Russian super-rockets in the Energiya program, the world's most powerful, are also under consideration for transporting into space many sections of the station's modular design.

Russian space officials have been enthusiastically promoting these ideas. They see a source of financial salvation for their own agencies and industries. So desperate are the Russians for the "American option" that they recently surrendered to U.S. State Department pressure over alleged "military rocket technology proliferation." That case involved in Russians' sharing with India their small-thrust liquid-hydrogen engine know-how, an expertise uniquely suited to communications and scientific launch vehicles and to a rocket technology that has never been used by any nation for military purposes. Nevertheless, the Russians agreed to break their existing contract with India and to withhold the manufacturing technology, reportedly as part of a deal to receive equally valued U.S. space contracts.

American space industries have been understandably reluctant partners in this new U.S.-Russian "space detente." They clearly would prefer that the space funding be given to them for the desired services. But when the "Russian option" provides services at a fraction of the American cost and years ahead of American schedules, congressional budget-cutters find the option attractive. As an alternative to total cancellation of major space program, U.S. aerospace giants have found they can live with the deal.

But all is not well with the fundamental underpinnings of the plan. Both the Russian space center at Baikonur and the Russian super-rocket Energiya are very bad bargains. By the time the U.S. may have to rely on their promised services, they may no longer exist.

The Energiya rocket, equivalent in power to the Saturn V moon rocket developed during the moon race in the 1960s, has flown only twice. Once, in 1987, it carried a throw-together 100-ton payload that tumbled out of control and never made it into orbit. Then, in 1988, it carried a stripped-down unmanned space shuttle on a two-orbit mission.

Since then, all flight hardware has been rotting and rusting away in storage halls at Baikonur. The Soviet shuttle, an immense strategic blunder, slowly strangled from lack of funding. It was finally terminated officially a few months ago. No further flights of the Energiya booster are even planned, unless lots of American money shows up, and even then the launches couldn't occur before 1997 or 1998.

Essentially, the entire Russian rocket program would have to be rebuilt from scratch. Key industrial partners in the project are now outside the Russian federation, and many of those factories have already been converted to other manufacturing. Between a third and a half of the most experienced personnel have already left the program for better-paying jobs with more secure futures.

Existing hardware has been cannibalized for other projects or sold off as scrap.

What is more, the Baikonur Cosmodrome, as Russia's main space center is called, is a walking corpse, already evacuated by its most energetic veterans and now long abandoned by the Soviet support bureaucracies that used to make it a semi-tolerable duty location. Launchings continue under skeleton staffs, but increasingly serious breakdowns and worker food riots are threatening to bring the delicate high-tech rocket work to a halt.

Two recent space failures illustrate how close modern rocket technology runs to the edge of disaster.

The Zenit rocket, which serves both as an independent launch vehicle and as a booster for the Energiya heavy lifter, is manufactured at a plant in Ukraine. Between 1985 and 1991 it had a string of successes, but suddenly two years ago the vehicle underwent a series of random flight failures caused by inadequate preparation and quality control from the Ukrainian factory. An explosion destroyed one of the two launch pads, which has not been rebuilt.

Then an independent booster program, the Proton, was done in by a squabble over which Moscow agency owned it. A technical bureau that had been locked out of a profit-sharing plan decided to withdraw its inspectors from the launch site, and the very next vehicle fell into the Pacific Ocean. Out of four pads at Baikonur for the Proton rocket, only one is operational.

As if all this weren't enough, there are other problems with the Baikonur site. Ecologically, the region is beyond salvation. As the Aral Sea to its west continues to dry up, emanations from the exposed salt flats, laced with decades of pesticide pollution in the cotton fields upstream, are blown by the choking summer winds eastward across the desert to blanket the city of Leninsk where the space workers live. Infant mortality and birth defects in the area are unendurably high.

The government of Kazakhstan has claimed sovereignty over the base but cannot afford to provide basic services such as power and water, much less technical services. Also looming as a future crisis is the question of political rights for large Russian minorities within the borders of Kazakhstan, particularly in the northern regions where they actually form the majority and where sentiment is growing for partition and ultimate reunion with Russia. None of these flash points bode well for the stability of the Baikonur spaceport.

Conceivably, the Russian government might actually get many of the hoped-for U.S. space dollars for expanded joint work, since there is much in the Russian space program well worth buying, leasing or licensing. Its space station hardware and experience can be extremely valuable. But the price of rebuilding the already collapsed infrastructure of Baikonur and the Energiya rocket is too high. Fruitful U.S. Russian space cooperation must depend on cold, hard realities, not not echoes of past fading glories.

Mr. LOTT, Madam President, in this article, the author Oberg outlines the political instability of the Russian launch facilities into Kazakhstan. I already talked about how the American people would not like the idea of losing jobs because of Russian rockets, but also would their rockets be there and workable? He points out that only one of the four Proton launch pads is operational.

He states that the launch facility is "a walking corpse, already evacuated by most of its energetic veterans and now long abandoned by the Soviet support bureaucracies."

Do we want to put our space program at the mercy of these Russian launch capabilities when we do not even know—and it was cited earlier tonight what is going to be happening in Russia. No, that is not the answer. ASRM is the answer.

With regard to the cost involved, this is a classic example of penny-wise and pound-foolish and Senator SASSER, of Tennessee, uses this phrase in his letter supporting ASRM. He is not a Senator known for going along with a project just to go along with it. He has taken a firm stand for ASRM.

Why is it foolish? Not only would we lose the added performance, safety, and opportunities for international co-operation provided by ASRM, but we would spend more money terminating the program than we would completing the program. That is what causes American people to lose faith in us. We tell them we are going to do something, we spend their money, we get it about ready and then we say, "Well, we changed our mind, we are going to shut it down; sorry about the money you invested; sorry about the time; sorry about the jobs and, by the way, it is going to cost us more to close than it would to go forward to completion." They look at us and say: "How can you people do that?"

Senator HEFLIN, in a very excellent letter that he sent to Senator MIKULSKI, points out the cost savings. Just in case he did not have it printed in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the explanation of this \$2.5 billion savings over the next 10 years be printed in the RECORD.

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

TALKING POINTS LONG VERSION COST

ASRM increases Shuttle payload by 30%—less shuttle flights=reduced costs.

Proponents and opponents have differed on costing ASRM—"direct" v. "indirect" costs.

Only sensible way to examine cost is to compare costs to NASA with and without the ASRM

Cost of ASRM cancellation:

	Million
Contractor termination liabilities	\$300
Space Station deployment	
-3 extra Shuttle flights	\$225
-9 months schedule slip	\$1050
RSRM v. ASRM cost difference (10 years)	\$1350
Space Station operations require additional shuttle flights (10 years) ...	\$1125
	Billions
Cancellation costs through 2000	\$4.05
Remaining ASRM program costs	\$1.6
SAVINGS from ASRM	\$2.45

If ASRM is not used to launch the Space Station:

RSRM will still cost—over 10 years—\$2.5 billion, while ASRM will cost \$1.6 billion over the same period.

ASRM saves \$900 million with this option.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, finally, we do have a commitment to the people. We have a commitment to our foreign partners in this effort. But I have to tell you, I am here tonight on the behalf of the people of my State of Mississippi, too. We do need the jobs. We are the poorest State in the Nation. You are talking about jobs for men and women, black and white, that without this, they do not have a job.

And the poorest State in the Nation has already spent \$60 million of its money for infrastructure, highways, improvement in schools. It has really excited the people. It has pulled them together, and they have done things on schools, roads, and airports that they would not have done otherwise. They did not ask for this.

We, the Federal Government, came to them and said, "Will you take it? Will you make the commitment? Will you make the improvements to do this job?" And the people said, "We'll do it," and they did it. They have lived up to their part of the deal. Now, are we going to walk away from them after they fulfilled their commitment. No, Madam President, this would be a major mistake. We should not pick apart our space program and we should not break our commitment to the American people, our international partners, or to the people in the area who fulfilled their part of the deal. Let us defeat this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I commend my distinguished colleague from Mississippi for his outstanding statement, and I also want to compliment the others who have spoken tonight on this amendment.

I think the quality of debate has been excellent and it has outlined the issue, described the points of view on both sides. But I think when we come down to it, the final question is: Can we run the risk of another Challenger disaster? If we do not go forward and use the safest, most reliable, most efficiently designed rocket motor for our space program, we are running the risk of another explosion where astronauts will be killed. We do not need to take that risk. We are building the best that our scientists and our engineers can design, and we are almost there.

This plant is almost completed and new motors are about to be available for the shuttle program.

So I urge Senators, as we vote tomorrow on this amendment, think of what is really at stake: The lives of those who have trained and who have become the world's most outstanding astronauts. The future of our manned space program is at stake, and I hope they will defeat this amendment and leave the money in the bill to complete this project.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FORD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

APPOINTMENT BY THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, pursuant to Public Law 93-415, as amended by Public Law 102-586, announces the appointment of Lisa Beecher, of Maine, to the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, vice Ronald Costigan, resigned.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FORD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein.

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

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION TAKES A STAND ON METRIC CONVERSION

Mr. PELL. Madam President, while those of us in the Senate were at home meeting with our constituents, the Clinton administration took an important step in bringing this country into line with the rest of the world.

As many of my colleagues know, I have been a long-time champion of efforts to convert the United States to the metric system. Most recently, on June 8, 1993, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 100, which affirms that conversion to the metric system would greatly benefit the United States.

When I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 100, I made the following statement:

By actively promoting metric conversion, our Government would open the door for new markets and thereby help to create the new jobs this Nation so drastically needs. The fact is, U.S. businesses will have to think in metrics or eventually be left behind. It is that simple. And it is time for our Government to assume a leadership position on the metric issue, instead of passively waiting for market forces to reverse our archaic system of measurement.

In response to my letter to the President telling him of my interest in metric conversion, the Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, John H. Gibbons, wrote to me that the Clinton administration believes the Federal Government has an important role to play in the conversion to the metric system both in industry and in education.

Mr. Gibbons wrote that the administration believes:

The Federal Government has an important role to play. It must provide both a vision and a demonstrated commitment. It must advance our Nation's interests by encouraging U.S. industry as well as the educational community, to complete our conversion to the metric system. The result will be that we will all benefit from greater efficiency in industry and education.

I am very pleased the administration shares my view on the important role of the Federal Government in the metric conversion process.

Madam President, this is the first time any administration has said officially that the entire Federal Government has a role and responsibility in converting the United States to the metric system. It is also the first time an administration has talked about the role the education community can play in the conversion process. In the past, administrations have spoken only of citizens learning the metric system.

I congratulate the President for committing his administration and the entire Federal Government to the conversion process and I commend Mr. Gibbons' letter to my colleagues.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from John Gibbons, Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND
TECHNOLOGY POLICY,
Washington, DC, August 18, 1993.

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter to the President about Senate Joint Resolution 100 and why it is important for the United States to use the metric system. I have been asked to respond to you and I am pleased to provide the following comments.

In his letter of April 6, 1993, that transmitted the 1992 annual metric progress report to the President, Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown stated that it is in the Nation's best interest for the Federal Government to encourage use of the metric system by U.S. industry. He explained that Federal encouragement of metric usage will provide an economic stimulus that will "enhance our competitive edge and create new jobs and opportunities for our citizens." We agree with you that by adopting the metric system U.S. industry will increase its exports and create new jobs.

We understand that U.S. industry's adopting the metric system is important because world markets are almost entirely metric, and, to be accepted in those markets, U.S. products must be metric also. Industry is becoming increasingly aware of this reality. Firms that have made the change to metric standards have found that it was worth the effort because their products gained global acceptance.

The Federal Government has an important role to play. It must provide both a vision and a demonstrated commitment. It must advance our Nation's interests by encouraging U.S. industry, as well as the educational

community, to complete our conversion to the metric system. The result will be that we will all benefit from greater efficiency in industry and education.

In response to the current legislative mandate and Executive Order 12770, Federal agencies are making significant progress in converting their programs to metric units and in assisting firms to convert voluntarily. However, actions by the Federal Government alone may not be enough to achieve the goal. Other interested parties, such as state and local governments and the education community, must become more involved.

We appreciate your leadership on the subject of conversion to the metric system.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. GIBBONS, *Director*.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Edwin R. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The nomination received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ACTIVITIES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 40

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:

In accordance with Section 511(a) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1969, as amended ("the Act"), 30 U.S.C. 958(a), I transmit herewith the annual report on mine safety and health activities for fiscal year 1992. This report was prepared by, and covers activities occurring exclusively during the previous Administration. The enclosed report does not reflect the policies or priorities of this Administration.

My Administration is committed to working with the Congress to ensure vigorous enforcement of existing mine safety and health standards. We are also intent on improving these rules where necessary and appropriate to better protect worker health and safety.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 21, 1993.

REPORT ON THE SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992—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 Environment and Public Works.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation's Annual Report for fiscal year 1992. This report has been prepared in accordance with section 10 of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Act of May 13, 1954 (33 U.S.C. 989(a)), and covers the period October 1, 1991, through September 30, 1992.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 21, 1993.

REPORT ON THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992—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 Labor and Human Resources.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 3(f) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1862(f)), I am pleased to send you the annual report of the National Science Foundation for Fiscal Year 1992. This report describes research supported by the Foundation in the mathematical, physical, biological, social, behavioral, and computer sciences; engineering; and 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, national security, and the overall well-being of our people.

As we move toward the 21st century, the Foundation will continue its efforts to expand our Nation's research achievements, our productivity, and our ability to remain competitive in world markets.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 21, 1993.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1993, the Secretary of the Senate, on September 20, 1993, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 184. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands within the State of Utah, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to designate the weeks of September 19, 1993, through September 25, 1993, and of September 18, 1994, through September 24, 1994, as "National Rehabilitation Week";

S.J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to designate October 1993 as "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month";

H.R. 873. An act to provide for the consolidation and protection of the Gallatin Range; and

H.J. Res. 220. Joint resolution to designate the month of August as "National Scleroderma Awareness Month," and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills and joint resolutions were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD] during the September 21, 1993 session of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:50 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 714) to provide funding for the resolution of failed savings associations, and for other purposes, and asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; that the following Members be the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, for consideration of the Senate bill, and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Government Operations, for consideration of section 13 of the Senate bill, and section 23 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. CLINGER, and Mrs. MCCANDLESS.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 18 and 22 of the Senate bill, and sections 4 and 19 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FISH, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 303(a) of Public Law 103-3, the Chair on behalf of the Speaker appoints the following as members to the Commission on Leave on the part of the House: Mrs. UNSOELD, and from private life, Ms. Pamela L. Egan of Helena, MT, and Ms. Ellen Bravo of Milwaukee, WI.

At 4 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, an-

nounced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2608. An act to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 635(b) of Public Law 102-393, the Speaker appoints to the Commission on the Social Security "Notch" Issue the following individuals from private life on the part of the House: Mr. James C. Corman of McLean, VA; and Ms. Carroll L. Estes of San Francisco, CA.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 635(b)(5) of Public Law 102-393, the Minority Leader appoints to the Commission on the Social Security "Notch" Issue the following individuals from private life on the part of the House: Mr. Barber Conable of Alexander, NY; and Mr. Arthur L. Singleton of Dunnsville, VA.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following measure, previously received from the House of Representatives, was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2139. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on September 21, 1993 he had presented to the President of the United States, the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 184. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands within the State of Utah, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to designate the weeks of September 19, 1993, through September 25, 1993, and of September 18, 1994, through September 24, 1994, as "National Rehabilitation Week"; and

S.J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to designate October 1993 as "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month."

