

Mr. President, CDBG has a proven track record. Our Nation's communities continue to need our support.

OPPOSITION TO TRANSIT CUTS

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I want to express my strong opposition to the Budget Committee's proposal to eliminate Federal mass transit operating subsidies.

The report that accompanies the Senate Budget Resolution calls for eliminating mass transit operating subsidies. Simply stated, these cuts will have significant consequences for our Nation's communities by leading to increased fares, reductions in services, and losses in ridership. As a result, working people will find it more difficult and costly to get to their jobs, roadways will become more congested, and environmental quality will decline.

Public transportation is a critical element of our economy. In 1990, 8.8 billion American took transit trips; 7.5 million people ride public transportation every weekday. Of these trips 54.4 percent are trips to work. An additional 20 percent of the trips taken by transit riders are to get to school or to access medical services. Trips to work are especially important uses of transit systems in large urban areas; use of bus service by elderly households to get medical attention is the largest component of rides in smaller communities and rural areas.

A high proportion of transit riders are low-income persons or minorities, 27.5 percent of the transit ridership has incomes below \$15,000 compared to 16.9 percent in the general population. African-American and Hispanic riders as a percentage of total ridership are more than two times the percentage of African-American and Hispanic individuals in the general population. However, the importance of transit for working people is underscored by statistics showing that 55 percent of the riders have incomes between \$15,000 and \$50,000.

For most transit systems, operating revenues are a combination of fares and federal and state money. Assuming no increases in state contributions, fares would, on average, have to increase 50 percent to make up for the loss of revenue. Cuts in operating subsidies will also have disparate impacts on smaller communities. Federal operating subsidies make up 21 percent of total operating revenues for transit systems in communities below 200,000 people compared to 13 percent on aver-

age for all transit systems. Fares would nearly have to double for these smaller systems. This assumes no cutbacks in services and no loss in ridership as a result of the fare increases.

Many individuals faced either with increased fares or decreased service will either have to give up their employment or use their cars to get to work. According to an article by Neal R. Pierce in the National Journal on April 15 of this year, one study already puts the cost of traffic congestion at \$100 billion a year in lost productivity. Fewer transit riders and more drivers will exacerbate this problem. More cars on the road and increased congestion will worsen air quality in metropolitan areas where environmental quality is already strained.

I realize, Mr. President, that the Budget Resolution itself does not cut transit operating subsidies. Decisions with respect to the appropriate level of funding for operating subsidies are left up to the Appropriations Committee. However, I felt it was important to raise a voice in opposition to the recommendation in the Budget Committee's report at this time and to urge my colleagues to begin to focus on the many cost to our citizens that would occur if the Budget Committee's proposed cuts in transit operating subsidies were carried out.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT, 1995—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on H.R. 1158 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of May 16, 1995.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself whatever time I require.

Mr. President, the conference report before us reflects the agreement of the two Houses on H.R. 1158, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for fiscal year 1995, and for other purposes.

This conference report is a culmination of several weeks of effort on a number of different fronts. It represents a balance between our responsibility to provide additional funding when necessary to address urgent national needs, on the one hand, and our responsibility to reduce funding for lower priority programs whenever and wherever we can, on the other hand. The Senate's conferees on this measure present it to the Senate with a belief that it merits approval of this body, and I urge its adoption.

The bill provides a total of \$7,249,503,600 in additional appropriations, of which \$6,700,000,000, equally divided between fiscal years 1995 and 1996, is for FEMA for the disaster relief programs. We have fully funded the President's request in this regard, and we concur with his designation of this funding as an emergency requirement.

We also agree with the President's request for additional emergency appropriations in response to the Oklahoma City tragedy and have provided \$183,798,000 for that purpose.

Finally, we are recommending \$365,705,600 in nonemergency supplementals for fiscal year 1995. That latter figure includes \$275 million in debt relief for Jordan as requested by the President and endorsed by the joint leadership of the Senate.

In addition, the conferees reached agreement on rescissions of budget authority and other funding limitations totaling \$16,413,932,975, and those reductions have been the focus of the debate throughout the consideration of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table summarizing the supplementals and rescissions recommended in the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

H.R. 1158, SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

	President's request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference	Conference vs.—		
					President's request	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS							
Emergency supplementals:							
FEMA disaster relief, 1995	6,700,000,000	5,360,000,000	1,900,000,000	3,350,000,000	-3,350,000,000	-2,010,000,000	1,450,000,000
FEMA disaster relief, 1996 advance			4,800,000,000	3,350,000,000	3,350,000,000	3,350,000,000	-1,450,000,000
Other emergency supplementals	718,297,000	28,297,000			-718,297,000	-28,297,000	
Subtotal, emergency supplementals	7,418,297,000	5,388,297,000	6,700,000,000	6,700,000,000	-718,297,000	1,311,703,000	
Other supplementals	434,672,000	85,471,600	306,915,600	365,705,600	-68,966,400	280,234,000	58,790,000
Subtotal, supplementals	7,852,969,000	5,473,768,600	7,006,915,600	7,065,705,600	-787,263,400	1,591,937,000	58,790,000
Rescissions	-1,536,623,805	-17,187,861,839	-15,144,481,050	-16,247,831,476	-14,711,207,671	940,030,363	-1,103,350,426
Reductions in limitations on obligations		-201,791,000	-279,166,000	-166,101,500	-166,101,500	35,689,500	113,064,500

