Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

VA–HUD SUBCOMMITTEE—SPENDING TOTALS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL

[Fiscal year 1996, in millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
Defense discretionary:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed	.....	78
H.R. 2099, as reported to the Senate	153	92
Scorekeeping adjustment	.....	.....
Subtotal defense discretionary	153	169
Nondefense discretionary:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed	.....	45,660
H.R. 2999, as reported to the Senate	61,464	28,963
Scorekeeping adjustment	.....	.....
Subtotal nondefense discretionary	61,464	74,624
Mandatory:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed	.....	133
H.R. 2099, as reported to the Senate	19,362	17,213
Adjustment to conform mandatory programs with Budget	.....	.....
Resolution assumptions	−224	341
Subtotal mandatory	19,138	17,688
Adjusted bill total	80,754	92,481
Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary	171	189
Nondefense discretionary	61,500	74,642
Violent crime reduction trust fund	.....	.....
Mandatory	19,138	17,688
Total allocation	80,809	92,519
Adjustment bill total compared to Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary	−18	−20
Nondefense discretionary	−36	−18
Violent crime reduction trust fund	.....	.....
Mandatory	.....	.....
Total allocation	−55	−38

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with current scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, the appropriations bill before us today represents a major step backward for the environment. While less extreme than the House-passed measure, it still proposes to cut EPA's budget by $1.7 billion—fully 23 percent below the levels enacted in fiscal 1995—and contains 11 so-called riders which would significantly undermine the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to administer and enforce environmental laws and perform its important mission of protecting public health and the environment.

Maryland alone would lose over $14 million in funding needed to upgrade outdated sewage treatment facilities—projects which have a direct impact on the water quality of the Chesapeake Bay, our coastal beaches and bays, and local waters. Legislative provisions in the underlying measure would prohibit EPA from implementing section 404(c) of the Clean Water Act which gives the agency authority to review U.S. Army Corps of Engineers wetlands permit decisions and provides another system of checks and balances in protecting the quality of our Nation's waters. In addition, the proposed cut of some $20 million in EPA's enforcement and compliance assurance program would severely impact upon the agency's ability to inspect industrial and Federal facilities in Maryland and prosecute violations.

Mr. President, this bill unfairly singles out EPA to bear a disproportionate share of the deficit reduction burden. It will not just decrease the rate of increases, but will severely cut EPA's funding. Its riders would undercut a number of our Nation's environmental statutes, without adequate hearings, public involvement or review. These actions are unjustified and unwarranted and for these and other reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this bill.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

U.S. SENTENCING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 1254, a bill to block reductions in penalties for crack dealing proposed by the United States Sentencing Commission. If the Congress does not act, those changes will take effect this November 1.

According to the Department of Justice, which has also asked us to block implementation of the changes, the new penalty structure will make base sentences for crack anywhere from two to six times shorter than they are now.

That is simply irresponsible public policy. It would send a terrible message both to crack dealers and to communities trying to fight back against the crack trade.

No one, not even the Sentencing Commission, denies that the brunt of crack's social consequences have fallen on poor, urban, minority, residents. Given what crack has done to our cities, it frankly amazes me to hear people arguing for lower sentences. Especially from people who wouldn't for one moment tolerate an open-air crack market in their neighborhood in Scarsdale or Chevy Chase.

The Commission's own report, moreover, acknowledges that crack's psychoactive effects are far more intense than powder cocaine, which means that crack is far more addictive.

Members of the Sentencing Commission are concerned that the current sentencing structure creates a perception of unfairness because most convicted crack dealers are African-Americans, whereas a majority of convicted powder dealers are White or Hispanic. I am sensitive to these concerns. This Congress will deal severely and aggressively with any indication that prosecution or sentencing is being driven by racial considerations. We will not tolerate any racial discrimination in our criminal justice system.

But Mr. President, it is also important to remember that the number of people convicted for crack violations each year is just 3,430. I am more concerned, to be blunt, about the millions of people living in our cities whose quality of life is being ruined. These people have equal rights to safe neighborhoods.

To those who say the Federal Government is locking up tens of thousands of nonviolent, low-level offenders, let me say this: We studied that question. What we found was that out of the 3,430 crack defendants convicted in 1994, the number of youthful, small-time crack offenders with no prior criminal history and no weapons involvement, sentenced in Federal courts, was just 51. The median crack defendant was convicted of trafficking 109 grams—more than 2,000 rocks or doses. Only ten percent of crack defendants had trafficked less than 2–3 grams of crack—the equivalent of 40–60 doses.

And finally, on Tuesday, September 12, HHS released alarming figures showing drug use up sharply among our young people. Mr. President, this is not the time to be sending the message that we are weakening social sanctions against the drug trade.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

D.C. BOOTH HISTORIC FISH HATCHERY

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of the rededication of the D.C. Booth Historic Fish Hatchery in Spearfish after extensive renovations. These developments represent exciting opportunities for learning and historic preservation.

It was Senator Pettigrew, one of South Dakota's earliest and most prominent Senators, who first appropriated funding for the hatchery in the 1890's. Originally called the Spearfish National Fish Hatchery, it was later renamed in honor of the original superintendent, D.C. Booth. The facility is now almost 100 years old and has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It is one of the oldest fisheries west of the Mississippi River and now plays a significant role in western South Dakota's tourism industry, bringing in over 200,000 visitors each year.

I worked closely with my colleagues on South Dakota's congressional delegation to authorize the renovation of the D.C. Booth Fish Hatchery. In 1991, Congress recognized the historic importance of this fish hatchery. Funding was subsequently provided to renovate the existing facilities. In addition, an