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-1529. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Global Cooperative Initiatives and the Counterproliferation Initiative; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1530. A communication from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of the intention to transfer a vessel to the

Government of Morocco; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1531. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, and the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal years 1992 and 1993; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1532. A communication from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the financial audit of the Panama Canal Commission's financial statements for fiscal years 1991 and 1992; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1533. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to multifamily housing; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1534. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Responsibilities Under the Community Reinvestment Act"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1535. A communication from the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the National Transportation Safety Board's fiscal year 1995 submission to the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1536. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance (Royalty Management Program), Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the intention to make refunds of offshore lease revenues where a refund or recoupment is appropriate; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1537. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on emergency vehicle weight restrictions on interstate highways; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1538. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the activities of the Economic Development Administration for fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1539. A communication from the Acting Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Chehalis River Basin Fishery Resources: Status, Trends, and Restoration Goals"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1540. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the major issues associated with the North American Free Trade Agreement; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1541. A communication from the Administrator of the Agency For International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Development Assistance Program allocations for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1542. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs), Department of State, a report of a Presidential determination relative to the Cooperative Republic of Guyana; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1543. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs), Department of State, a report of a Presidential determination relative to Mozambican refugees

and returnees; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1544. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs), Department of State, a report on the nuclear reactor safety situation in eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1545. A communication from the Plan Administrator of the Eighth Farm Credit District Employee Benefit Trust, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of financial statements and independent auditors' report for calendar years 1991 and 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1546. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of proposed regulations relative to defining membership; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-1547. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to defining membership; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-1548. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the financial audit of the Capitol Preservation Fund as of March 31, 1991 and March 31, 1992; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-1549. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Veterans' Appeals Improvement Act of 1993"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1550. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of employment and training programs for veterans during the period July 1, 1991 through June 30, 1992 and fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1551. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Final Engineering Report: Mni Wiconi Rural Water Supply Project"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of September 15, 1993, the following reports of committees were submitted on September 16, 1993:

By Mr. PELL, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 1467. An original bill to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 103-144).

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. CRAIG:

S. 1475. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Hagerman Fossil Beds National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRAIG:

S. 1476. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Craters of the Moon National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. McCAIN:

S. 1477. A bill to provide for a 2-year Federal budget cycle, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Governmental Affairs, jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, with instructions that if one committee reports, the other committee have 30 days to report or be discharged.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HEFLIN, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. DOLE, Mr. COATS, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. BREAU):

S. 1478. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to ensure that pesticide tolerances adequately safeguard the health of infants and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. McCAIN:

S. 1477. A bill to provide for a 2-year Federal budget cycle, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Governmental Affairs, jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, with instructions that if one committee reports, the other committee have 30 days to report or be discharged.

BIENNIAL BUDGET LEGISLATION

• Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to create a biennial budget process. Simply, instead of the current process where the Congress passes budgets and appropriations on an annual basis, we will enact a budget and appropriate every 2 years. Twenty States now use biennial budgets. This budget technique has proven to be very successful.

The current process is both exceedingly time consuming and very inefficient. Further, due to our annual ability to completely rewrite the budget, the Congress has used this opportunity to micromanage Federal spending and ignore long-term budgetary goals.

By adopting a 2-year budget, the Congress will have more time to develop and implement long-term budget plans. Additionally, a 2-year budget process will give the Congress sufficient time to thoroughly evaluate programs and spending. This bill will, however, allow the Congress to retain the power to make small adjustments in off years if revenues or expenditures deviate widely from forecasts.

This idea is not new. Congressman Leon Panetta, currently serving the administration as the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, introduced the first biennial budgeting bill in 1977, and many have been offered since that time. Currently Congressman REGULA has introduced companion legislation in the House of Representatives.

Additionally, the Vice President, in his National Performance Review, "Creating a Government that Works Better and Costs Less," commonly referred to as "RE-GO," strongly endorses the concept of biennial budgeting. The Vice President states:

We recommend that Congress establish biennial budget resolutions and appropriations and multiyear authorizations.

Vice President GORE goes on to state:

Biennial budgeting will not make our budget decisions easier, for they are shaped by competing interests and priorities. But it will eliminate an enormous amount of busy work that keeps us from evaluating programs and meeting customer needs.

The Vice President could not be more correct.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will act on the Vice President's recommendation. It is time we made the budget process more streamlined and more efficient. Biennial budgeting is an important step in that direction. •

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HEFLIN, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. DOLE, Mr. COATS, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. BREAU):

S. 1478. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to ensure that pesticide tolerances adequately safeguard the health of infants and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

THE FOOD QUALITY PROTECTION ACT OF 1993

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I am here today, along with my colleague from Indiana, Senator LUGAR, and others to introduce the Food Quality Protection Act of 1993. This bill offers a comprehensive and balanced approach to the regulation of pesticides used on food, which, I am proud to say, has been endorsed by the director of the National Center for Agricultural Law Research and Information at the University of Arkansas.

There is widespread recognition of the need to reform and modernize the provisions governing the use of pesticides in both the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act [FIFRA] and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act [FFDCA]. Our legislation provides a good vehicle to accomplish that goal while ensuring that the United States will continue to have the world's most safe and abundant food supply.

Although this measure is not perfect, I believe this approach is the best point of departure in the ongoing debate on food safety. For many years now, there has been only one position presented to the Senate in legislative form. Accordingly, in the interest of full and open debate with all views represented, we are introducing our bill at this time.

Mr. President, in 1987, a distinguished committee of the National Academy of Sciences [NAS] recommended in the Delaney Paradox Report that a single negligible-risk standard, and not a zero-risk standard, should govern tolerances for pesticide residues in both raw commodities and processed food. The NAS concluded

that a consistently applied negligible-risk standard would greatly reduce total dietary exposure to hazardous pesticides and would permit the EPA to focus its limited resources on regulating pesticides that pose significant risks. The NAS also recognized that the benefits of pesticide uses are an important consideration in tolerance decisions.

The bill that we are introducing today would implement the NAS recommendations, integrate the pesticide tolerance provisions of the FFDCA and provide a logical and consistent framework for pesticide tolerance regulation in the coming decades.

In a separate NAS study, "Pesticides in the Diets of Infants and Children," published in June of this year, the NAS made several recommendations to improve the way pesticide tolerances are set in order to protect infants and children. Children's diets physiologically differ from adults in ways that could make them more vulnerable to exposure of pesticide residues. The bill we introduce today would direct the EPA, the FDA, and the USDA to implement the recommendations of this important report. By requiring the agencies to implement the NAS recommendations, the bill will help provide certainty that children will bear no undue risk from pesticides in their diets.

Experts in the field have suggested that the pesticide tolerance provisions of the FFDCA are outdated and unnecessarily complex. There have been dramatic advances in analytical chemistry, toxicological testing, and risk assessment which were unforeseen at the time current laws were enacted. The bill we introduce today would simplify the legal standards governing pesticide tolerances and give EPA flexibility to consider evolving scientific principles when making food safety decisions.

A recent decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Les versus Reilly* has focused increased attention on the need to reform EPA's regulation of pesticide tolerances. The ninth circuit held that the Delaney clause of the food additive provision of the FFDCA prohibits EPA from authorizing minimum levels of carcinogenic pesticides in processed food. Following the ninth circuit decision, EPA released a list of 35 pesticides that could be outlawed under EPA's current pesticide tolerance policies.

The bill that we are introducing today would break the legal logjam created by the ninth circuit decision and would subject raw commodities and processed food to the same safety standard for pesticide residues. The bill would provide a comprehensive, long-term solution to the difficult food safety issues that face EPA. It is important to recognize, however, that EPA has ample existing authority to reform its pesticide tolerance policies to per-

mit continued use of valuable pesticides that pose negligible risks.

Our balanced approach to pesticide tolerance regulation would substantially improve current law and would give EPA necessary flexibility to employ reasonable-risk estimates and to preserve valuable minor use pesticides. It would streamline the pesticide cancellation process, and update and improve regulation of pesticide residues in food. It would provide a uniform negligible-risk standard for pesticide residues in both raw and processed food, as recommended by the NAS. It would assure that EPA employs actual pesticide use and residue data and reasonable assumptions in conducting risk assessments, it would reconfirm EPA's duty to conduct risk-benefit evaluations in setting pesticide tolerances, and would mandate national uniformity of pesticide tolerances that meet current EPA requirements.

I asked the National Center for Agricultural Law Research and Information at the University of Arkansas to review this legislation and compare it with the only other position that has been presented to the Senate. The center has done so and, I am happy to report, has endorsed the legislation which we are introducing today.

Mr. President, let me make a very important point. The Clinton administration has addressed this difficult and many times emotional issue head-on. Almost as soon as he came to office, President Clinton asked the appropriate agencies to form an interagency working group to devise the administration's solution to these very serious problems. Although they have not unveiled details, I understand that later today, administration officials will explain their position in a hearing on the House side but that actual legislation will not be presented. It is also my understanding that the administration's approach is very reasonable and balanced and I look forward to reviewing it.

I am committed to working with President Clinton and my colleagues in Congress to ultimately reach a solution to this dilemma. For the safety of our food and the future of agribusinesses, it is time to act. We are fortunate to have an administration in place that understands the urgency and has the courage and commitment to seek a resolution.

Mr. President, I ask that a copy of the bill be placed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1478

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 "Food Quality Protection Act of 1993".

TITLE I—DATA COLLECTION AND PROCEDURES TO ENSURE THAT TOLERANCES SAFEGUARD THE HEALTH OF INFANTS AND CHILDREN

SEC. 101. IMPLEMENTATION OF NRC REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall coordinate the development and implementation of procedures to ensure that pesticide tolerances adequately safeguard the health of infants and children, based on the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report entitled "Pesticides in the Diets of Infants and Children" of the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences.

(b) PROCEDURES.—To the extent practicable, the procedures referred to in subsection (a) shall include—

(1) collection of data on food consumption patterns of infants and children;

(2) improved surveillance of pesticide residues, including guidelines for the use of comparable analytical and standardized reporting methods, the increased sampling of foods most likely consumed by infants and children, and the development of more complete information on the effects of food processing on levels of pesticide residues;

(3) toxicity testing procedures that specifically evaluate the vulnerability of infants and children;

(4) methods of risk assessment that take into account unique characteristics of infants and children; and

(5) other appropriate measures considered necessary by the Administrator to ensure that pesticide tolerances adequately safeguard the health of infants and children.

SEC. 102. COLLECTION OF PESTICIDE USE INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall collect data of Statewide or regional significance on the use of pesticides to control pests and diseases of major crops and crops of dietary significance, including fruits and vegetables.

(b) COLLECTION.—The data shall be collected by surveys of farmers or from other sources offering statistically reliable data.

(c) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall, as appropriate, coordinate with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency in the design of the surveys and make available to the Administrator the aggregate results of the surveys to assist the Administrator in developing exposure calculations and benefits determinations with respect to pesticide regulatory decisions.

SEC. 103. INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT.

Section 28(c) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w-3(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(c) INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT.—The Administrator," and inserting the following:

"(c) INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator,";

and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) JOINT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture shall research, develop, and disseminate information concerning integrated pest management techniques and other pest control methods that enable producers to reduce or eliminate applications of pesticides that pose a greater than negligible dietary risk to humans, with a special focus on crops critical to a balanced, healthy diet and that are considered as minor crops in terms of acreage produced."

TITLE II—CANCELLATION AND SUSPENSION

SEC. 201. REFERENCE.

Whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.).

SEC. 202. CANCELLATION.

Subsection (b) of section 6 (7 U.S.C. 136d(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) CANCELLATION AND CHANGE IN CLASSIFICATION OR OTHER TERMS OR CONDITIONS OF REGISTRATION.—

“(1) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Administrator may, by use of informal rulemaking under this subsection, prescribe requirements regarding the composition, packaging, and labeling of a pesticide (or a group of pesticides containing a common active or inert ingredient), may classify the pesticide, or may prohibit the registration or continued registration of the pesticide for some or all purposes, to the extent necessary to ensure that the pesticide, when used in accordance with widespread and commonly recognized practice, does not generally cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment.

“(2) BASIS FOR RULE.—

“(A) The Administrator may not initiate a rulemaking under this subsection unless the rulemaking is based on a validated test or other significant evidence raising a prudent concern that the pesticide causes unreasonable adverse effects on the environment.

“(B)(i) The Administrator shall submit, to a scientific peer review committee established by the Administrator, the validated test or other significant evidence on which the Administrator proposes to base a rulemaking under paragraph (1).

“(ii) The scientific peer review committee shall provide written recommendations to the Administrator as to whether the test or evidence reviewed satisfies the criteria under subparagraph (A) for initiating a rulemaking under paragraph (1).

“(iii) The scientific peer review committee shall consist of employees of or consultants to the Environmental Protection Agency who have not been involved in a previous analysis of the validated test or significant evidence presented to the committee and who are experts in the physical or biological disciplines involved in the proposed rulemaking.

“(3) PRENOTICE PROCEDURES.—

“(A) The Administrator may not initiate a rulemaking under paragraph (1) until the Administrator has provided, to the registrant of each affected pesticide, a notice that includes a summary of the validated test or other significant evidence on which the Administrator proposes to base the rulemaking and the basis for a determination that the test or evidence raises a prudent concern that the pesticide causes unreasonable adverse effects on the environment. A registrant may respond to a notice provided under this subparagraph not later than 30 days after receipt of the notice.

“(B) At the same time as the Administrator provides the notice to a registrant of the pesticide under subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall also provide the notice to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services. If an agricultural commodity is affected, on receipt of the notice, the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare an analysis of the bene-

fit and use of the pesticide and provide the analysis to the Administrator.

“(4) ADVANCE NOTICE TO PUBLIC.—

“(A) After receiving the recommendation of the peer review committee established under paragraph (2)(B), together with any comments submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and a registrant, the Administrator shall—

“(i) issue an advance notice of proposed rulemaking; or

“(ii) issue a notice of a proposed decision not to initiate a rulemaking under paragraph (1).

“(B) The Administrator shall publish the notice in the Federal Register and provide a period of not less than 60 days for comment on the notice. The notice shall contain a statement of the basis and purpose of the notice and a summary of—

“(i) the factual data on which the notice is based;

“(ii) the major scientific assumptions underlying the notice; and

“(iii) the notice provided under paragraph (3) and any significant comments received from a registrant, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

“(C) If the Administrator, after considering any comments received, decides not to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register a notice setting forth the decision and the basis for the decision.

“(5) DOCKET.—

“(A) For each rulemaking under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall establish a docket.

“(B) The docket shall include a copy of—

“(i) the notice provided under paragraph (3);

“(ii) any notice issued under paragraph (4);

“(iii) the notice of proposed rulemaking issued under paragraph (6);

“(iv) each timely comment filed with the Administrator;

“(v) the report of the Scientific Advisory Panel under paragraph (8);

“(vi) a record of each hearing held by the Administrator in connection with the rulemaking; and

“(vii) the final rule or decision to withdraw the rule.

“(C) Information in the docket shall be made available to the public consistent with section 10.

“(D) No factual material that has not been entered into the docket in a timely manner may be relied on by the Administrator in issuing a final rule or in withdrawing a proposed rule or by a person in a judicial review proceeding, except for—

“(i) information of which the Administrator may properly take official notice; or

“(ii) information of which a court may properly take judicial notice.

“(6) NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING.—

“(A) Not less than 60 days after an advance notice of proposed rulemaking, except as provided in paragraph (14), the Administrator may issue a notice of proposed rulemaking. The notice of proposed rulemaking shall include a statement of the basis and purpose of the proposed rulemaking, a request for any additional data needed, and a bibliography of all significant scientific data and studies on which the proposed rule is based. The statement of basis and purpose shall include a summary of—

“(i) the factual data on which the proposed rule is based;

“(ii) the major scientific assumptions, legal interpretations, and policy considerations underlying the proposed rule;

“(iii) a summary of available risk-benefit information, including benefits and use information as provided by the Secretary of Agriculture; and

“(iv) the analysis and tentative conclusions of the Administrator regarding the balancing of the risks and benefits.

“(B)(i) A registrant of the pesticide and a person who submits comments on the proposed rule shall make a report to the Administrator of all scientific data and studies possessed by the person concerning the risks and benefits of the pesticide that is the subject of the rulemaking that were not included in the bibliography included in the notice required under subparagraph (A).

“(ii) If, after the date of the report made under clause (i), the registrant or the person receives additional scientific data or studies pertinent to the rulemaking that were not included in the bibliography, the person shall make a report of the scientific data and studies to the Administrator promptly after receipt.