H.R. 1158, SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL CONFERENCE AGREEMENT—Continued

	President's request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference	Conference vs.—		
					President's request	House allowance	Senate allowance
Rescissions and other reductions	-1,536,623,805	-17,389,652,839	-15,423,647,050	-16,413,932,976	-14,877,309,171	975,719,863	-990,285,926
Total title I	6,316,345,195	-11,714,093,239	-8,137,565,450	-9,182,125,876	-15,498,471,071	2,531,967,363	-1,044,560,426
TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS							
Travel and administrative reduction			-342,500,000				342,500,000
Forest Service timber sales		-31,169,000	-31,169,000	-31,169,000	-31,169,000		
Total title II		-31,169,000	-373,669,000	-31,169,000	-31,169,000		
TITLE III—ANTITERRORISM AND OKLAHOMA CITY							
Total title III	116,037,000			183,798,000	67,761,000	183,798,000	183,798,000
Bill total, budget authority	6,432,382,195	-11,745,262,239	-8,511,234,450	-9,029,496,876	-15,461,879,071	2,715,765,363	-518,262,426
Reductions in limitations on obligations		-201,791,000	-279,166,000	-166,101,500	-166,101,500	35,689,500	113,064,500
Bill total, budget resources	6,432,382,195	-11,947,053,239	-8,790,400,450	-9,195,598,376	-15,627,980,571	2,751,454,863	-405,197,926
Note.—Rescissions and other reductions:							
Rescissions	-1,536,623,805	-17,187,861,839	-15,144,481,050	-16,247,831,476	-13,607,857,245	2,043,380,789	-1,103,350,426
Travel and administrative rescission			-342,500,000			-342,500,000	342,500,000
Reductions in limitations on obligations		-201,791,000	-279,166,000	-166,101,500	-279,166,000	-77,375,000	113,064,500
Total reductions	-1,536,623,805	-17,389,652,839	-15,766,147,050	-16,413,932,976	-14,229,523,245	1,623,505,789	-647,785,926

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I believe this is a good bill. I believe we should pass it, and I believe the President of the United States should sign it into law. I know that the President's administration has objections to the final outcome reached by the conferees. But I hope the President will realize the conferees addressed many of his most pressing concerns, and we tried as best we could to reach an accommodation of his interests. The so-called striker replacement language which the administration indicated was the sole provision—I emphasize the sole provision—that would prompt a Presidential veto on its own was dropped. That was in a letter addressed to me as the chairman of the committee signed by Alice Rivlin, the Director of OMB.

I wish to reiterate. In all of the period of this bill's consideration, there was only one communication from the White House that indicated there was a proviso in the bill that would elicit a veto response from the President. I think that is very important to understand. And during that 2 months of the consideration of this bill and for the week and a half practically that we were in conference, the only other communications were verbal communications indicating categories of disappointment, and that is all I can call them. There were no specifics that were given to us. Account-by-account categories of disappointment that we had failed to reach the President's funding request levels in a number of education matters, and so forth, but they were general.

I wish to emphasize also that there were many days in which there was more than one encounter with Presidential representatives from the White House and not once did I, as the chairman of the committee, receive any kind of counsel requests that would indicate we had to comply with certain requirements of the White House in order to get a signature. There was always the striker replacement and categories of what I call disappointment.

On any number of funding issues, we moved more than halfway toward the

administration's priorities as they were known to us.

I would like to also indicate, having served on this committee over a number of years, this is the first administration that has not hovered in the appropriations process, hovered day by day, hour by hour, making known specifics, their requests, and what they considered to be the requirements of a compatible bill between the Congress and the President.

In the past 2 days, we have seen indications that the President intends to veto this legislation. I suppose I should say that there have been more than indications since the President himself said as much in public remarks yesterday.

I am very, very disappointed by that. I want very much to see this bill enacted. It is not the bill in all its particulars that I personally would craft if I were acting alone, but it is a most significant step in the direction of a balanced budget which we all, the President included, have endorsed as a common goal.

Our conference agreement would achieve an estimated \$3 billion in fiscal year 1996 outlays which may be a drop in the bucket compared to the enormity of the task ahead but is a good start, and get started we must.

So I hope the President will reconsider and will sign this bill, assuming that we pass this report. And if he chooses to veto it, he will miss a great opportunity. Other opportunities may lie ahead, and I have always been ready to work with this or any other administration to seize those opportunities as they arise. But I hope the President, and his many advisors, will remember that the legislative exercise, particularly in matters of the budget, is an exercise in give and take and neither side can expect to have things entirely their own way.

I yield the floor. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to reserve the remainder of my time for Senator COCHRAN.

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

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the conference agreement on H.R. 1158 is the product of lengthy and difficult negotiations with the House conferees. The agreement we reached was the best we could do, under the circumstances.

The President has expressed his dissatisfaction, and has indicated his intent to veto the measure when it reaches his desk. Despite the misgivings of some, I want to remind the Members of the time-sensitive and emergency nature of some of the items included in the bill.