“(iii) If the Administrator receives reports containing additional data concerning risks or benefits, the Administrator shall revise the bibliography to reflect the data and make the revised bibliography available to the public.

“(C)(i) The Administrator shall provide a comment period of not less than 90 days after the publication of the notice of proposed rulemaking.

“(ii) During the period, a person may submit comments, data, or documentary information on the proposed rule.

“(iii) Promptly on receipt by the Administrator, all written comments and documentary information on the proposed rule received from a person for inclusion in the docket during the comment period, shall be placed in the docket.

“(D)(i) At the same time as the Administrator publishes notice under subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall provide the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services with a copy of the proposed rule.

“(ii) Not later than 90 days after the publication of the notice of proposed rulemaking, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services may provide comments on the proposed rule.

“(iii) If an agricultural commodity is affected, the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide to the Administrator an analysis of the impact of the proposed action on the domestic and global availability and prices of agricultural commodities and retail food prices and any associated societal impacts (including impacts on consumer nutrition and health and low-income consumers).

“(7) INFORMAL HEARING.—

“(A)(i) A person who has submitted a comment may, not later than 15 days after the close of the comment period, request the Administrator to conduct an informal hearing on questions of fact pertaining to the proposed rule or comments on the rule.

“(ii) The Administrator shall—

“(I) on receipt of the request, schedule an informal hearing of not to exceed 20 days duration; and

“(II) not later than 60 days after the close of the comment period, conduct the hearing.

“(iii) The Administrator shall publish the time, place, and purpose of the hearing in the Federal Register.

“(iv) The informal hearing shall be limited to addressing questions of fact raised by materials in the docket.

"(v) A transcript shall be made of any oral presentation, discussion, or debate and included in the docket.

"(B) The Administrator shall appoint a presiding officer who shall have the authority to administer oaths, regulate the course of the hearing, conduct prehearing conferences, schedule presentations, and exclude irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious evidence.

"(C)(i) The presiding officer shall conduct the informal hearing in a manner that encourages discussion and debate on questions of fact regarding the docket.

"(ii) The Administrator shall designate 1 or more employees of the Environmental Protection Agency to participate in the hearing.

"(iii) A person who submitted a comment on the proposed rule may participate in the hearing and shall be entitled to present evidence and argument to support the position of the person or rebut a contrary position and may choose to present materials in oral or written form.

"(8) REVIEW BY SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PANEL.—

"(A) At the time the Administrator issues a notice of proposed rulemaking under paragraph (6), the Administrator shall provide a copy of the notice to the Scientific Advisory Panel established under section 25(d) (referred to in this paragraph as the 'Panel').

"(B) If a person submits comments under paragraph (6) in opposition to the proposed rule, the Administrator shall request the comments, evaluations, and recommendations of the Panel as to the impact on health and the environment of the proposed rule and on any disputed issues of fact or scientific policy that appear to be of significance in the rulemaking.

"(C) The Panel may hold a public hearing to discuss the proposed rule.

"(D) The Panel shall provide a report to the Administrator not later than 30 days after the close of the comment period (or, if a hearing has been requested under paragraph (7), not later than 30 days after the end of the hearing).

"(E) The Administrator shall allow a reasonable time for written public comment on the report of the Panel. A copy of the report of the Panel and any comments on the report shall be included in the rulemaking docket.

"(9) FINAL ACTION.—

"(A) After considering all material in the docket, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register a final rule or a withdrawal of the proposed rule.

"(B) The Administrator may not prohibit a use of a pesticide if an alternative requirement will ensure that the pesticide, when used in accordance with widespread and commonly recognized practice, will not generally cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment.

"(C) In taking a final action, the Administrator shall take into account the impact of the action on production and prices of agricultural commodities, retail food prices, and otherwise on the agricultural economy.

"(D) The final rule or withdrawal of the proposed rule shall be accompanied by a statement that—

"(i) explains the reasons for the action;

"(ii) responds to any comments made by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and to any report of the Scientific Advisory Panel established under section 25(d);

"(iii) responds to each significant comment contained in the docket; and

"(iv) in the case of a final rule—

"(I) explains the reason for any major difference between the final rule and the proposed rule;

"(II) describes the impact of the final rule on production and prices of agricultural commodities, retail food prices, and otherwise on the agricultural economy; and

"(III) explains any significant disagreement the Administrator may have with any comment, evaluation, or recommendation contained in the report under paragraph (8), the benefits and use information described in paragraph (6)(A)(iii), or the analysis described in paragraph (6)(D) as the analysis bears on the final rule.

"(E) A final rule issued under this subsection shall become effective on the date of the publication of the final rule in the Federal Register.

"(10) MODIFICATION OR CANCELLATION.—

"(A)(i) Subject to clause (ii), a final rule shall state any requirement, classification, or prohibition imposed by the rule, and shall state that each affected registrant shall have a 30-day period from the date of the publication of the rule in the Federal Register to apply for an amendment to the registration to comply with the rule or to request voluntary cancellation of the registration.

"(ii) If the rule unconditionally prohibits all uses of a pesticide, the rule may provide that cancellation of the registration of the pesticide is effective beginning on the date of the publication of the rule.

"(iii) The final rule may prohibit or limit distribution or sale by the registrant of the affected pesticide to any other person in a State during the 30-day period.

"(B) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if an application for an amendment to the registration to make the registration comply with a rule issued under subparagraph (A) is not submitted within the 30-day period, the Administrator may issue and publish in the Federal Register an order canceling the registration, effective beginning on the date of the publication of the order in the Federal Register.

"(11) DENIAL OF APPLICATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no application for initial or amended registration of a pesticide under section 3 or 24(c) may be approved if the registration would be inconsistent with a rule in effect under this subsection.

"(12) AMENDMENT OF RULE.—

"(A) A registrant, or other interested person with the concurrence of the registrant, may petition for the amendment or revocation of a rule that has been issued under this subsection.

"(B) The petition shall state the factual material and argument that form the basis for the petition.

"(C) The Administrator shall publish a notice of the petition in the Federal Register and allow a 60-day comment period on the petition.

"(D) Not later than 180 days after publication of the notice, the Administrator shall determine whether to deny the petition or to propose to amend or revoke the rule, and publish the determination and the basis for the determination in the Federal Register.

"(E) In making the determination, the Administrator shall give due regard to—

"(i) the desirability of finality;

"(ii) the opportunity that the petitioner had to present the factual material and argument in question in the prior rulemaking proceeding; and

"(iii) any new evidence submitted by the petitioner.

"(F) If the Administrator proposes to amend or revoke the rule, the procedures es-

tablished by paragraph (1) and paragraphs (6) through (9) shall apply.

"(G) A denial of a petition shall be judicially reviewable as provided in paragraph (13).

"(13) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A decision not to initiate a rulemaking published under paragraph (4), a final rule or a withdrawal of a proposed rule published under paragraph (9), or a denial of a petition under paragraph (12) shall be judicially reviewable in the manner specified by section 16(b)(2).

"(14) EXCEPTION TO REQUIREMENTS.—If the Administrator finds it is necessary to issue a suspension order under subsection (c), the Administrator may waive the requirements of paragraphs (3) and (4)."

SEC. 203. PESTICIDES IN REVIEW.

If the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, on or before January 1, 1993, publishes a document instituting a special review proceeding or public interim administrative review proceeding with respect to a pesticide or an active ingredient of a pesticide, the Administrator may, in lieu of proceeding under section 6(b) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (as amended by section 202 of this Act), elect to continue the review proceeding and, on completion of the proceeding, take such action as is warranted in accordance with section 3(c)(6) and subsections (b) and (d) of section 6 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act).

SEC. 204. SUSPENSION.

(a) ORDER.—Section 6(c)(1) (7 U.S.C. 136d(c)(1)) is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting the following new sentence: "Except as provided in paragraph (3), no order of suspension may be issued under this subsection unless the Administrator has issued, or at the same time issues, a proposed rule under subsection (b)."

(b) EMERGENCY ORDER.—Section 6(c)(3) (7 U.S.C. 136d(c)(3)) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "The Administrator may issue an emergency order under this paragraph before issuing a proposed rule under subsection (b), if the Administrator proceeds expeditiously to issue a proposed rule."

SEC. 205. TOLERANCE REEVALUATION AS PART OF REREGISTRATION.

Section 4(g)(2) (7 U.S.C. 136a-1(g)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(E) As soon as the Administrator has sufficient information with respect to the dietary risk of a particular active ingredient, but in any event no later than the time the Administrator makes a determination under subparagraph (C) or (D) with respect to a pesticide containing a particular active ingredient, the Administrator shall—

"(i) reassess each associated tolerance and exemption from the requirement for a tolerance issued under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 346a);

"(ii) determine whether the tolerance or exemption meets the requirements of such Act;

"(iii) determine whether additional tolerances or exemptions should be issued;

"(iv) publish in the Federal Register a notice setting forth the determinations made under this subparagraph; and

"(v) commence promptly such proceedings under this Act and section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 346a) as are warranted by the determinations."

SEC. 206. SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PANEL.

Section 25(d) (7 U.S.C. 136w(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(d) SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PANEL.—The Administrator shall" and inserting the following:

"(d) SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PANEL.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) SCIENCE REVIEW BOARD.—

"(A) There is established a Science Review Board to consist of 60 scientists who shall be available to the Scientific Advisory Panel to assist in reviews conducted by the Panel.

"(B) The Scientific Advisory Panel shall select the scientists from 60 nominations submitted by each of the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health.

"(C) A member of the Board shall be compensated in the same manner as a member of the Panel."

SEC. 207. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Paragraph (6) of section 3(c) (7 U.S.C. 136a(c)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION.—

"(A)(i) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if the Administrator proposes to deny an application for registration because the application does not satisfy the requirements of paragraph (5), the Administrator shall notify the applicant of the proposal and the reasons for the denial (including the factual basis of the proposal).

"(ii) Unless the applicant makes the necessary corrections to the application and notifies the Administrator of the corrections during the 30-day period beginning on the day after the date the applicant receives the notice, or during the period the applicant submits a request for a hearing, the Administrator may issue an order denying the application.

"(iii) If during the period referred to in clause (ii), the Administrator does not receive the corrections to the application or a request for a hearing, the Administrator may issue an order denying the application.

"(iv) The order denying the application shall be published in the Federal Register and shall not be subject to judicial review.

"(v) If during the period referred to in clause (ii), the Administrator receives a request for a hearing, a hearing shall be conducted under section 6(d).

"(vi) If a hearing is held, a decision after completion of the hearing shall be final and shall be subject to judicial review under section 16(b)(1).

"(B)(i) The Administrator may deny an application for registration because the application does not comply with the requirements of a rule issued under section 6(b).

"(ii) The Administrator shall notify the applicant of the denial.

"(iii) The notice shall explain why the application does not comply with the requirements and shall state that the applicant may petition to amend or revoke the rule under section 6(b)(12)."

(b) Section 3(c) (7 U.S.C. 136a(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (8).

(c) Section 3(d) (7 U.S.C. 136a(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking "on the initial classification and registered pesticides" and inserting "under section 6(b). A registered pesticide"; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking all that follows "on the environment," and inserting "the Administrator may initiate a proceeding under section 6(b)."

(d) Section 4(e)(3)(B)(iii)(III) (7 U.S.C. 136a-1(e)(3)(B)(iii)(III)) is amended—

(1) by striking "section 6(d), except that the" and inserting "section 6(d). The"; and

(2) by inserting after "guidelines," the following new sentence: "If a hearing is held, a decision after completion of the hearing shall be final."

(e) Section 6(c)(4) (7 U.S.C. 136d(c)(4)) is amended by striking "Section 16 of this Act" and inserting "section 16(b)(1)".

(f) Section 6(d) (7 U.S.C. 136d(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following new sentence: "If a hearing is requested pursuant to section 3(c)(2)(B)(iv), 3(c)(6), or 4(e)(3)(B)(iii)(III), or subsection (c)(2) or (e)(2), the hearing shall be held for the purpose of receiving evidence relevant and material to the issues raised by the request for the hearing."; and

(2) by striking all that follows the eighth sentence and inserting the following new sentence: "A hearing under this subsection shall be held in accordance with sections 554, 556, and 557 of title 5, United States Code. As soon as practicable after the completion of the hearing, the Administrator shall issue a final order setting forth the decision of the Administrator. The order and decision shall be based only on substantial evidence of the record of the hearing, shall set forth detailed findings of fact on which the order is based, and shall be subject to judicial review under section 16(b)(1)."

(g) Section 16(a) (7 U.S.C. 136n(a)) is amended by inserting after "a hearing" the following: "or a proceeding under section 6(b)".

(h) Section 16(b) (17 U.S.C. 136n(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(b) REVIEW BY COURT OF APPEALS.—In the case of" and inserting the following:

"(b) REVIEW BY COURT OF APPEALS.—

"(1) REVIEW OF CERTAIN ORDERS.—In the case of";

(2) in the last sentence of paragraph (1) (as so designated), by striking "under this section" and inserting "under this paragraph"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) REVIEW OF CERTAIN RULES.—

"(A) In the case of actual controversy as to the validity of a rule issued by the Administrator under section 6(b)(9), a decision by the Administrator under paragraph (4) or (9) of section 6(b) not to issue a proposed rule or to withdraw a proposed rule, or a denial of a petition to revoke or amend a final rule under section 6(b)(12), a person who will be adversely affected by the rule or decision and who has filed comments in the proceeding leading to the rule or decision may obtain judicial review by filing a petition in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the person resides or has a place of business, not later than 60 days after the entry of the order.

"(B) A copy of the petition shall be transmitted to the Administrator or an officer designated by the Administrator.

"(C) On receipt of the copy of the petition, the Administrator shall file in court the record of the proceedings on which the Administrator based the rule or decision, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(D) On the filing of the petition, the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm or set aside the rule or decision in whole or in part.

"(E) The standard of review shall be the standard set forth in section 706 of title 5, United States Code.

"(F) The judgment of the court under this paragraph shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court on certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

"(G) The commencement of proceedings under this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court to the contrary, operate as a stay of an order."

(i) Section 25(a) (7 U.S.C. 136w(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) EXCEPTION.—The requirements of this subsection shall not apply to a rule or rule-making proceeding under section 6(b)."

(j) Section 25(d)(1) (as designated by section 206) is further amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking "of the action proposed in notices of intent issued under section 6(b) and"; and

(2) in the second sentence—

(A) by striking "notices of intent and"; and

(B) by striking "6(b) or 25(a), as applicable," and inserting "25(a)."

(k) The second sentence of section 25(e) (7 U.S.C. 136w(e)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: "except for an action that may be taken under section 6(b)".

SEC. 208. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO FIFRA TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents in section 1(b) (7 U.S.C. prec. 121) is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to section 3(c)(6) and inserting the following new item:

"(6) Denial of application for registration";

(2) by striking the item relating to section 3(c)(8);

(3) by striking the item relating to section 6(b) and inserting the following new items:

"(b) Cancellation and change in classification or other terms or conditions of registration.

"(1) Authority.

"(2) Basis for rule.

"(3) Prenotice procedures.

"(4) Advance notice to public.

"(5) Docket.

"(6) Notice of proposed rule-making.

"(7) Informal hearing.

"(8) Review by Scientific Advisory Panel.

"(9) Final action.

"(10) Modification or cancellation.

"(11) Denial of applications.

"(12) Amendment of rule.

"(13) Judicial review.

"(14) Exception to requirements."

(4) by striking the item relating to section 16(b) and inserting the following new items:

"(b) Review by court of appeals.

"(1) Review of certain orders.

"(2) Review of certain rules."

(5) by adding at the end of the items relating to section 25(a) the following new item:

"(5) Exception."

(6) by striking the item relating to section 25(d) and inserting the following new items:

"(d) Scientific Advisory Panel.

"(1) In general.

"(2) Science Review Board."

and

(7) by striking the item relating to section 28(c) and inserting the following new items:

"(c) Integrated pest management.

"(1) In general.

"(2) Joint research and development."

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

SEC. 301. REFERENCE.

Whenever in this title an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321 et seq.).

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

(a) PESTICIDE CHEMICAL; PESTICIDE CHEMICAL RESIDUE.—Section 201(q) (21 U.S.C. 321(q)) is amended to read as follows:

"(q)(1) The term 'pesticide chemical' means—

"(A) any substance that is a pesticide within the meaning of section 2(u) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136(u)),

"(B) any active ingredient of a pesticide within the meaning of section 2(a) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136(a)), or

"(C) any inert ingredient of a pesticide within the meaning of section 2(m) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136(m)).

"(2) The term 'pesticide chemical residue' means a residue in or on raw agricultural commodity or processed food of—

"(A) a pesticide chemical, or

"(B) any other added substance that is present in the commodity or food primarily as a result of the metabolism or other degradation of a pesticide chemical.

"(3) Notwithstanding subparagraphs (1) and (2), the Administrator may by regulation except a substance from the definition of 'pesticide chemical' or 'pesticide chemical residue' if—

"(A) the substance's occurrence as a residue on a raw agricultural commodity or processed food is attributable primarily to natural causes or to human activities not involving the use of any substances for a pesticidal purpose in the production, storage, processing, or transportation of any raw agricultural commodity or processed food, and

"(B) the Administrator, after consultation with the Secretary, determines that the substance more appropriately should be regulated under one or more provisions of this Act other than sections 402(a)(2)(B) and 408."

(b) FOOD ADDITIVE.—Subparagraphs (1) and (2) of section 201(s) (21 U.S.C. 321(s)) are amended to read as follows:

"(1) a pesticide chemical residue in or on a raw agricultural commodity or processed food; or

"(2) a pesticide chemical; or"

(c) PROCESSED FOOD.—Section 201 (21 U.S.C. 321) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(gg) The term 'processed food' means any food other than a raw agricultural commodity and includes any raw agricultural commodity that has been subject to processing, such as canning, cooking, freezing, dehydration, or milling.

"(hh) The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency."

SEC. 303. PROHIBITED ACTS.

Section 301(j) (21 U.S.C. 331(j)) is amended by inserting before the first period the following: ", or the violation of section 408(g)(2) or any regulation issued under such section."

SEC. 304. ADULTERATED FOOD.

Section 402(a)(2) (21 U.S.C. 342(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) if—

"(A) it bears or contains any added poisonous or added deleterious substance (other than a substance that is a pesticide chemical residue in or on a raw agricultural commodity or processed food, a food additive, a color additive, or a new animal drug) that is unsafe within the meaning of section 406;

"(B) it bears or contains a pesticide chemical residue that is unsafe within the meaning of section 408(a); or

"(C) it is or if it bears or contains—

"(i) any food additive that is unsafe within the meaning of section 409; or

"(ii) a new animal drug (or conversion product thereof) that is unsafe within the meaning of section 512; or"

SEC. 305. TOLERANCES AND EXEMPTIONS FOR PESTICIDE CHEMICAL RESIDUES.

Section 408 (21 U.S.C. 346a) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 408. TOLERANCES AND EXEMPTIONS FOR PESTICIDE CHEMICAL RESIDUES.

"(a) REQUIREMENT FOR TOLERANCE OR EXEMPTION.—

"(1) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this section, the term 'food,' when used as a noun without modification, shall mean a raw agricultural commodity or processed food.

"(2) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in paragraph (3) or (4), any pesticide chemical residue in or on a food shall be deemed unsafe for the purpose of section 402(a)(2)(B) unless—

"(A) a tolerance for such pesticide chemical residue in or on such food is in effect under this section and the concentration of the residue is within the limits of the tolerance; or

"(B) an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance is in effect under this section for the pesticide chemical residue.

"(3) PROCESSED FOOD.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the following provisions shall apply with respect to processed food:

"(A) If a tolerance is in effect under this section for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a raw agricultural commodity, a pesticide chemical residue that is present in or on a processed food because the food is made from that raw agricultural commodity shall not be considered unsafe within the meaning of section 402(a)(2)(B) despite the lack of a tolerance for the pesticide chemical residue in or on the processed food if the concentration of the pesticide chemical residue in the processed food when ready for consumption or use is not greater than the tolerance prescribed for the pesticide chemical residue in the raw agricultural commodity.

"(B) If an exemption from the requirement for a tolerance is in effect under this section for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a raw agricultural commodity, a pesticide chemical residue that is present in or on a processed food because the food is made from that raw agricultural commodity shall not be considered unsafe within the meaning of section 402(a)(2)(B).

"(4) RESIDUES OF DEGRADATION PRODUCTS.—If a pesticide chemical residue is present in or on a food because it is a metabolite or other degradation product of a precursor substance that itself is a pesticide chemical or pesticide chemical residue, such a residue shall not be considered to be unsafe within the meaning of section 402(a)(2)(B) despite the lack of a tolerance or exemption from the need for a tolerance for such residue in or on such food if—

"(A) the Administrator has not determined that the degradation product is likely to

pose any potential health risk from dietary exposure that is of a different type than, or of a greater significance than, any risk posed by dietary exposure to the precursor substance;

"(B) either—

"(i) a tolerance is in effect under this section for residues of the precursor substance in or on the food, and the combined level of residues of the degradation product and the precursor substance in or on the food is at or below the stoichiometrically equivalent level that would be permitted by the tolerance if the residue consisted only of the precursor substance rather than the degradation product; or

"(ii) an exemption from the need for a tolerance is in effect under this section for residues of the precursor substance in or on the food; and

"(C) the tolerance or exemption for residues of the precursor substance does not state that it applies only to particular named substances or states that it does not apply to residues of the degradation product.

"(5) EFFECT OF TOLERANCE OR EXEMPTION.—While a tolerance or exemption from the requirement for a tolerance is in effect under this section for a pesticide chemical residue with respect to any food, the food shall not by reason of bearing or containing any amount of such a residue be considered to be adulterated within the meaning of section 402(a)(1).

"(b) AUTHORITY AND STANDARD FOR TOLERANCES.—

"(1) AUTHORITY.—The Administrator may issue regulations establishing, modifying, or revoking a tolerance for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food—

"(A) in response to a petition filed under subsection (d); or

"(B) on the Administrator's initiative under subsection (e).

"(2) STANDARD.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—A tolerance may not be established for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food at a level that is higher than a level that the Administrator determines is adequate to protect the public health.

"(B) MODIFICATION OR REVOCATION OF A TOLERANCE.—The Administrator shall modify or revoke a tolerance if it is at a level higher than the level that the Administrator determines is adequate to protect the public health.

"(C) DETERMINATION FACTORS.—In making a determination under this paragraph, the Administrator shall take into account, among other relevant factors, the validity, completeness, and reliability of the available data from studies of the pesticide chemical residue, the nature of any toxic effects shown to be caused by the pesticide chemical in such studies, available information and reasonable assumptions concerning the relationship of the results of such studies to human risk, available information and reasonable assumptions concerning the dietary exposure levels of food consumers (and major identifiable subgroups of food consumers, including infants and children) to the pesticide chemical residue, and available information and reasonable assumptions concerning the variability of the sensitivities of major identifiable groups, including infants and children, and shall consider other factors to the extent required by subparagraph (F).

"(D) NEGLIGIBLE DIETARY RISK STANDARD.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a tolerance level for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food shall be considered to be adequate to protect the public health if the dietary risk posed to food consumers by such

level of the pesticide chemical residue is negligible. The Administrator shall by regulation set forth the factors and methods for determining whether such a risk is negligible.

"(E) CALCULATION OF DIETARY RISK.—Where reliable data are available, the Administrator shall calculate the dietary risk posed to food consumers by a pesticide chemical on the basis of the percent of food actually treated with the pesticide chemical and the actual residue levels of the pesticide chemical that occur in food. In particular, the Administrator shall take into account aggregate pesticide use and residue data collected by the Department of Agriculture.

"(F) EXCEPTIONS TO THE NEGLIGIBLE DIETARY RISK STANDARD.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a level of a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food that poses a greater than negligible dietary risk to consumers of the food shall be considered to be adequate to protect the public health if the Administrator determines that such risk is not unreasonable because—

"(i) use of the pesticide that produces the residue protects humans or the environment from adverse effects on public health or welfare that would, directly or indirectly, result in greater risk to the public or the environment than the dietary risk from the pesticide chemical residue;

"(ii) use of the pesticide avoids risks to workers, the public, or the environment that would be expected to result from the use of another pesticide or pest control method on the same food and that are greater than the risks that result from dietary exposure to the pesticide chemical residue; or

"(iii) the unavailability of the pesticide would limit the availability to consumers of an adequate, wholesome, and economical food supply, taking into account regional and domestic effects, and such adverse effects are likely to outweigh the risk posed by the pesticide residue.

In making the determination under this subparagraph, the Administrator shall not consider the effects on any pesticide registrant, manufacturer, or marketer of a pesticide.

"(3) LIMITATIONS.—

"(A) ISSUANCE OF TOLERANCE.—A tolerance may be issued under the authority of paragraph (2)(F) only if the Administrator has assessed the extent to which efforts are being made to develop either an alternative method of pest control or an alternative pesticide chemical for use on such commodity or food that would meet the requirements of paragraph (2)(D).

"(B) ESTABLISHMENT OF A TOLERANCE.—A tolerance for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food shall not be established by the Administrator unless the Administrator determines, after consultation with the Secretary, that there is a practical method for detecting and measuring the levels of the pesticide chemical residue in or on the food.

"(C) ESTABLISHMENT OF A TOLERANCE LEVEL.—A tolerance for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food shall not be established at a level lower than the limit of detection of the method for detecting and measuring the pesticide chemical residue specified by the Administrator under subparagraph (B).

"(4) INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS.—In establishing a tolerance for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food, the Administrator shall take into account any maximum residue level for the chemical in or on the food that has been established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The Administrator shall determine whether the Codex maximum residue level is adequate to pro-

tect the health of United States' consumers and whether the data supporting the maximum residue level are valid, complete, and reliable. If the Administrator determines not to adopt a Codex maximum residue level, the Administrator shall publish a notice in the Federal Register setting forth the reasons.

"(C) AUTHORITY AND STANDARD FOR EXEMPTIONS.—

"(1) AUTHORITY.—The Administrator may issue a regulation establishing, modifying, or revoking an exemption from the requirement for a tolerance for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food—

"(A) in response to a petition filed under subsection (d); or

"(B) on the Administrator's initiative under subsection (e).

"(2) STANDARD.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—An exemption from the requirement for a tolerance for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food may be established only if the Administrator determines that a tolerance is not needed to protect the public health, in view of the levels of dietary exposure to the pesticide chemical residue that could reasonably be expected to occur.

"(B) REVOCATION OF EXEMPTION.—An exemption from the requirement for a tolerance for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food shall be revoked if the Administrator, in response to a petition for the revocation of the exemption or at the Administrator's own initiative determines that the exemption does not satisfy the criterion of subparagraph (A).

"(C) DETERMINATION FACTORS.—In making a determination under this subparagraph, the Administrator shall take into account, among other relevant factors, the factors set forth in subsection (b)(2)(C).

"(3) LIMITATION.—An exemption from the requirement for a tolerance for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food shall not be established by the Administrator unless the Administrator determines, after consultation with the Secretary—

"(A) that there is a practical method for detecting and measuring the levels of such pesticide chemical residue in or on such food; or

"(B) that there is no need for such a method, and states the reasons for such determination in the order issuing the regulation establishing or modifying the regulation.

"(d) PETITION FOR TOLERANCE OR EXEMPTION.—

"(1) PETITIONS AND PETITIONERS.—Any person may file with the Administrator a petition proposing the issuance of a regulation—

"(A) establishing, modifying, or revoking a tolerance for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food; or

"(B) establishing or revoking an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for such a residue.

"(2) PETITION CONTENTS.—

"(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—A petition under paragraph (1) to establish a tolerance or exemption for a pesticide chemical residue shall be supported by such data and information as are specified in regulations issued by the Administrator, including—

"(i)(I) an informative summary of the petition and of the data, information, and arguments submitted or cited in support of the petition; and

"(II) a statement that the petitioner agrees that such summary or any information it contains may be published as a part of the notice of filing of the petition to be published under this subsection and as part of a proposed or final regulation issued under this section;

"(ii) the name, chemical identity, and composition of the pesticide chemical residue and of the pesticide chemical that produces the residue;

"(iii) data showing the recommended amount, frequency, method, and time of application of that pesticide chemical;

"(iv) full reports of tests and investigations made with respect to the safety of the pesticide chemical, including full information as to the methods and controls used in conducting such tests and investigations;

"(v) full reports of tests and investigations made with respect to the nature and amount of the pesticide chemical residue that is likely to remain in or on the food, including a description of the analytical methods used;

"(vi) a practical method for detecting and measuring the levels of the pesticide chemical residue in or on the food, or a statement why such a method is not needed;

"(vii) practical methods for removing any amount of the residue that would exceed any proposed tolerance;

"(viii) a proposed tolerance for the pesticide chemical residue, if a tolerance is proposed;

"(ix) all relevant data bearing on the physical or other technical effect that the pesticide chemical is intended to have and the quantity of the pesticide chemical that is required to produce the effect;

"(x) if the petition relates to a tolerance for a processed food, reports of investigations conducted using the processing method or methods used to produce such food;

"(xi) such information as the Administrator may require to make the determination under subsection (b)(2)(E); and

"(xii) such other data and information as the Administrator requires by regulation to support the petition.

If information or data required by this subparagraph is available to the Administrator, the person submitting the petition may cite the availability of the information or data in lieu of submitting it. The Administrator may require a petition to be accompanied by samples of the pesticide chemical with respect to which the petition is filed.

"(B) MODIFICATION OR REVOCATION.—The Administrator may by regulation establish the requirements for information and data to support a petition to modify or revoke a tolerance or to revoke an exemption from the requirement for a tolerance.

"(3) NOTICE.—A notice of the filing of a petition that the Administrator determines has met the requirements of paragraph (2) shall be published by the Administrator within 30 days after such determination. The notice shall announce the availability of a description of the analytical methods available to the Administrator for the detection and measurement of the pesticide chemical residue with respect to which the petition is filed or shall set forth the petitioner's statement of why such a method is not needed. The notice shall include the summary required by paragraph (2)(A)(i).

"(4) ACTIONS BY THE ADMINISTRATOR.—The Administrator shall, after giving due consideration to a petition filed under paragraph (1) and any other information available to the Administrator—

"(A) issue a final regulation (which may vary from that sought by the petition) establishing, modifying, or revoking a tolerance for the pesticide chemical residue or an exemption of the pesticide chemical residue from the requirement of a tolerance;

"(B) issue a proposed regulation under subsection (e), and thereafter either issue a final

regulation under subsection (e) or an order denying the petition; or

"(C) issue an order denying the petition.

"(5) EFFECTIVE DATE.—A regulation issued under paragraph (4) shall take effect upon publication.

"(6) FURTHER PROCEEDINGS.—

"(A) OBJECTIONS.—Not later than 60 days after a regulation or order is issued under paragraph (4), subsection (e)(1), or subsection (f)(1), any person may file objections thereto with the Administrator, specifying with particularity the provisions of the regulation or order considered to be objectionable and stating reasonable grounds therefor. If the regulation or order was issued in response to a petition under paragraph (d)(1), a copy of each objection filed by a person other than the petitioner shall be served by the Administrator on the petitioner.

"(B) PUBLIC EVIDENTIARY HEARING.—An objection may include a request for a public evidentiary hearing upon the objection. The Administrator shall, upon the initiative of the Administrator or upon the request of an interested person and after due notice, hold a public evidentiary hearing if and to the extent the Administrator determines that such a public hearing is necessary to receive factual evidence relevant to material issues of fact raised by the objections. The presiding officer in such a hearing may authorize a party to obtain discovery from other persons and may upon a showing of good cause made by a party issue a subpoena to compel testimony or production of documents from any person. The presiding officer shall apply the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in making any order for the protection of the witness or the content of documents produced and shall order the payment of reasonable fees and expenses as a condition to requiring testimony of the witness. On contest, such a subpoena may be enforced by a Federal district court.