The conference agreement includes the full \$6.7 billion request for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, disaster relief efforts. These funds are to be used to finance the relief costs associated with the Northridge earthquake, as well as to address declared disasters resulting from floods and storms throughout some 40 States, including the most recent, extraordinary rains and hail which occurred in Louisiana and some other States. These funds are needed in the next several weeks, or FEMA will run out of funds to assist in these disasters.

With regard to the administration's request for emergency supplemental appropriations in the wake of the tragedy in Oklahoma City, the conferees provided approximately \$250 million for anti-terrorism initiatives and Oklahoma City recovery efforts. This included substantial increases above the President's request for the FBI, the Department of Justice, the Secret Service, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, and the Judiciary. Included in this amount is \$67 million to meet the special needs of the General Services Administration created by the April 19, 1995, terrorist bombing attack at the Murrah Federal Building.

With regard to the striker replacement issue, the Senate bill struck a provision which was included in the House bill and which would have prohibited the use of any funds in any appropriations act for fiscal year 1995 to

issue, administer or enforce any Executive order that prohibited Federal contracts with companies that hire permanent replacements for striking employees. The conference agreement deletes that provision.

The conferees adopted a provision which I authored and which passed the Senate by a vote of 99 yeas to 0 nays. This provision will assure that the net savings in this bill, in the amount of approximately \$9 billion, will be applied to deficit reduction only.

Members will recall that under the Daschle/Dole joint leadership amendment, which was adopted when the measure was before the Senate, approximately \$835 million was restored for various programs which assist children and improve education programs. Among those funds added back by the joint leadership amendment were a number of Presidential and congressional priorities, such as AmeriCorps, WIC, summer jobs, school-to-work, and Chapter 1. Despite numerous meetings and the strong efforts of the Senate conferees, the House conferees were adamant, and the Senate was not able to sustain many of the priority addbacks in conference. For example, of the \$35 million in the WIC restoration in the Senate, the conferees agreed to restore \$15 million. With regard to Chapter 1 funding for the education of the disadvantaged, the Senate was successful in preventing any funds from being rescinded. The House had proposed rescinding \$140.3 million and the conference agreement fully restored these funds. The conferees also fully restored the House-proposed rescission of \$16.3 million for impact aid. Overall, for the programs of the Department of Education, the House had proposed rescinding \$1.6 billion, the Senate had restored \$1.3 billion, and the conferees agreed to rescind approximately \$800 million. In other words, the conferees restored about \$800 million or one-half of the education cuts proposed by the House. However, this still fell short, by about \$500 million, of the Senate level of restorations in the education area.

Members may also be encouraged to know that the Senate position prevailed in conference with regard to the 1995 Summer Youth Program. The full cut of \$867 million, as proposed by the House, was restored. The conferees did, however, rescind all funding for next summer's program, although this issue can be revisited during the processing of the fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the conference agreement now before the Senate provides important disaster relief and antiterrorism funding. The objectionable provision relating to striker replacements is deleted. The savings in the bill of about \$9 billion will be applied to deficit reduction. Unfortunately, there are still substantial cuts in priority programs affecting children and improving education. The Senate conferees struggled to support the Senate positions, but, through the give-

and-take of the conference process, were unable to sustain all Senate positions. Nevertheless, the rescissions agreed to in conference are more reasonable and responsible, in large part, than were contained in the original version of the House bill.

Consequently, I urge the adoption of the conference report. If the conference report is adopted by the Senate and the bill is vetoed when it reaches the President's desk, and if the veto is sustained, it remains to be seen if the Congress, in subsequent legislation, will be able to do any better in the areas of concern to the President.

Mr. President, in closing, I compliment the chairman, Senator HATFIELD, for his leadership in bringing this legislation through the conference. I also compliment all of the Senate and House conferees. They worked hard and they worked diligently to resolve the issues in conference. Although I would have favored other outcomes in conference, I must commend the House conferees, under the leadership of their chairman, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and their ranking minority member, Mr. OBEY, for their fairness and cordiality. I think it is a good agreement and I intend to vote for it.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, this bill passed the Senate on a totally bipartisan vote of 99-0. I voted for it, along with every one of our Democratic colleagues.

I had hoped I could vote for this conference report, especially given the hard work that the chairman, ranking member, and every other member of the committee put into the compromise that passed in the Senate.

I particularly want to thank the ranking member for his efforts in bringing the bill to the point that we had it prior to the time it went to conference. And I would like to thank him as well for his efforts in the conference. Without his tireless effort, this conference report would lack even more than it does of the characteristics of the agreement we reached with the majority leader. I know that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, the ranking member, did everything in his power to preserve that agreement.

Unfortunately, despite those efforts, some key changes were made in conference at the behest of many of our Republican colleagues.

As a result, I am unable to support this conference report today, and the President is absolutely right to insist that these changes be reversed. If they are not, the President, in my view, is right to veto the bill.

This is a different bill than the one we supported when it passed the Senate. The bipartisan compromise we reached with the majority leader made it a bill that we could support and the President could sign. Unfortunately, in

conference, that deal was undone. The priorities were changed.

This is not a fight about deficit reduction. It is a fight about priorities. We all agree and have voted to cut over \$16 billion as this bill proposes. We simply disagree about where the cuts ought to be made.

The bipartisan deal we reached actually cut spending in the bill by \$812 million. The Dole-Daschle amendment restored \$835 million for investments in children and education. It paid for these investments with \$1.65 billion in additional cuts in lower priority programs.

The deal cut spending by twice as much money as it added back for children and education. Yet, the programs for which we restored \$835 million were cut \$685 million in conference below the amount provided in the Senate bill. In other words, 80 percent of the funds for programs we restored were dropped in conference.

Those cuts, while a small part of the overall bill, betrayed the agreement that we had in the Senate. Worse, in my view, they undermined our highest priority: America's children and their families.

The programs shortchanged by the conference agreement include child care, education, Safe and Drug Free Schools, child nutrition, and the President's national service program. As a result:

Fifteen thousand fewer adults will serve their communities and earn money for education as AmeriCorps members;

Two thousand fewer schools in 47 States will receive funds for comprehensive reforms that can boost academic standards;

Several thousand young people would lose the opportunity to participate in apprenticeships in the School-to-Work Program;

Nearly 20 million students and nearly 90 percent of all schools would lose the benefits of antiviolence and drug prevention programs.

We simply cannot accept this effort to undermine a bipartisan agreement we made to protect our investments in children and education. At the same time, we have no debate with the bulk of the provisions in this bill. We accept and have voted for the same level of cuts contained in it.

We would prefer to have a rescissions package that we can all support. Disaster funding for FEMA, the President's antiterrorism initiative, and the costs arising from the Oklahoma City bombing should not be held hostage because certain Members insist on cutting funds for children's programs.

It is not too late. There is still time for us to accommodate many of these concerns, and I hope in the coming days that discussion and perhaps resulting negotiations can bring about a better result.

If this bill is vetoed, we should quickly revisit the issue and make the changes that can allow us to support

and the President to sign a better bill. We are going to have to put the pieces back together in some form that accommodates our concerns, but also addresses the bipartisan concern about the need for \$16 billion in overall rescissions. Whether it is done before or after, it must be done. Many of us prefer it be done before. But if it is done after, let us get on with it, let us do it, let us do our job and do it right.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I want to say to my colleague from Arizona, I will be relatively brief, probably within 10 minutes.

Mr. President, let me just thank the Senator from West Virginia for his fine work. In many ways, I look to him as a teacher, especially when it comes to understanding this process and also when it comes to wedding integrity with politics. I thank him.

I rise, however, in disagreement with two Senators for whom I have a tremendous amount of respect, because I hold the Senator from Oregon in the same high regard, in the highest regard.

Mr. President, while I supported many of the cuts provided for in this bill, I really believe that what happened in conference committee, as the minority leader pointed out, really violates a basic standard of fairness. For example, I brought an amendment to the floor which put the Senate on record that we will take no action that would increase hunger or homelessness among children. The distinguished Senator from Oregon accepted that amendment as a part of this rescissions package that then went to conference committee. The amendment was dropped in conference.

I understand why it was dropped, that we were simply expressing the sense of the Senate, and not the sense of the House of Representatives, too. But I also realize, based upon the cuts in this rescissions bill and based upon some of the votes that we have cast today, that it is going to be very important for me and other like-minded colleagues to work hard to make sure that we, in fact, will not take such action in the months to come as we move through this budget process. Mr. President, I think that is exactly what we are doing.

Frankly, I was never quite sure of that bill we passed in the Senate. I worked about 12 or 15 hours. So did other Senators, right before the final vote which must have been about 10 p.m. that night, to restore certain funding for key programs.

I felt proud at that point, because while it was not all that I wanted, it moved us in the right direction. And when I got up in the middle of the night about 3 a.m. that night, I started thinking maybe I should not even have voted for that package. It was a close call. We have a lot of close calls, and we make our best decisions.

However, I felt good about some of the work many Members had done together. We restored some of the funding for WIC, Women, Infants and Children Program, restored funding for child care. There was a counseling program for seniors, to make sure that they did not get ripped off, as all too often happens when it comes to some of the supplemental Medicare coverage. We worked hard to restore funding in Medstart, safe and drug-free schools, School to Work initiatives.

In any case, Mr. President, I felt like we had done a good job of restoring some funding for programs that are not bureaucratic, but that makes a very important difference to a lot of young people in our country, especially children at risk.

Mr. President, now what has happened is that more than 80 percent of the funds that we restored, most of that funding for the most vulnerable citizens in this country—children—have now been cut again. Of the \$835 million we restored, \$685 million was dropped in the final package.

Mr. President, I believe that this rescissions packages just simply does not meet a basic standard of fairness. So many kids are in trouble in our country, and we have to be willing to reach out and invest in them, reach out and provide support for them.

Not support that reinforces dependency, but support that is important to kids, that broadens their opportunities. Starting with making sure that a woman who is expecting a child has a decent diet. Making sure that a newborn infant has a decent diet. What are we doing cutting the Women, Infant, and Children Program? It is an unqualified success.