"(C) ISSUANCE OF AN ORDER.—After receiving the arguments of the parties, the Administrator shall, as soon as practicable, issue an order stating the action taken upon each such objection and setting forth any revision to the regulation or prior order that the Administrator has found to be warranted. If a hearing was held under subparagraph (B), such order and any revision to the regulation or prior order shall, with respect to questions of fact at issue in the hearing, be based only on substantial evidence of record at such hearing, and shall set forth in detail the findings of facts and the conclusions of law or policy upon which the order or regulation is based.

"(D) EFFECTIVE DATE OF AN ORDER.—An order issued under this paragraph ruling on an objection shall not take effect before the 90th day after its publication unless the Administrator finds that emergency conditions exist necessitating an earlier effective date, in which event the Administrator shall specify in the order the Administrator's findings as to such conditions.

"(7) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

"(A) FILING OF PETITION.—In a case of actual controversy as to the validity of any order issued under paragraph (6) or any regulation that is the subject of such an order, any person who will be adversely affected by such order or regulation may obtain judicial review by filing in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit wherein such person resides or has its principal place of business, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, not later than 60 days after publication of such order, a petition praying that the order or regulation be set aside in whole or in part.

"(B) FILING OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS.—A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Administrator, or any officer designated by the Administrator for that purpose, and thereupon the Administrator shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which the Administrator based the order or regulation, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such a petition, the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm or set aside the order or regulation complained of in whole or in part. The findings of the Administrator with respect to questions of fact shall be sustained only if supported by substantial evidence when considered on the record as a whole.

"(C) ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE.—If a party applies to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shows to the satisfaction of the court that the additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce the evidence in the proceeding before the Administrator, the court may order that the additional evidence (and evidence in rebuttal thereof) shall be taken before the Administrator in the manner and upon the terms and conditions the court deems proper. The Administrator may modify prior findings as to the facts by reason of the additional evidence so taken and may modify the order or regulation accordingly. The Administrator shall file with the court any such modified finding, order, or regulation.

"(D) FINAL JUDGMENT.—The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any order under paragraph (6) and any regulation that is the subject of such an order shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this paragraph shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court to the contrary, operate as a stay of a regulation or order.

"(E) LIMITATIONS ON JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any issue as to which review is or was obtainable under paragraph (6) and this paragraph shall not be the subject of judicial review under any other provision of law.

"(F) ACTION ON ADMINISTRATOR'S OWN INITIATIVE.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—The Administrator may issue a regulation—

"(A) establishing, modifying, or revoking a tolerance for a pesticide chemical or a pesticide chemical residue;

"(B) establishing or revoking an exemption of a pesticide chemical residue from the requirement of a tolerance; or

"(C) establishing general procedures and requirements to implement this section.

A regulation issued under this paragraph shall become effective upon its publication.

"(2) NOTICE.—Before issuing a final regulation under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall issue a notice of proposed rulemaking and provide a period of not less than 60 days for public comment on the proposed regulation, except that a shorter period for comment may be provided if the Administrator for good cause finds that it would be contrary to the public interest to do so and states the reasons for the finding in the notice of proposed rulemaking. The Administrator shall provide an opportunity for a public hearing during the rulemaking under procedures provided in subsection (d)(6)(B).

"(F) SPECIAL DATA REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) REQUIRING SUBMISSION OF ADDITIONAL DATA.—If the Administrator determines that additional data or information are reason-

ably required to support the continuation of a tolerance or exemption that is in effect under this section for a pesticide chemical residue on a food, the Administrator shall—

"(A) issue a notice requiring the persons holding the pesticide registrations associated with such tolerance or exemption to submit the data or information under section 3(c)(2)(B) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a(c)(2)(B));

"(B) issue a rule requiring that testing be conducted on a substance or mixture under section 4 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2603); or

"(C) publish in the Federal Register, after first providing notice and an opportunity for comment of not less than 90 days duration, an order—

"(i) requiring the submission to the Administrator by one or more interested persons of a notice identifying the person or persons who will submit the required data and information;

"(ii) describing the type of data and information required to be submitted to the Administrator and stating why the data and information could not be obtained under the authority of section 3(c)(2)(B) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a(c)(2)(B)) or section 4 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2603);

"(iii) describing the reports to the Administrator required to be prepared during and after the collection of the data and information;

"(iv) requiring the submission to the Administrator of the data, information, and reports referred to in clauses (ii) and (iii); and

"(v) establishing dates by which the submissions described in clauses (i) and (iv) must be made.

The Administrator may revise any such order to correct an error.

"(2) NONCOMPLIANCE.—If a submission required by a notice issued in accordance with paragraph (1)(A) or an order issued under paragraph (1)(B) is not made by the time specified in such notice or order, the Administrator may by order published in the Federal Register modify or revoke the tolerance or exemption in question.

"(3) REVIEW.—An order issued under this subsection shall be effective upon publication and shall be subject to review in accordance with paragraphs (6) and (7) of subsection (d).

"(g) CONFIDENTIALITY AND USE OF DATA.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—Data and information that are submitted to the Administrator under this section in support of a tolerance shall be entitled to confidential treatment for reasons of business confidentiality and to exclusive use and data compensation, to the same extent provided by sections 3 and 10 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a and 136h).

"(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Data that are entitled to confidential treatment under paragraph (1) may be disclosed to the Congress, and may be disclosed, under such security requirements as the Administrator may provide by regulation, to—

"(A) employees of the United States who are authorized by the Administrator to examine such data in the carrying out of their official duties under this Act or other Federal laws intended to protect the public health; or

"(B) contractors with the United States authorized by the Administrator to examine such data in the carrying out of contracts under such statutes.

"(3) SUMMARIES.—Notwithstanding any provision of this subsection or other law, the Administrator may publish the informative summary required by subsection (d)(2)(A)(i) and may, in issuing a proposed or final regulation or order under this section, publish an informative summary of the data relating to the regulation or order.

"(h) STATUS OF PREVIOUSLY ISSUED REGULATIONS.—

"(1) REGULATIONS UNDER SECTION 406.—Regulations affecting pesticide chemical residues in or on raw agricultural commodities promulgated, in accordance with section 701(e), under the authority of section 406(a) upon the basis of public hearings instituted before January 1, 1953, shall be deemed to be regulations issued under this section and shall be subject to modification or revocation under subsections (d) and (e).

"(2) REGULATIONS UNDER SECTION 409.—Regulations that established tolerances for substances that are pesticide chemical residues on or in processed food, or that otherwise stated the conditions under which such pesticide chemicals could be safely used, and that were issued under section 409 on or before the date of the enactment of this paragraph, shall be deemed to be regulations issued under this section and shall be subject to modification or revocation under subsection (d) or (e).

"(3) REGULATIONS UNDER SECTION 408.—Regulations that established tolerances or exemptions under this section that were issued on or before the date of the enactment of this paragraph shall remain in effect unless modified or revoked under subsection (d) or (e).

"(i) TRANSITIONAL PROVISION.—If, on the day before the date of the enactment of this subsection, a substance that is a pesticide chemical was, with respect to a particular pesticidal use of the substance and any resulting pesticide chemical residue in or on a particular food—

"(1) regarded by the Administrator or the Secretary as generally recognized as safe for use within the meaning of the provisions of section 408(a) or 201(s) as then in effect; or

"(2) regarded by the Secretary as a substance described by section 201(s)(4),

such a pesticide chemical residue shall be regarded as exempt from the requirement for a tolerance, as of the date of enactment of this subsection. The Administrator shall by regulation indicate which substances are described by this subsection. An exemption under this subsection may be revoked or modified as if it had been issued under subsection (c).

"(j) HARMONIZATION WITH ACTION UNDER OTHER LAWS.—

"(1) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a final rule under this section that revokes, modifies, or suspends a tolerance or exemption for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food may be issued only if the Administrator has first taken any necessary action under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.), with respect to the registration of the pesticide whose use results in such residue to ensure that any authorized use of the pesticide in producing, storing, processing, or transporting food that occurs after the issuance of such final rule under this section will not result in pesticide chemical residues on such food that are unsafe within the meaning of subsection (a).

"(2) REVOCATION OF TOLERANCE OR EXEMPTION FOLLOWING CANCELLATION OF ASSOCIATED REGISTRATIONS.—If the Administrator, acting under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide,

and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.), cancels the registration of each pesticide that contains a particular pesticide chemical and that is labeled for use on a particular food, or requires that the registration of each such pesticide be modified to prohibit its use in connection with the production, storage, or transportation of such food, due in whole or in part to dietary risks to humans posed by residues of such pesticide chemical on such food, the Administrator shall revoke any tolerance or exemption that allows the presence of such pesticide chemical, or any pesticide chemical residue that results from its use, in or on such food. The Administrator shall use the procedures set forth in subsection (e) in taking action under this paragraph. A revocation under this paragraph shall become effective not later than 180 days after—

"(A) the date by which each such cancellation of a registration has become effective; or

"(B) the date on which the use of the canceled pesticide becomes unlawful under the terms of the cancellation, whichever is later.

"(3) SUSPENSION OF TOLERANCE OR EXEMPTION FOLLOWING SUSPENSION OF ASSOCIATED REGISTRATIONS.—

"(A) SUSPENSION.—If the Administrator, acting under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.), suspends the use of each registered pesticide that contains a particular pesticide chemical and that is labeled for use on a particular food, due in whole or in part to dietary risks to humans posed by residues of such pesticide chemical on such food, the Administrator shall suspend any tolerance or exemption that allows the presence of such pesticide chemical, or any pesticide chemical residue that results from its use, in or on such food. The Administrator shall use the procedures set forth in subsection (e) in taking action under this paragraph. A suspension under this paragraph shall become effective not later than 60 days after the date by which each such suspension of use has become effective.

"(B) EFFECT OF SUSPENSION.—The suspension of a tolerance or exemption under subparagraph (A) shall be effective as long as the use of each associated registration of a pesticide is suspended under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.). While a suspension of a tolerance or exemption is effective the tolerance or exemption shall not be considered to be in effect. If the suspension of use of the pesticide under such Act is terminated, leaving the registration of the pesticide for such use in effect under such Act, the Administrator shall rescind any associated suspension of a tolerance or exemption.

"(4) TOLERANCES FOR UNAVOIDABLE RESIDUES.—In connection with action taken under paragraph (2) or (3), or with respect to pesticides whose registrations were canceled prior to the effective date of this paragraph, if the Administrator determines that a residue of the canceled or suspended pesticide chemical will unavoidably persist in the environment and thereby be present in or on a food, the Administrator may establish a tolerance for the pesticide chemical residue at a level that permits such unavoidable residue to remain in such food. In establishing such a tolerance, the Administrator shall take into account the factors set forth in subsection (b)(2)(F)(iii) and shall use the procedures set forth in subsection (e). The Administrator shall review any such tolerance periodically and modify it as necessary so

that it allows only that level of the pesticide chemical residue that is unavoidable.

"(5) PESTICIDE RESIDUES RESULTING FROM LAWFUL APPLICATION OF PESTICIDE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if a tolerance or exemption for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food has been revoked, suspended, or modified under this section, an article of that food shall not be considered unsafe solely because of the presence of such pesticide chemical residue in or on such food if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that—

"(A) the residue is present as the result of an application or use of a pesticide at a time and in a manner that was lawful under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.); and

"(B) the residue does not exceed a level that was authorized at the time of that application or use to be present on the food under a tolerance, exemption, food additive regulation, or other sanction then in effect under this Act.

unless, in the case of any tolerance or exemption revoked, suspended, or modified under this subsection or subsection (d) or (e), the Administrator has issued a determination that consumption of the legally treated food during the period of its likely availability in commerce will pose an unreasonable dietary risk.

"(k) FEES.—The Administrator shall by regulation require the payment of such fees as will in the aggregate, in the judgment of the Administrator, be sufficient over a reasonable term to provide, equip, and maintain an adequate service for the performance of the Administrator's functions under this section. Under the regulations, the performance of the Administrator's services or other functions under this section, including—

"(1) the acceptance for filing of a petition submitted under subsection (d);

"(2) the promulgation of a regulation establishing, modifying, or revoking a tolerance or establishing or revoking an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance under this section;

"(3) the acceptance for filing of objections under subsection (d)(6); or

"(4) the certification and filing in court of a transcript of the proceedings and the record under subsection (d)(7),

may be conditioned upon the payment of such fees. The regulations may further provide for waiver or refund of fees in whole or in part when in the judgment of the Administrator such a waiver or refund is equitable and not contrary to the purposes of this subsection.

"(l) NATIONAL UNIFORMITY OF TOLERANCES.—

"(1) QUALIFYING PESTICIDE CHEMICAL RESIDUE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualifying pesticide chemical residue' means a pesticide chemical residue resulting from the use, in production, processing, or storage of a food, of a pesticide chemical that is an active ingredient and that—

"(A) was first approved for such use in a registration of a pesticide issued under section 3(c)(5) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a(c)(5)) on or after April 25, 1985, on the basis of data determined by the Administrator to meet all applicable requirements for data prescribed by regulations in effect under such Act on April 25, 1985; or

"(B) was approved for such use in a reregistration eligibility determination issued under section 4(g) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a-1(g)) on or after the date of enactment of the Food Quality Protection Act of 1993.

"(2) QUALIFYING FEDERAL DETERMINATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualifying Federal determination' means—

"(A) a tolerance or exemption from the requirement for a tolerance for a qualifying pesticide chemical residue that was—

"(i) issued under this section after the date of enactment of the Food Quality Protection Act of 1993; and

"(ii) issued (or, pursuant to subsection (h) or (i), deemed to have been issued) under this section, and determined by the Administrator to meet the standard under subsection (b)(2) (in the case of a tolerance) or (c)(2) (in the case of an exemption); and

"(B) any statement, issued by the Secretary, of the residue level below which enforcement action will not be taken under this Act with respect to any qualifying pesticide chemical residue, if the Secretary finds that such pesticide chemical residue level permitted by such statement during the period to which such statement applies protects human health.

"(3) LIMITATION.—The Administrator may make the determination described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii) only by issuing a rule in accordance with the procedure set forth in subsection (d) or (e) and only if the Administrator issues a proposed rule and allows a period of not less than 30 days for comment on the proposed rule. Any such rule shall be reviewable in accordance with paragraphs (6) and (7) of subsection (d).

"(4) STATE AUTHORITY.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), no State or political subdivision may establish or enforce any regulatory limit on a qualifying pesticide chemical residue in or on any food if a qualifying Federal determination applies to the presence of such pesticide chemical residue in or on such food, unless such State regulatory limit is identical to such qualifying Federal determination. A State or political subdivision shall be considered to establish or enforce a regulatory limit on a pesticide chemical residue in or on food if it purports to prohibit or penalize the production, processing, shipping, or other handling of a food because it contains a pesticide residue (in excess of a prescribed limit), or if it purports to require that a food containing a pesticide residue be the subject of a warning or other statement relating to the presence of the pesticide residue in the food.

"(5) PETITION PROCEDURE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Any State may petition the Administrator for authorization to establish in such State a regulatory limit on a qualifying pesticide chemical residue in or on any food that is not identical to the qualifying Federal determination applicable to such qualifying pesticide chemical residue.

"(B) PETITION REQUIREMENTS.—Any petition under subparagraph (A) shall—

"(i) satisfy any requirements prescribed, by rule, by the Administrator; and

"(ii) be supported by scientific data about the pesticide chemical residue that is the subject of the petition or about chemically related pesticide chemical residues, data on the consumption within such State of food bearing the pesticide chemical residue, and data on exposure of humans within such State to the pesticide chemical residue.

"(C) ORDER.—Subject to paragraph (6), the Administrator may, by order, grant the authorization described in subparagraph (A) if the Administrator determines that the proposed State regulatory limit—

"(i) is justified by compelling local conditions;

"(ii) would not unduly burden interstate commerce; and

"(iii) would not cause any food to be in violation of Federal law.