Mr. President, there were never any cuts in the Pentagon budget. None of the big military contractors was asked to sacrifice at all.

I think this rescissions package asks the very citizens who cannot tighten their belts, to tighten their belts. Especially children in our country. Especially low-income children, minority children.

And it is for that reason I believe the President of the United States is absolutely right when he says we should make some changes in this bill, or he will veto it. And they don't have to be wholesale changes, relative to the amount of funds in the whole bill. There are parts of this rescissions package I want to support. So do my colleagues. But when it comes to the disproportionate cuts that affect the most vulnerable citizens in this country, starting with children, it just simply is wrong. And the President of the United States of America is absolutely right to draw the line. To say, "I am not going to be a party to or agree to a package of cuts that basically focus on those citizens who do not give the big bucks, who did not have the political power. These are just cuts based upon the path of least political resistance, and I won't be a party to them."

And let me observe one more thing about the President's role in all these negotiations on this bill. It has been implied on the floor here today that the administration did not provide its full views on the rescission bill as it moved through the conference committee process. That is simply not true. I understand the administration provided its specific objections to the bill at each stage of its development, including a letter to the conferees on April 28. These objections are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 18, 1995 on pages H5339 through H5352. I commend this letter to my colleagues' attention.

Mr. President, let me finally say one more thing about this bill. I do not know that there is another Senator who has been more of a leader on issues that affect people in Indian country than Senator McCAIN, and so I say this conscious of his important role.

In many Indian communities there is no running water, sanitation facilities or indoor plumbing. Mr. President, 40 percent of the American Indian population live in substandard housing, in substandard housing conditions, in deplorable conditions.

Yet we are now poised to wipe out \$80 million that was duly appropriated last Congress, which could really make a difference in providing some affordable low-income housing. Mr. President, I cannot stand by in silence, while the Senate prepares to pass legislation which I think would have devastating effects on our first American citizens.

Mr. President, as I review overall this rescissions package, I just think that we can do better. What has come back from the conference in the form of this conference report includes many of the cuts we restored for nutrition programs, safe and drug free schools, safe housing for children, child care, School to Work, AmeriCorps, 8 percent of that, has now been cut again.

I speak tonight to express support for the President's decision but, more importantly, to support some of the most important citizens in my State and in this country, and that is young people. Some of the kids who are having the most difficult time are the very kids we ought to be supporting right now.

We can do much better. I think we will do much better. But only if we stand strong and only if the President remains firm in his commitment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I do not intend to take the full 30 minutes as I have under the unanimous consent agreement, and also I would like to yield some of the time to the Senator from Pennsylvania. Also, if necessary, I would be glad to yield some of the time to my colleague from Iowa or the Senator from Mississippi in response to some of the concerns that I have.

First let me applaud the Appropriations Committee for doing an admirable job and resisting earmarks and

other unnecessary spending, and I especially want to thank Chairman HATFIELD, Senator BYRD, Chairman LIVINGSTON, and other members of the committee.

I also disagree with the President for stating that he intends to veto this bill. Certainly, the bill is not perfect, but it does, I think, contribute to our efforts to reduce unnecessary spending.

There are several aspects of this bill that I have concerns about and, very frankly, Mr. President, when the President says there is pork barrel spending in the bill, I am sorry to say that I also have reached that conclusion.

I just want to mention several aspects of the bill, and I would be glad to hear a response either from the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, from West Virginia, or the Senator from Iowa, if he so chooses.

To begin with, there are several portions of the bill where money was added—added—in, and projects created without being in either rescission bill before it went to conference.

Again, Mr. President, I find this practice unacceptable. I find it a deprivation of my rights as a Senator to vote and debate on authorization and appropriation, and that is why I would continue to raise especially these items that are put in conference without consultation with the rest of the Senate or even, very frankly, having been debated or discussed in the formulation of the bill on both sides.

One, the bill's text says:

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-330 and other Acts, \$1,400,000 are rescinded; *Provided* that of balances available within this account, \$12,678,000 shall be available for a grant to Iowa State University for the construction of the National Swine Research Center.

And the manager's statement says:

The House bill proposed rescinding \$12,678,000 from amounts appropriated for the National Swine Research Facility in Ames, Iowa. The conference agreement provides that the \$12,678,000 for the National Swine Research Facility be provided as a grant to Iowa State University to construct that facility at Ames, Iowa. The conferees direct the Agricultural Research Service to convey ownership to Iowa State University. The conferees are aware of the interest and need for important swine research; however, financial constraints require difficult choices. The conferees expect that any future cost of operation associated with that facility be provided by sources other than the federal government.

By the way, I noted that just last month the President of the United States went to Iowa and expressed his strong support for spending \$13 million for a 13th Federal swine research center.

What I do not understand here is, first, why does this action have to be taken in a conference that is on a rescission bill? That is No. 1. No. 2, why should it be given to Iowa State University? Are there other universities in the country that are qualified? Was there any competition? Was there any estimate made of the cost? Or did we just decide that \$12,678,000 should be

given to build a facility at Iowa State University? There may be very legitimate answers to these questions, but none of them have been discussed or debated by the entire U.S. Senate.

There are several more, but two especially. One concerns Clear Lake Development Facility.

The conferees agree to include an administrative provision which will enable the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to exercise an option to purchase the Clear Lake Development Facility, as modified for use as a Neutral Buoyancy Laboratory. The facility is currently being leased by NASA. It is the intention of the conferees that the cost of the facility as modified by the current owner (or contractor) and delivered completely modified to NASA, will be no more than \$35,000,000.

The bill text says:

SEC. 1008. The Administrator shall acquire, for no more than \$35,000,000 a certain parcel of land, together with existing facilities, located on the site of the property referred to as the Clear Lake Development Facility, Clear Lake, Texas. The land and facilities in question comprise approximately 13 acres and include a light Manufacturing Facility, an Avionics Development Facility and an Assembly and Test Building which shall be modified for use as a Neutral Buoyancy Laboratory in support of human space flight activities.

This provision, which is in the bill text, and the report language was not in either the House or the Senate bills as passed by each body. Have there been hearings on this matter? The President's budget request does not contain request for this purchase.

It is my understanding that NASA must now, should this act become law, purchase this one certain parcel of land. What if there were other facilities that could be bought more inexpensively?

Does NASA need the facilities described in the bill text?

Why is NASA purchasing building facilities that it is then directed to convert into a buoyancy lab?

Does NASA have any need for these additional buildings?

It is my understanding that McDonnell-Douglas currently owns this facility. What is the fair market value of this facility? Have NASA and McDonnell-Douglas been negotiating this sale?

Could not this purchase wait for the normal authorization and appropriation process to occur?

It seems to me if we are going to make a purchase of \$35 million from a private corporation of a piece of land it should not appear suddenly in the conference report of a rescission bill. As I say there may be perfectly legitimate reason to do so, but this is no way to legislate.

The next one, of course, that I find very unusual is:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) shall convey, without reimbursement, to the State of Mississippi, all rights, title and interest of the United States in the property known as the Yellow Creek Facility and consisting of

approximately 1,200 acres near the city of Iuka, Mississippi, including all improvements thereon and also including any personal property owned at NASA that is currently located on-site and which the State of Mississippi to facilitate the transfer: Provided, that appropriated funds shall be used to effect this conveyance; Provided further, that \$10,000,000 in appropriated funds otherwise available to NASA shall be transferred to the State of Mississippi to be used in the transition of the facility; Provided further, that each federal agency with prior contact to the site shall remain responsible for any and all environmental remediation made necessary as a result of its activities on the site * * *

The Manager's statement says:

Yellow Creek Facility, Mississippi—The federal government has a long history of involvement in Yellow Creek, located near Iuka, Mississippi. The site, originally purchased by the Tennessee Valley Authority for use as a nuclear energy plant, was subsequently transferred to NASA after the nuclear energy plant's cancellation. NASA intended to use Yellow Creek to build the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor (ASRM) and, after its cancellation, instead committed to use the site to build nozzles for the Redesign Solid Rocket Motor (RSRM). On May 2, 1995, due to its current budgetary constraints, NASA terminated the RSRM nozzle production effort at Yellow Creek. The bill language included by the conferees on the transfer of the NASA Yellow Creek facility reflects the most recent commitment made by the NASA Administrator to the Governor of the State of Mississippi. The major investment by the State of Mississippi in facilities and infrastructure to support Yellow Creek, in excess of \$100,000,000 is a key to factor in NASA's agreement to turn the site over to the State of Mississippi. The main elements of the agreement reached between NASA and the State of Mississippi, which the conferees expect to be adhered to by the two parties, are as follows: The Yellow Creek facility will be turned over to the appropriate agency of the State of Mississippi within 30 days of enactment of this Act. All of the NASA property on Yellow Creek which the State of Mississippi requires to facilitate the transfer of the site transfers within the site to the State, subject to the following exceptions * * *

And those exceptions are interesting, to say the least. But, also, and the final paragraph is also interesting:

Within thirty days of enactment of this Act, \$10,000,000 will be transferred from NASA to the appropriate agency of the State of Mississippi. The site's environmental permits will become the property of the State of Mississippi. NASA will provide all necessary assistance in transferring these permits to the State of Mississippi.

Again, Mr. President, this is a rescission bill. This provision was contained in neither the House nor the Senate bills nor accompanying reports. Again, this language is not in the President's budget.

Why are we forcing NASA to buy one parcel of land while we are forcing it to give another away at no cost? If NASA has been working with the State of Mississippi on this matter, why was this provision not included in the rescission bill when that measure was before the Senate? Is there some emergency, some reason why we are transferring this land to the State of Mississippi in this bill without waiting for

NASA reauthorization and appropriations bills?

Mr. President, there are numerous other provisions in this bill which I will make part of the RECORD as part of my statement. But here is the problem again.

The problem is that we have authorization bills on which many issues are silent, like these two I just went over. Then we have an appropriations process here on the floor of the Senate where we are silent on these two major projects totaling well over \$70 million here.

And then out of the conference into the report, where no Member of this body can make any changes to it, appear these appropriations for as much as \$50 or \$60 million in this case. It deprives the Members of the Senate of the ability to debate and discuss issues and the expenditure of their taxpayers' dollars.