"(D) CONSIDERATION OF PETITION AS PETITION FOR TOLERANCE OR EXEMPTIONS.—In lieu of any action authorized under subparagraph (C), the Administrator may treat a petition under this paragraph as a petition under subsection (d) to revoke or modify a tolerance or to revoke an exemption. If the Administrator determines to treat a petition under this paragraph as a petition under subsection (d), the Administrator shall thereafter act on the petition pursuant to subsection (d).

"(E) REVIEW OF ORDER.—Any order of the Administrator granting or denying the authorization described in subparagraph (A) shall be subject to review in the manner described in subsections (d)(6) and (d)(7).

"(6) RESIDUES FROM LAWFUL APPLICATION.—No State or political subdivision may enforce any regulatory limit on the level of a pesticide chemical residue that may appear in or on any food if, at the time of the application of the pesticide that resulted in such residue, the sale of such food with such residue level was lawful under this Act and under the law of such State, unless the State demonstrates that consumption of the food containing such pesticide residue level during the period of the food's likely availability in the State will pose an unreasonable dietary risk to the health of persons within such State."

SEC. 305. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

Section 512(a)(1) (21 U.S.C. 360b(a)(1)) is amended by striking "section 402(a)(2)(D)" and inserting "section 402(a)(2)(C)(ii)".

SEC. 306. AUTHORIZATION FOR INCREASE MONITORING.

There is authorized to be appropriated \$12,000,000 in addition to other amounts appropriated for increased monitoring by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of pesticide residues in imported and domestic food.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, on June 28 of this year, the National Academy of Sciences released its long-awaited report, "Pesticides in the Diets of Infants and Children." The Academy believes that the food supply is safe, but concluded that there is room for improvement, particularly when it comes to our children. Senator PRYOR and I are introducing legislation to expedite the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences, along with other improvements in the way we regulate pesticides.

This bill specifically recognizes that need for obtaining better information on what children eat, and what's in the food they eat. The bill also calls for improvements in the toxicity testing requirements of pesticides and methods of risk assessment to ensure that pesticide tolerances adequately ensure the safety of our children.

In addition, this legislation puts an end to the pesticide double standard by creating a single safety standard for pesticide tolerances on raw and processed food as recommended by another recent Academy report. The bill also establishes procedures to expedite current cancellation and suspension authority in order to remove bad actors from the market quickly avoiding costly and time-consuming adjudicatory proceedings. Finally, the bill directs

EPA and USDA to research and collect data on integrated pest management to reduce or eliminate the use of high risk pesticides.

Many of the concepts contained in this bill have been embraced by the administration. I look forward to working closely with the administration on these very difficult issues as they progress.

I urge all my colleagues to join Senator PRYOR and me in supporting this sound, comprehensive approach to pesticide regulatory reform.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, today I join with Senators PRYOR and LUGAR in support of maintaining a plentiful, wholesome, and economical food supply. Our Nation now enjoys some of the highest safety standards and the lowest food prices in the world. I am convinced that we can maintain this quality supply by means of laws and regulations which promote sound and practical scientific methods while considering the advantageous aspects of certain pesticides to the national health and economy. However, a combination of antiquated legislation, a recent judicial decision, and EPA policy now threaten to undermine the integrity of the food supply.

In 1958, Congress enacted the Delaney clause of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act [FD&C Act] which prohibits the approval of any food additives found to be carcinogenic, no matter how remote the statistical probability of additional cancers. The clause completely ignores any consideration of social benefit in relation to the significance of the risk posed by the additive.

The Delaney clause illustrates well how the admirable intentions of strict Government regulations often create a situation which later becomes onerous. As analytical methods have improved, so has our ability to detect trace amounts of residual substances in food products as well as the ability to predict remote health threats. Residual substances can now be detected at levels well below threshold level. Cancer rates can be predicted at levels far fewer than one additional cancer per million people.

The Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], after realizing the anachronistic nature of the clause, established a de minimis policy for pesticides and additives to processed foods; that is, they established a policy accepting of negligible risks to allow much needed flexibility. This standard, supported by a 1987 National Academy of Sciences study, allowed for pesticide levels which are suspected of producing less than one additional cancer per million people. In addition, EPA departed from the de minimis restrictions to allow for somewhat higher risks when benefits are judged significant. This was in compliance with current law applying only to nonprocessed foods which

maintains that EPA must consider "the need for an adequate, wholesome, and economical food supply" when establishing regulations for these residues.

However, this functional policy was overturned by the decision of the U.S. ninth circuit court last year in the case of *Les versus Reilly*. This decision has created a possible crisis. EPA has identified 32 pesticides used on 29 different crops subject to the court decision and the Delaney clause consequently prohibiting them from use. The paradox created is that though this act was intended to protect the public health, it now prohibits registration of pesticides which may cause less risk than other pesticides available which do not happen to bear the dreaded title of carcinogen, but which may in fact pose greater health risk of another nature.

The court decision regarding the Delaney clause in addition to new studies by the National Academy of Sciences regarding food safety has led to renewed interest in reforming pesticide and food additive policy in general. The FD&C Act and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act [FIFRA] have both been under scrutiny by my colleagues looking to improve upon current pesticide regulations. The bill presented by Senators PRYOR and LUGAR today seeks not only to find a solution to the Delaney dilemma, but also to expand upon several broader concerns which have arisen out of current regulations found in FD&C and FIFRA.

The first of these reforms strikes at the very heart of the regulatory inefficiency of FIFRA. It provides EPA with the streamlined regulatory procedures needed to quickly eliminate the use of any pesticide by removing the constraints of the layers of paperwork now necessary for EPA to cancel the use of a pesticide. EPA sometimes needs to respond quickly in emergency situations to eliminate the use of certain pesticides when updated scientific data shows that such an action is necessary. The new provisions for cancellation outlined in the legislation not only replace a cumbersome adjudicatory hearing with an informal rulemaking procedure, but they also require that EPA seek scientific background from USDA, FDA, and EPA scientists. In addition, it allows for a comment period which is significant while not being too much of a regulatory burden. This reform presents a moderate approach to the cancellation procedure, promoting swift action while allowing all interested parties sufficient time to respond to proposed cancellations.

The heart of the reforms presented in this bill, however, are the amendments to the FD&C Act. It is here that the troublesome Delaney clause is replaced by a modern and rational standard limiting pesticide risks to negligible levels

as recommended by the National Academy of Sciences. This standard would be uniform across all foods. Importantly, the standard is flexible and allows EPA to consider benefits when setting pesticide tolerances. Such benefits would include nutritional benefits as well as the impact of a loss of a pesticide on the availability and affordability of wholesome domestic foods.

This flexible negligible risk standard also would take into account the validity and reliability of studies on individual pesticides and incorporate real-life, commonsense data into the development of residue tolerances. It would not base tolerances on theoretically ambiguous, arbitrary assumptions which ignore actual application levels to crops and actual residue levels found in the food supply. This bill offers a moderate, commonsense approach to pesticide tolerance levels which seeks to regulate the excessive use of pesticides while still recognizing that pesticides are beneficial to society.

This bill, unlike the current Delaney clause, would allow for further technological and analytical improvements to be incorporated into EPA's regulatory strategy. Not only would it give EPA the flexibility to adapt regulations to the specific circumstances of individual foods and their real impact on human health, but it would enable EPA to consider any new scientific evidence concerning major subgroups of the population. For instance, the National Academy of Sciences recently released a study on the nature of the effects of pesticides on children. The NAS proposed that EPA consider the specific needs of children—their unique diets and nutritional requirements—when establishing tolerances. This bill allows for and promotes an incorporation of any such new information into regulation, while avoiding unnecessary disruptions while taking into account common practice and available scientific data. Likewise, the bill establishes no numerical standards. Instead, the legislation advocates a rational, real-life approach to pesticide regulation—something that the Delaney clause did not allow. This approach recognizes that analytic methods are constantly improving, and that the EPA should be given authority to set tolerance levels on a case-by-case basis which allows for such improvements as well as the inclusion of subgroups.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so that we may respond to the real crisis situation which has been created by the Delaney clause. Pesticides and food additives provide great benefits to American agriculture and American consumers. The loss of the pesticides listed by the EPA for cancellation in response to *Les versus Reilly* will result in reductions in crop yields, farm income, agricultural employment, and American competitiveness abroad. We must understand that

pesticides and food safety are not mutually exclusive, but that pesticides help provide our Nation with a food supply that is truly plentiful, wholesome, and economical. As pesticides are unnecessarily forced out of the market, the availability of anticarcinogenic, wholesome fruits and vegetables declines and the probability of disease-causing organisms in food increases. In light of the great impact of pesticides on the Nation's good health and healthy economy, it is imperative that we allow EPA to balance the benefits and risks of pesticide use as they search for meaningful tolerance and registration regulations.

Mr. President, if the Congress is to improve the safety of our food supply and the health of our economy, it must follow this course. We cannot enact regulations based upon hypothesis and panic, but we must instead search for ways to maintain the quality of our food supply in a rational, scientifically based method. This legislation is a great step toward that goal, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senators PRYOR and LUGAR and others in introducing the Food Quality Protection Act of 1993. This legislation is needed to update our Nation's food safety laws to reflect the state of modern science and to ensure the continued integrity of our food supply.

Congress has been struggling for years now to arrive at appropriate reforms to update our food safety laws, but consensus has eluded us. Now, we no longer have the luxury of time to resolve this issue. The ninth circuit court ruling in *Les versus Reilly*, requiring the strict application of the Delaney clause's zero-risk standard for setting pesticide tolerances, could result in the revocation of 32 to 60 tolerances. This would affect 80 to 100 different crops. Further, as the process of pesticide reregistration now underway continues, more pesticides may fall within the scope of a strictly interpreted Delaney clause, affecting Americans' continued access to abundant, affordable foods.

The National Academy of Sciences' report, "Pesticides in the Diets of Infants and Children," also underscores the need for timely action on food safety reforms. The report finds that children may be at greater health risk from exposure to pesticides in the foods they consume. Children consume less of a variety of foods and consume more food per unit of body weight than adults. In addition, children are growing and developing and thus have different metabolic rates than adults. Our food safety laws must be updated to reflect these differences.

As we again tackle the reform of our food safety laws, it is important to remember that our Nation currently enjoys a food supply that is unparalleled

in its safety, abundance, and affordability. I believe that there are several principles which must underlie our reform efforts if we are to retain and enhance this balance among safety, abundance, and affordability.

First, a single, narrative negligible risk standard should be used as the basis for regulating pesticide residues in raw and processed food. It would be unwise, in my view, to establish a numerical standard in law, given the advances we are constantly making in our scientific understanding of the effects of pesticides.

Second, it is important that in setting tolerances, the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] be required to balance potential pesticide health risks against the benefits consumers may receive from the continued availability of a pesticide.

Third, in establishing pesticide exposure assessments, the EPA should be given the flexibility to use actual data on food consumption, pesticide use, and residue, as opposed to mandating the use of hypothetical, worst-case exposure assumptions.

Fourth, reform should encourage and support the development of safer pesticides and alternatives to the use of pesticides.

Fifth, reform should be comprehensive and include changes in the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to give the EPA the necessary tools to remove potentially hazardous pesticides from the market within a reasonable time-frame.

These principles inform the Food Quality Protection Act of 1993. This legislation provides a strong foundation for the reform of our food safety laws. I am looking forward to working with my colleagues to perfect this legislation and to achieve the consensus necessary to respond to the pressing need to update our Nation's food safety laws.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 106

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 106, a bill to modernize the United States Customs Service.

S. 446

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] were added as cosponsors of S. 446, a bill to extend until January 1, 1996, the existing suspension of duty on tamoxifen citrate.

S. 486

At the request of Mr. HEFLIN, the names of the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] were added as cosponsors of S. 486, a bill to establish a specialized corps of judges necessary

for certain Federal proceedings required to be conducted, and for other purposes.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. HEFLIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to improve the administration of the bankruptcy system, address certain commercial issues and consumer issues in bankruptcy, and establish a commission to study and make recommendations on problems with the bankruptcy system, and for other purposes.

S. 669

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 669, a bill to permit labor management cooperative efforts that improve America's economic competitiveness to continue to thrive, and for other purposes.

S. 784

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 784, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish standards with respect to dietary supplements, and for other purposes.

S. 852

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 852, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment to States of per diem for veterans who receive adult day health care through State homes, and to authorize the provision of assistance to States for the construction of adult day health care facilities at State homes.

S. 1054

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1054, a bill to impose sanctions against any foreign person or United States person that assists a foreign country in acquiring a nuclear explosive device or unsafeguarded nuclear material, and for other purposes.

S. 1055

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1055, a bill to amend the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to improve the organization and management of United States nuclear export controls, and for other purposes.

S. 1111

At the request of Mr. KERREY, the names of the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY], the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1111, a bill to authorize the minting of coins to commemorate the Viet-

nam Veterans' Memorial in Washington, D.C.

S. 1171

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the names of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] were added as cosponsors of S. 1171, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the taxation of certain sponsorship payments to tax-exempt organizations and certain amounts received by Olympic organizations.

S. 1350

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MATHEWS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1350, a bill to amend the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 to provide for an expanded Federal program of hazard mitigation and insurance against the risk of catastrophic natural disasters, such as hurricanes, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 41

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the names of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 41, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require a balanced budget.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 91

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 91, a joint resolution designating October 1993 and October 1994 as "National Domestic Violence Awareness Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 105

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 105, a joint resolution designating both September 29, 1993, and September 28, 1994, as "National Barrier Awareness Day."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 31

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, a concurrent resolution concerning the emancipation of the Iranian Baha'i community.

AMENDMENT NO. 905

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] were added as cosponsors of Amendment No. 905 proposed to H.R. 2491, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of

Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

SELF-EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY ACT

WOFFORD (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 906

(Ordered referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.)

Mr. WOFFORD (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BRADLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1045) to permit States to establish programs using unemployment funds to assist unemployed individuals in becoming self-employed, as follows:

On page 3, strike lines 9 through 15, and insert the following:

(c) BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary authorizes a self-employment program for a State under this section, the State may use the State unemployment fund to provide cash unemployment benefits, exclusive of the expenses of administration, to individuals participating in the program.

(2) USE OF AMOUNTS.—No State may use amounts made available under paragraph (1) for any purpose other than the provision of the benefits described in paragraph (1) to the individuals described in paragraph (1). Such benefits shall be used to assist such individuals in becoming self-employed.

(3) PROVISION OF BENEFITS.—A State that provides benefits under paragraph (1) to individuals participating in a self-employment program shall provide the benefits to the individuals on a weekly basis.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

BRADLEY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 907

Mr. BRADLEY (for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 2491) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, as follows:

On page 71, line 21, strike "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000".

WARNER AMENDMENT NO. 908

Mr. WARNER proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2491, *supra*; as follows:

On page 60, line 9, after "1994" insert the following: ", and any funds above such \$1,000,000,000 may only be obligated with the approval of Congress."

WARNER AMENDMENT NO. 909

Mr. WARNER proposed an amendment to amendment No. 908 proposed by himself to the bill H.R. 2491, *supra*; as follows:

Strike all after the first clause and add: "any funds above such \$1,000,000,100 may only be obligated with the approval of Congress."

BUMPERS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 910

Mr. BUMPERS (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KOHL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. FEINGOLD) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2491, *supra*; as follows:

On page 62, after line 2, add the following: "Provided, That of the funds provided under this heading \$100,000,000 shall be made available for termination of the contracts relating to the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor project."

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Governmental Affairs Committee for authority to meet for a hearing on Tuesday, September 21, at 9:30 a.m., on the subject: Environmental Problems in the Federal Government.

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

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, September 21, 1993, at 2:30 p.m., in SD-138 on "The North American Free-Trade Agreement: Effect on U.S. Agriculture."

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

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet for a joint hearing with the House Energy and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Health and the Environment on legislative issues related to pesticides, during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, September 21, 1993, at 2:30 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. FORD. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs would like to request unanimous consent to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to receive the legislative presentation of the American Legion.