Especially egregious is when it is on a rescission bill. This is not a spending bill. This is a rescission bill. So instead of cutting funding we are adding money.

Mr. President, as I say, there are probably good and valid and legitimate reasons for these areas and others I will highlight in the formal part of my statement. But I can assure you, there is no argument that can be made that this process is correct because it does not allow the Members of this body, who were duly elected but were not members of the conference on appropriations with the other body to have any input whatsoever into these decisions. We deserve that. And it is our obligation, since it is our taxpayers' dollars being expended, to be a part of that.

I hope this process will stop. I hope this process will stop. We are about to begin the appropriations cycle of some 12 or 13 bills.

I intend, I say to my colleagues, to continue to do everything in my power to stop this practice and return to the practices that we should follow in the U.S. Senate, which are hearings, authorization, appropriation, conference, and final signing of the bill by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 18 minutes and 5 seconds remaining.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I will yield at the appropriate time, when he is ready, 10 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania, of my time remaining.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I thank very much the Senator from Arizona for yielding. I appreciate his comments. It is gratifying to know the Senator, not only on this bill but many other bills that come through here, is dogged in his determination to ferret out inappropriate things that are put in bills. I appreciate the Senator's comments on that and congratulate him on his vigor.

I wanted to first congratulate the Senator from Oregon, Senator HATFIELD, and the Senator from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, on plain, true leadership in this bill through the process. They went into the conference and they stood by the Senate positions as best they could. They negotiated, I think, a very good bill, a bill that strikes a good balance in a variety of different programs. They provided leadership. They provided leadership. They stood up, fought for what they believed in, and they were able to succeed in coming out with a compromise bill that I think will pass overwhelmingly on the Senate floor.

I am not surprised by the comments of Senator HATFIELD. Senator HATFIELD said that in his entire tenure as a Member of the Appropriations Committee—which I am sure spans well over 20 years—that this was the first conference committee that he has been to where the administration had no input, had no one there, was providing no guidance, no leadership, no direction as to where to take this conference report and how to reduce the budget deficit. Absent, without leadership, AWOL again this time on a \$16 billion rescissions bill. It was not there.

Now, after Senator HATFIELD, Senator BYRD, and Chairman Livingston over in the House worked so hard, put together and crafted a compromise that they could all live with, the President comes in and waves a white flag and, says, "Oh, no. I do not like this. I know this is bad. Of the \$16 billion there, is almost \$1 billion I do not like. I cannot sign it. I wish you would have told me."

That is not leadership. That is not taking a very serious problem, and the problem is the budget deficit, and doing something proactive coming into those conferences and providing direction.

So now we see the veto threat coming out, that they are going to veto this bill that passed the House with bipartisan support, and passed the Senate with partisan support, and will now go to the President to be buried. It is something that did not have to happen.

If there is a sad thing about what is going to occur in the next few days, it is it did not have to be this way. The reason it is this way is because the President refused to lead. But this should come as no shock to anyone in this Chamber.

One of the reasons I am here tonight—and I have been for the past several nights—is to talk about the President's lack of leadership with respect to the budget resolution. Now, 6 days ago, as I add the number 7 to the chart—7 days ago Senator DOMENICI's Budget Committee presented a balanced budget resolution on the floor of the Senate. It has been 7 days with no proposal to balance the budget from President Clinton now, a week the President has sat on the sidelines. Yesterday was day 6, a potentially exciting

day because there were reports that the President was actually going to come forward with a budget, that he said in some radio interview with National Public Radio in New Hampshire that he was really going to work on his 10-year budget plan, that he thought we could get to a balanced budget in 10 years, and he was going to offer something.

But, again, not with a great amount of surprise, the President came out today, and according to the Washington Post:

Clinton sidestepped questions about whether he was still committed to the time frame he outlined in a weekend radio interview with four New Hampshire reporters * * *

He said, you know, I think all Americans should be committed to a balanced budget.

That was his new comment that, you know, we should all be for this but, of course, he is not going to put anything forward. In fact, Michael McCurry, his spokesperson, his press secretary, said:

Right now, to come forward [with an alternative budget] would be an idle exercise.

Now I understand. Leadership, according to the White House, is an "idle exercise," going to conference committee meetings to discuss reducing the budget deficit by \$16 billion is an "idle exercise" that is not worth the President's time. Why should he get involved in anything such as cutting money or the balanced budget? This is an "idle exercise." This, for a President who weeks ago had a debate with himself as to whether he was relevant to the process here in Washington.

Mr. President, you are answering your own questions by your actions.

So while he says, "Well, I am not now putting together a budget because it would be an idle exercise to do so," we find out from senior spokespeople at the White House that the Office of Management and Budget is working on a budget. I do not know whether they are not telling the President they are working on a budget or the President does not want anybody to know he is working on a budget, or whether, you know, someone is just leaking it out that they are working on a budget so we think they are working on a budget. These are all very interesting things that could be going on.

But the bottom line is that it is 7 days and no budget, no plan; 7 days, no leadership, no direction, no ideas, walking away from one of the greatest and most important moments in the last several decades, which is balancing this budget.