The hearing will be held on September 21, 1993, at 9:30 a.m., in room 334 of the Cannon House Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to meet today at 10 a.m. to hear testimony on the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate Tuesday, September 21, 1993, at 10 a.m. to markup S. 1275, the Community Development, Credit Enhancement and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1993.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES, TRANSPORTATION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask that the Subcommittee on Water Resources, Transportation, Public Buildings and Economic Development, Committee on Environment and Public Works, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, September 21, beginning at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the National Performance Review report's suggested reforms to the General Services Administration's real estate activities.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, NATIONAL PARKS AND FORESTS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests of the committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, 2:30 p.m., September 21, 1993, to receive testimony on the following bills: S. 986, to provide for an interpretive center at the Civil War Battlefield of Corinth, MS, and for other purposes; S. 1033, to establish the Shenandoah Valley National Battlefields and Commission in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; S. 1341, to establish the Wheeling National Heritage Area in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes; and H.R. 1305, to make boundary adjustments and other miscellaneous changes to authorities and programs of the National Park Service.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MR. BILLY JIM VAUGHN

• Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Billy Jim

Vaughn who has been the Scoutmaster for troop one in Brentwood, in my home State of Tennessee for 59 years.

During his tenure as Scoutmaster, nearly 150 boys have earned the coveted and prestigious rank of Eagle Scout under his stewardship.

Over these many years, I am sure he has been a guiding influence in the lives of hundreds of young men, instilling in them a strong sense of pride, confidence, and accomplishment.

He is to be commended for his commitment and dedication to the Boy Scouts of America and to the youth of middle Tennessee, and for his outstanding service and contribution to his community.●

SENATOR HELMS' NEA AMENDMENTS

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise to explain my votes to oppose both amendments offered by Senator HELMS making changes in how the National Endowment for the Arts distributes grants to States, arts organizations, and individual artists around the country.

Members of this body know of my long-standing support for the NEA and for governmental funding for the arts, in general.

In part, that support reflects what I learned in the early 1970's when I helped design Minnesota's State program in support of the arts.

I became convinced at that time that government at all levels should play a positive role in ensuring broad access to the arts and in encouraging and recognizing art that is of high quality.

In part, my longstanding support for the NEA also reflects the importance of the NEA to Minnesota's arts community and to the Nation as a whole.

Minnesota has historically been among the top three States in the number and total volume of NEA grants both sought and received.

We have an outstanding State Arts Board, which receives both NEA grants and distributes State funding, as well.

Of course, we are well known for some of the Nation's best large arts organizations—the Guthrie Theatre, Minnesota Orchestra, St. Paul Chamber Orchestra, Walker Art Center, Minneapolis Institute of Arts, and many others.

And, we also have hundreds of community theatre groups and smaller arts organizations—and thousands of individual artists—in small towns and cities and neighborhoods all over the State.

Because of the strength of Minnesota's arts leadership, our State's arts organizations and individual artists have always done well under the competitive grant programs run by the NEA.

In the first three quarters of the current fiscal year, for example, Min-

nesota artists and arts groups received 94 NEA grants totaling more than \$4.7 million.

The groups ranged from large and internationally known organizations like the Walker Art Center and Minnesota Orchestral Association to individual artists like Helen Demichiel and Jim Periman.

Also among Minnesota NEA grant recipients were smaller arts groups throughout the State—including the New Tradition Theatre Company in St. Cloud and St. Francis Music Center in Little Falls.

Not all States are equally endowed, however.

And, I realize an argument can be made that the NEA's funds should be distributed in a way that helps bring more support to States that don't get funded now. That is one reason a portion of NEA funds now go to States on a formula basis, rather than competitively.

That balance in how funds are distributed has worked well in the past, however, and it should not now be disrupted. It is vital that a significant portion of NEA funds continue to be distributed on a nationally competitive basis. That way Congress' original intent—that NEA grants help stimulate nationally recognized quality—will be maintained.

Significant leverage in broadening support for local arts activity in the private sector comes with that kind of NEA recognition. So, the impact of each dollar of NEA support is actually magnified many times over through private sector contributions.

Finally, let me address two suggestions that have been made to address concerns about the content of art being funded by the NEA and accountability for the use of NEA funds by individual artists. Although the first of these suggestions—additional content restrictions—is not explicitly part of Senator HELMS amendment—it is clearly behind the changing being proposed.

This first suggestion is that we further legislate restrictions on the content of art that is eligible for NEA funding. The second—included in the Helms amendment—would prohibit NEA grants to individual artists.

Although I am a strong NEA supporter, I am also sympathetic to the concerns that lie behind support for additional content restrictions. And, I am also sensitive to concerns about accountability for the use of scarce Federal funds, when the NEA makes grants to individual artists.

However, I do not believe it is either wise or necessary to impose additional content standards on NEA grant recipients. Nor do I believe it should be necessary to ban NEA grant awards to individuals in order to assure accountability for the use of Federal funds.

My opposition to further content standards, Mr. President, does not

mean I believe any community in this country should be forced to put up with art that is obscene or pornographic—regardless of how it is funded.

We have laws in this country, Mr. President, against both obscenity or pornography, Mr. President. I support those laws. And, I believe they should be vigorously enforced. I also believe art should not be exempt from the standards that courts have developed over time that define the legal bounds of what is both obscene and pornographic.

I also support vigorous enforcement of a policy I helped frame several years ago which requires NEA supported artists who violate local or State obscenity or pornography statutes to return their NEA grants.

Unfortunately, defining what is pornographic or obscene is not an easy job. That is why I believe its best left where it now lies—in criminal statutes and in the courts—not in this appropriations bill or in any additional statutory content restrictions on the NEA.

As to banning NEA grant awards to individual artists, I support reasonable ways of ensuring accountability for the use of Federal funds in ways that do not eliminate creativity or exclude entire classes of artists or entire categories of value arts forms.

My biggest concern is that an outright ban on grants to individuals would disproportionately hurt certain art forms—like visual arts, folk arts, and literature—that are almost totally dependent on the work of individual artists who work independently.

One way the NEA already addresses this concern is by making grants to collectives or other organizations which, in turn, make grants to individual artists.

If such collectives continued to be used, special efforts must be made to ensure that they were well-known among individual artists and diverse and inclusive in the awards they make.

Let me state again, Mr. President, that the issues raised by the Senator from North Carolina deserve our attention and debate. In several cases, they attempt to address concerns that deserve our most thoughtful and careful attention.

But, for all the reasons I have stated, I believe the Helms amendments would do more harm to arts in the communities across America than it would do good. That is why I voted to table both amendments and am pleased that a majority of my colleagues agreed.●

GROUNDWORK FOR CASE AGAINST FAKE TURF

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I happen to be a football fan. I enjoy watching games on television, on those occasions when I have the time to do so.

It is the only sport I follow closely. I know from various articles I read that artificial turf is tough on players, particularly their knees.

Just recently, I read an item by Brian Hewitt, of the Chicago Sun-Times, titled, "Grounds for Case Against Fake Turf."

Here is one football fan who casts his vote for using natural grass and avoiding some of the injuries we now have with professional football.

I ask to insert the article by Brian Hewitt into the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times; Sept. 19, 1993]

GROUNDS FOR CASE AGAINST FAKE TURF

(By Brian Hewitt)

This is what you need to know about the debate over the relative merits of artificial playing surfaces vs. grass fields in the NFL:

Owners run the league.

Owners are out to make money.

Artificial surfaces are generally cheaper to maintain than grass.

Artificial surfaces are harder and faster than grass which makes falls and collisions more dangerous.

There is no organized movement among players to eliminate artificial surfaces.

The risk of injury on an artificial surface is greater than on grass.

The NFL disputes this last item. But its arguments are unconvincing.

"We continue to study the NFLPA's assertion that artificial turf causes more serious injuries than grass fields," league spokesman Greg Aiello said. "Unfortunately, injuries occur on both surfaces. There are certainly many instances in which an artificial turf that provides for even footing and a cushion would be preferable to a frozen, bumpy, worn grass field."

But last year John Powell, the NFL's chief tracker of injury trends, published a comparative analysis of knee injuries in the league from 1980 through 1989 in the American Journal of Sports Medicine. And even Powell had to acknowledge in his study, "... anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) sprains show a statistically higher injury rate for AstroTurf."

Powell's study charted knee sprains from 1980 through 1989. And the most eye-popping piece of hard data related to special teams play. "Of the 18 ACL sprains attributable to the AstroTurf during the current study years," Powell wrote, "14 ACL sprains to members of the kicking unit may have been prevented had there been no participation on AstroTurf."

"Maybe this is something that should be addressed," Kansas City running back Marcus Allen said. "You can't say the owners don't care. But there are always things that could be better."

"Artificial turf is bad," ex-Bear Dan Hampton said. "We all know that. It all comes down to dollars. You can replace players easier than grass."

That doesn't mean all owners are evil or that the league is conspiring to preside over a mounting injury toll. Fifteen NFL teams play their home games on artificial surfaces, 13 on natural grass. Bears president Michael McCaskey, a man roundly and ceaselessly bashed for being fiscal at all the wrong times, deserves credit for nagging the Park District into converting Soldier Field back from artificial turf to natural grass prior to the 1988 season. It was because of McCaskey's urging that the Chicago Park District decided to spend the \$800,000 needed to tear out the old artificial turf and replace it with grass.

"A lot of careers have been lost on this crap," said former Bears running back-

turned broadcaster Mike Adamle, who reported the removal of the artificial turf for the WLS-TV on March 29, 1988.

But the loosely-organized natural grass movement suffered a setback when the 1988 summer drought coupled with poor installation prevented the new Soldier Field sod from taking root.

Park District officials had to replace the grass before the first regular-season home game. Then McCaskey asked them to replace it again after the season. The Park District refused the request. And, according to Tim LeFevour, the Bears director of administration, it has refused the same request every year since then.

The net effect, according to NFL agronomist George Toma, was to discourage other teams from converting to grass from turf. This, Toma said, "was the kind of thing that makes the artificial turf people smile."

And doctors frown.

"Playing on artificial turf is literally like almost playing on a floor," said Dr. Michael Schafer, the Bear's chief consulting physician. "The nature of the collisions on it are more severe."

Toma said the average installation cost of an Astro-Turf surface that will last between six and 10 years ranges from \$1 to \$2.5 million.

The maintenance is minimal. Real grass is cheaper to install—Toma estimates between \$250,000 and \$1 million—but usually takes more time and money to maintain.

THE STADIUM TURFS

Fifteen of the 28 NFL teams play on artificial turf. Here's the stadium breakdown:

Artificial turf: Cowboys, Texas Stadium; Eagles, Veterans Stadium; Falcons, Georgia Dome; Giants, Giants Stadium; Lions, Pontiac Silverdome; Saints, Superdome; Vikings, Metrodome; Bengals, Riverfront Stadium; Bills, Rich Stadium; Chiefs, Arrowhead Stadium; Colts, Hoosierdome; Jets, Giants Stadium; Oilers, Astrodome; Seahawks, Kingdome; Steelers, Three Rivers Stadium.

Natural turf: Bears, Soldier Field; Buccaneers, Tampa Stadium; Cardinals, Sun Devil Stadium; 49ers, Candlestick Park; Packers, Lambeau Field, Milwaukee County Stadium; Rams, Anaheim Stadium; Redskins, RFK Stadium; Broncos, Mile High Stadium; Browns, Cleveland Stadium; Chargers, Jack Murphy Stadium; Dolphins, Joe Robbie Stadium; Patriots, Foxboro Stadium; Raiders, Memorial Coliseum.

*AstroTurf-8.

**Prescription Athletic Turf.*

COSPONSORSHIP OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 27

• Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise today to announce my cosponsorship of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 27 was introduced by my distinguished colleague from Vermont, Senator LEAHY, on May 28, 1993. A number of our colleagues supported the Every Fifth Child Act in the last Congress and have now signed on as cosponsors of this legislation.

The bill would express the sense of Congress that funding should be provided to begin a phase-in toward full funding of the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and

children [WIC], and of the Head Start programs, and to expand the Job Corps Program.

Today, approximately every fifth child in the United States lives in poverty. Children are also the fastest growing segment of the homeless population, accounting for 15 percent of all homeless Americans. In Minnesota, the poverty rate for children between ages 5 and 17 has climbed to 18 percent.

Mr. President, the programs targeted for increases by this legislation have proven to be successful, worthwhile investments of public funds in dealing with child poverty, nutrition, and joblessness. That is why in my 15 years as a Senator I have consistently supported both programmatic improvements and increased funding levels for all three of these programs.

Since its inception in 1965, Head Start has served over 12 million low-income preschoolers and their families. Not only does this program prepare young children for school by teaching them a variety of necessary learning skills, but it provides medical services, social services and nutritional education to the entire family. Head Start was the first comprehensive program to treat the child and family as a whole, which recognizes the impact improvements in parents lives will have on the future of the child. In addition, this program serves not only as a way to prepare children for school it is also fiscally sound, researchers estimate that for every dollar spent on Head Start the Federal Government saves \$4 in future benefit.

Head Start has continued to see significant increases in its funding levels over the last couple of years. In fact, since 1989, the Federal commitment to Head Start has more than doubled, allowing for more children to be served each year.

Recently, some questions have been raised concerning the quality of some Head Start programs. Much of this concern is caused by the programs' tremendous growth in a very short period of time. Hearings have been held to discuss some ideas for improving quality while continuing to expand the program to serve more children. An administration task force is also scheduled to have a report ready by late October proposing refinement of the program. These hearings will help to shape the reauthorization of Head Start which will take place next year.

The WIC Program provides nutrition supplemental foods to low-income pregnant, postpartum and breast-feeding women and to children up to age 5 who are determined to be at nutritional risk. Recipients also receive nutrition education, advice and assistance on the importance of breast feeding and referrals to the health care system. The WIC Program also proves to have fiscal benefits, a Department of Agriculture study found that for every

dollar invested in WIC up to \$4 is saved by the Federal Government.

Job Corps is a major training and unemployment program designed to alleviate the severe unemployment problems faced by disadvantaged youth throughout the United States. The services provided include basic education, vocational skills training, work experience, counseling, health care, and related support services.

Mr. President, I realize that Job Corps is one of many current and proposed programs that have work place readiness as their goal. It has been a good program in the past and it deserves our continued support. However, I also hope that as we expand funding for Job Corps we carefully consider how to best coordinate and integrate a number of other current and proposed efforts to improve job skills.

As we have seen, there is a growing interest in National and Community Service, School to Work opportunities, and apprenticeship programs. I hope we can use the continuing debate to raise the awareness of Federal Job Corps programs. All of these efforts need to be done in concert, Mr. President. As a member of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, I look forward to working with my colleagues to make sure that important goal is realized.

While I fully and wholeheartedly support these programs, I must also say I have severe concerns about funding expectations. I believe deficit reduction is just as vital an investment in our children's future as direct program expenditures. So, while I have cosponsored this legislation, I cannot emphasize enough the need to address our growing national debt, as well as the funding expectations of this bill.

At the same time, I believe that this legislation establishes the right priorities. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to create an environment in which we can work together on these and other pressing human need in a fiscally responsible manner.●

VIOLENCE ON TELEVISION

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I have been working closely with the entertainment industry for some time now to encourage the reduction of gratuitous violence on television. For many years, I focused only on programming. Recently, however, I have also focused on promotions.

Clearly, a 10-, 15-, or 20-second preview for a violent show shown at 7 p.m., during children's programming, or during coverage of a weekend afternoon sporting event, is likely to catch a child's eye. Jane Pauley commented on this program after her little girl witnessed a murderous preview for "Kiss of a Killer." Her experience led to an excellent article printed in TV

Guide which I think my colleagues will find interesting. In her words:

Even a parent who is careful about what her kids watch may be very surprised by what's falling through the cracks. The gruesome murder may come up just once in a show, but the promotions for it will show up many times in commercial rotation.

Her solution? Treat television promotions much like the previews shown in movie theaters: No previews may be shown for movies with a rating higher than the feature presentation.

Mr. President, I ask that the TV Guide article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

BLOCK THAT PROMO!

(By Jane Pauley)

So, what do you say when a little girl turns from the television set and asks: "Was he sticking a knife in her, Mommy?" It seemed perfectly clear that he was, so what my daughter really wanted to know was, "why?"

And I knew the answer to that question. He appeared to be sticking a knife in the lady because ABC knew we'd turn to look. It was a teaser for the movie "Kiss of a Killer," scheduled for later that night, long after my daughter's bedtime.

What I want to know is, why did they have to run that promo at 7 in the evening, between World News Tonight and Jeopardy!? Am I the only mother springing from the couch in the split second between the conclusion of The Simpsons and the promos for what's ahead on Fox? And it's not that my own network is above it. Perhaps your kids caught the 20-second sneak preview of "Marked for Murder"—during NBC's Sports World on Saturday afternoon a few weeks ago!

When did this become OK?

Actually, David Letterman was first to ask that question. He was referring to the underwear ads splayed on the sides of New York City buses featuring rapper Marky Mark in his underpants clutching himself in the place we used to call "private." As Dave said, "You couldn't do that anywhere near a bus" when he grew up.

So when did this become OK? We all know that the rules have changed. There used to be some pretty silly ones. In the late '50s, NBC censors insisted on hiding pregnant Florence Henderson's tummy behind a desk or potted plants, for instance. While that kind of censorship is long gone, until recently TV followed certain rules about what was fit for family viewing, depending on the time of day. But today those rules are barely observed. I'm told NBC toed the line more carefully when Bill Cosby led the lineup.

While there are still loose guidelines about what constitutes appropriate subject matter for children's programs (you'll be gratified to know that the networks are still sensitive to the use of the word "bastard," but "butthead" is OK)—the promos and teasers that run during the commercial breaks occupy a gray area that seems to be getting wider and darker by the minute.

Even a parent who is careful about what her kids watch may be very surprised by what's falling between the cracks. The vicious rape or the gruesome murder may come up just once in a show, but the promotions for it will show up many times in commercial rotation.

What to do?

Well, movie theaters screen coming-attraction trailers for "general audiences" when

they know there are kids in the house. How hard would it be for cable and TV networks to do likewise—and stick to it?●

TRIBUTE TO FONTBONNE COLLEGE

● Mr. BOND. Mr. President, for 70 years, Fontbonne College of St. Louis, MO, has served over 8,000 students in their pursuit of academic excellence. In the midst of tremendous political, societal, and economic changes of the past seven decades, Fontbonne College has continued its mission to provide men and women with the keys to successful careers and intellectual fulfillment through a career-based liberal arts approach to education. It gives me great pleasure, therefore, Mr. President, to rise in acknowledgement of the accomplishments and contributions of Fontbonne College on the occasion of its 70th anniversary.

The origins of Fontbonne College can be traced through the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet, who founded and continue to sponsor the college. In 1647, the community of the Sisters of St. Joseph was formed in LePuy, France. Following the French Revolution, during which five of the sisters were guillotined, the community was re-founded in 1807 by Mother St. John Fontbonne, for whom the college is named.

In 1836, Mother St. John Fontbonne sent six sisters to St. Louis to minister to the needs of the area's diverse inhabitants and to teach the deaf. The Sisters of St. Joseph concentrated on health care and elementary, secondary, and deaf education, until the turn of the century, when they began to establish colleges for women.

A charter for Fontbonne College was obtained from the State of Missouri on April 17, 1917, but the entrance of the United States into World War I in that year precluded the inauguration of classes. It was not until September 1923 that the first classes of Fontbonne College convened. In 1948, Fontbonne was accredited by the North Central Association, having been a corporate college of St. Louis University before that time.

Fontbonne is noted for its innovative programs in education and business as well as strong programs in the traditional liberal arts. Fontbonne's dedication to educational excellence is evidenced in its significant growth and placement record. Since 1980, enrollment has increased from 880 to over 2,000 students; placement of Fontbonne graduates in their chosen field has reached the exceptional level of 95 percent.

Fontbonne College is deeply rooted in the tradition and values of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet—quality, respect, diversity, community, justice, service, and faith. The college stands firmly in the Catholic tradition. Throughout its 70-year history, the college has maintained its identity while

striving to meet the needs of a rapidly changing society.

Often ahead of the times, Fontbonne College admitted African-American students in 1947—8 years before the U.S. Supreme Court school desegregation decision. In 1971, male students were admitted. In the 1980's, Fontbonne created degree programs with flexible scheduling to meet the needs of working adult students.

For 70 years, Fontbonne College has been guided by the belief that a college education is an important step in a lifelong process of personal enrichment and professional improvement; that professional studies must be founded in the liberal arts; that tradition must be blended with innovation; and that a quality education must illuminate the path to responsibility based on high ethical standards and sound personal values. Through 70 years of change, Fontbonne College has sustained and expanded its mission of quality education. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this fine institution on the occasion of its 70th anniversary. ●

THE CHICAGO ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, today I am proud to recognize the Chicago Academy of Science's ecological citizenship [EcoCit] project.

EcoCit is a model program designed to meet the need for urban environmental education. Using an effective, multidisciplinary approach, EcoCit educates students, teachers, and parents on environmental issues and results in community action. Students benefit from a hands-on approach to science that is engaging and fun. Teachers benefit from in-service training and hands-on science and cooperative teaching methods, and parents benefit from involvement in their children's education and community action.

EcoCit is currently serving 3,800 students and 160 teachers in four public elementary schools in Chicago. The program is designed for inner-city, economically and educationally disadvantaged communities, and benefits students from a wide range of racial backgrounds.

It is vital for programs such as EcoCit to continue their efforts in providing urban environmental education. If we are to ensure a safe environment for future generations, we must make an effort to educate our youth about the importance of preserving and enhancing our natural resources. I commend the Chicago Academy of Science's EcoCit project and their dedication to environmental education. ●

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. FORD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar No. 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 160, 361, 362, and 363. I further ask unanimous consent that the nominees be confirmed en bloc; that any statements be printed in the RECORD as if read; that upon confirmation the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

I ask unanimous consent that the following nominations be discharged from the Committee on Foreign Relations and placed on the Executive Calendar:

Hazel O'Leary to be U.S. Representative to the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency;

Ivan Selin to be an Alternative U.S. Representative to the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency; and

Jane Becker to be an Alternative U.S. Representative to the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and that the Senate return to legislative session.

Mr. COCHRAN. We have no objection, Madam President.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Zachary W. Carter, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York for the term of 4 years.

Patrick H. NeMoyer, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the Western District of New York for the term of 4 years.

Mary Jo White, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York for the term of 4 years.

James Patrick Connelly, of Washington, to be U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Washington for the term of 4 years.

John Thomas Schneider, of North Dakota, to be U.S. attorney for the District of North Dakota for the term of 4 years.

William David Wilmoth, of West Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the Northern District of West Virginia for the term of 4 years.

Gaynelle Griffin Jones, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the Southern District of Texas for the term of 4 years.

Karen Elizabeth Schreier, of South Dakota, to be U.S. attorney for the District of South Dakota for the term of 4 years.

Walter Michael Troop, of Kentucky, to be U.S. attorney for the Western District of Kentucky for the term of 4 years.

Eric Himpton Holder, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia for the term of 4 years.

Stephen Charles Lewis, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

Vicki Lynn Miles-LaGrange, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the Western District of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

John W. Raley, Jr., of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

Randall K. Rathbun, of Kansas, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Kansas for the term of 4 years.

Paula Jean Casey of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas for the term of 4 years.

Paul Kinloch Holmes, III, of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the Western District of Arkansas for the term of 4 years.

Lynne Ann Battaglia, of Maryland, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Maryland for the term of 4 years.

Scott M. Matheson, Jr., of Utah, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Utah for the term of 4 years.

Mr. FORD. Madam President, on a personal note, I would like to say that Walter Michael Troop, of Kentucky, has just been confirmed for U.S. attorney for the western district.

STATEMENT ON U.S. ATTORNEY NOMINATIONS

Mr. BOREN. Madam President, I am pleased that the Senate today confirms that three nominations for the U.S. attorney positions in Oklahoma. These outstanding Oklahomans each have extensive experience in our justice system. They have a long history of dedication to our justice system and the principles it represents.

Vicki Miles-LaGrange will serve as U.S. attorney for the western district. Her nomination is historic because she will be the first African-American woman to serve the Nation as U.S. attorney. Her strong qualifications guarantee that she will be among the Nation's finest Federal prosecutors. She began her career in the U.S. courts in 1973, serving as a law clerk for two Federal district court judges. She then moved to the Department of Justice in Washington, DC, serving for 4 years as law clerk and attorney.

In 1983, Ms. LaGrange became assistant district attorney in Oklahoma County. In 1988, she was elected to the Oklahoma State Senate where she served as chairperson of the judiciary committee. She is also the chairperson of the law and justice committee for the National Conference of State Legislatures. It is apparent that she will bring to the office of U.S. attorney her experience as a trial lawyer and as a legislator who has been very involved in the formulation of policies affecting the judicial system.

Steve Lewis, the nominee for U.S. attorney for the northern district, also has invaluable experience both as a trial lawyer and as a legislator in Oklahoma. He began his career in 1971 serving as assistant district attorney for the 23d Judicial District. In 1974, he became the district attorney for that district, and he also served as president of the State association of district attorneys. Six years later, he was elected to the State House of Representatives where he served as the speaker of the house, as well as Chairman of the House Committee on Criminal Justice. His background uniquely prepares him

to serve effectively and successfully as a Federal prosecutor.

Finally, the Senate has again confirmed John Raley as the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Oklahoma. Mr. Raley has served in the post since 1990 and earned a reputation as one of the finest Federal prosecutors in the country. His previous legal experience prepared him well as a trial lawyer. Beginning in 1961, he had worked as an assistant U.S. attorney for 8 years in the Western District of Oklahoma. Before his confirmation as U.S. attorney, he was a partner in a Ponca City law firm where he specialized in litigation. He is an advocate member of the American Board of Trial Advocates, a national organization whose membership is limited to lawyers who have been the lead counsel in over 100 jury trials.

I am pleased that these outstanding Oklahomans can now begin to serve their State as U.S. attorneys. I appreciate the prompt consideration that both the administration and the Judiciary Committee gave to these nominations. Vicki Miles-LaGrange, Steve Lewis, and John Raley will be outstanding U.S. attorneys, serving the country and Oklahoma effectively and proudly.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. FORD. Madam President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed en bloc to the immediate consideration of Calendar Nos. 203, 204, 205, and 206; that the resolutions be agreed to en bloc; that the motions to reconsider the passage of these items be laid upon the table en bloc; that the consideration of each resolution be included separately in the RECORD, and that statements with respect to the passage of each resolution be included in the RECORD where appropriate.

Mr. COCHRAN. We have no objection, Madam President.

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

RELIEF OF HARDWICK, INC.

The resolution (S. Res. 91) to refer S. 745 entitled "A bill for the Relief of Hardwick, Inc." to the chief judge of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 91

Resolved, That the bill S. 745 entitled "A Bill for the Relief of Hardwick, Inc.", now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is referred to the Chief Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims. The Chief Judge shall proceed with consideration of such case in accordance

with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code (notwithstanding any other appeal, statute, case law, or regulations, including section 1500 of title 28, United States Code, that may limit in any way the jurisdiction or authority of the court), and report thereon to the Senate at the earliest practicable date giving findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due to the claimants from the United States.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I am pleased that Senate Resolution 91 and its accompanying bill, S. 745, passed the Senate. These bills ask the U.S. Court of Federal Claims to advise the Senate on the merits of legal or equitable claims that Hardwick, Inc., may have against the United States.

Mr. and Mrs. Hardwick are an elderly couple who, along with their children, own and run a construction company. They deserve their day in court.

For over a decade, the Hardwicks have been involved in a contract dispute with the U.S. Government. In the late 1980's, the Hardwicks filed suit against the Army Corps of Engineers.

In a subsequent and unrelated case, the Federal circuit changed its jurisdictional rules for bringing suit. As a result of this change, the Hardwick's claim was thrown out of court.

The judge, in dismissing the Hardwick's claim, acknowledged the injustice of dismissing the case after years of litigation based on an unforeseen change in the law. He said:

You may very well be able to proceed on the basis of my ruling in UNR to obtain a Congressional reference. * * * It would appear to me * * * that you would have a meritorious case in Congress. That would be a way to proceed to avoid an appeal and a lot of additional expenditure of time and resources and obtain rulings on errors of the law where I think it is pretty clear.

In passing these bills, we have not made any conclusions about the merits of the Hardwick's claim. Under a congressional reference statute, the House or Senate can refer a case to the Claims Court for an advisory opinion on whether a party has a legal or equitable claim against the U.S. Government. The Hardwick's case is a complex one. The Claims Court is the appropriate body to determine if legal or equitable remedies are warranted.

A congressional reference resolution is not the same as a private relief bill. The resolution does not require Congress to allocate funds from the Treasury. After the Claims Court issues its opinion, Congress can then decide whether or not to implement the court's recommendations in the form of a private relief bill.

I am pleased that the Hardwick Relief Act of 1993 has passed the Senate. This act will ensure that the Hardwicks get their long-awaited day in court and that justice is done.

RELIEF OF LAND GRANTORS IN KENTUCKY

The resolution (S. Res. 98) to refer S. 794 entitled "A bill for the relief of land grantors in Henderson, Union and Webster Counties, KY, and their heirs," to the chief judge of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims for a report thereon was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 98

Resolved, That the bill (S. 794) entitled "A bill for the relief of land grantors in Henderson, Union, and Webster Counties, Kentucky, and their heirs", now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is referred to the Chief Judge of the United States Court of Claims. The Chief Judge shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and report back to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions that are sufficient to inform Congress of the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants individually.

RELIEF OF DR. BEATRICE BRAUDE

The resolution (S. Res. 102) to refer S. 840 entitled "For the relief of the estate of Dr. Beatrice Braude," to the chief judge of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims for a report thereon was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 102

Resolved, That the bill S. 840 entitled "For the relief of the estate of Dr. Beatrice Braude," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is referred to the Chief Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims. The Chief Judge shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and report thereon to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States or a gratuity and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due to the claimants from the United States.

RELIEF OF RICHARD KANEHL

The resolution (S. Res. 108) to refer S. 974 entitled "A bill for the relief of Richard Kanehl of Mobile, Alabama," to the chief judge of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims for a report thereon was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 108

Resolved, That the bill S. 974 entitled "A bill for the relief of Richard Kanehl of Mobile, Alabama," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is referred to the chief judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims. The chief judge shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and report thereon to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient

to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States or a gratuity and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due to the claimants from the United States.

Mr. FORD. Madam President, I might make a note of a personal nature that the relief of land grantors in Henderson, Union, and Webster Counties was Calendar No. 204 (S. Res. 98).

CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF SENATE RESOLUTION 98

Mr. FORD. Madam President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the enrollment of Calendar No. 204 with references to the U.S. Court of Claims be changed to U.S. Court of Federal Claims.

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1993

Mr. FORD. Madam President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9 a.m., Wednesday, September 22; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, the time of the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for

morning business not to extend beyond 9:15 a.m., with Senator LAUTENBERG recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes; that at 9:15 a.m., the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 2491, the VA-HUD appropriations bill.

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

RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. FORD. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:54 p.m., recessed until Wednesday, September 22, 1993, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 21, 1993:

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

ELI J. SEGAL, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE. (NEW POSITION)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 21, 1993:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ZACHARY W. CARTER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

PATRICK H. NEMOYER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

MARY JO WHITE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

JAMES PATRICK CONNELLY, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

JOHN THOMAS SCHNEIDER, OF NORTH DAKOTA, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

WILLIAM DAVID WILMOTH, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

GAYNELLE GRIFFIN JONES, OF TEXAS, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

KAREN ELIZABETH SCHREIER, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

WALTER MICHAEL TROOP, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

ERIC HIMPTON HOLDER, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

STEPHEN CHARLES LEWIS, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

VICKI LYNN MILES-LAGRANGE, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

JOHN W. RALEY, JR., OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

RANDALL K. RATHBUN, OF KANSAS, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

PAULA JEAN CASEY, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

PAUL KINLOCH HOLMES III, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

LYNNE ANN BATTAGLIA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

SCOTT M. MATHESON, JR., OF UTAH, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.