I am not surprised, but I am disappointed. As I said before, I am going to come here every day, every day between now and October 1, and challenge the President to stop it; please, please stop it. Please stop me from coming here and having to put this chart up, having to print up more numbers. These get expensive. I do not want to print up more numbers.

So I have to keep adding numbers to the chart here about how many days it

has been since you have decided not to participate in the process.

Today was an interesting day. It was an interesting day today. We had several Democratic Senators come forward with their balanced budget proposals. After, I am sure, imploring the Chief Executive Officer of the country to propose his budget that balances the budget, they decided to venture out on their own and introduce the budget an hour before the end of debate on the balanced budget resolution.

We had 50 hours of debate on the budget, and 1 hour before the termination of debate, several Democratic Senators rushed to the floor with their idea sketched out—I do not know whether it was on the back of the envelope or the front of the envelope—but it was sketched out in very vague terms about how they are going to get there. We are going to have some tax increases. We knew that. I mean, that was a given. The question was, how much? They said \$230 billion. The Senator from New Hampshire was suggesting maybe it is more like \$400 billion, about a third of what they want to cut the deficit by.

They want to do it over 9 years instead of 7. They want to use some of our cuts. They want to use some of our savings given by the Congressional Budget Office by balancing the budget, none of which has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office. They just want to throw this together with no specifics, no plan on how to get the \$150 billion in cuts they want to get out of Medicare, no plan on how they are going to restructure any of the programs that they want to cut in domestic discretionary or defense spending—no specifics, just some numbers, just some tax increases, and just a lot of rhetoric about, you know, we are for this too, we want to be relevant, too.

After sounding somewhat critical, I congratulate them. I congratulate them for at least stepping from behind the shadows and moving forward, and saying, "We believe in a balanced budget, too. Here is how we are going to get there. We don't believe we should fundamentally restructure Government as much as you think we need to do. We need to increase taxes some more because the American public does not pay enough to run this place. So we need to tax them some more."

That is fine, if they believe that. If that is what you believe, then come here and defend it.

I congratulate them for having the courage to come up and defend it. I am hoping that when this debate is all—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes allotted to the Senator has expired.

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD], is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I rise to thank my good friend, the senior Senator from Arizona, for his comments regarding

various provisions included in the conference report of the rescissions bill.

Let me first reiterate how pleased I am to be working with the Senator on a variety of congressional and budget related reforms. He and I share a number of common concerns regarding the impact of special interests on elected Government, and I was delighted when the Senator from Arizona approached me before this session began to see if I would be interested in working with him on some of those issues.

That kind of bipartisan spirit is essential if we are to build anything truly meaningful and lasting in the 104th Congress.

Without that spirit, all that can be done is to advance an agenda that is hollow and transitory. Despite the understandably partisan tone of the statements often made in the Chamber, I know there are people of good will on both sides of the aisle who are willing to try to tackle problems together.

I have often mentioned the Kerrey-Brown deficit reduction package that was developed in the last Congress as an example of that kind of effort. And I was happy to be a part of that bipartisan effort.

I think the effort the Senator from Arizona and I are making is another such example of bipartisan work.

There has been some progress made already this year. I was delighted that a measure to clean up the emergency appropriations process, which the Senator from Arizona and I sponsored, was included in the line-item veto measure that passed the Senate, and I very much hope that the line-item veto conferees will retain that emergency spending provision. And there will be others as well.

Mr. President, one of the ongoing efforts that the Senator from Arizona and I agreed on was to undertake a look at the earmarked items in appropriations bills. The Senator from Arizona has a long history of this already, of certainly some discomfort to some, but I believe it has had an impact. Just the knowledge that the Senator from Arizona will be asking questions about these kinds of appropriations can be a deterrent. I certainly hope this is the case. And I also hope that by joining him in this effort on a regular basis, we can discourage even more.

So, Mr. President, that brings me to the rescissions bill. It is ironic that legislation intended to take a first step toward a balanced budget has become again a vehicle for a number of provisions that I think move us in the wrong direction. Not only does the conference report specify new spending, for which there is no compelling or immediate need, it also contains provisions which restore funding beyond the level which passed either House.

My friend from Arizona mentioned some of these items. We have all read about the various earmarked transportation projects, courthouses and other building projects that somehow continue to endure. They are kind of like

cockroaches; no matter what we throw at them or how many we kill, some of them still survive.

Mr. President, there are other programs as well: \$12.7 million for a National Swine Research Center. It is my understanding that, as I believe my friend pointed out, there are already a dozen such centers. Do we really need a 13th swine research center? And if we do need a 13th swine research center, should there not be a competitive process to justify where the thing is sited?

Another one: \$1 million allocated to the Advanced Lead-Acid Battery Consortium.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that one company is the principal beneficiary of this research funding. This has all the trappings once again of corporate welfare. I question whether we should be dedicating scarce revenues to the kind of applied research for which the private benefits clearly exceed the public benefits.

And then, Mr. President, we find the following provision in section 1008 of the bill. It says:

The Administrator shall acquire, for no more than \$35 million, a certain parcel of land, together with existing facilities, located on the site of the property referred to as the Clear Lake Development Facility, Clear Lake, TX.

The section goes on to explain that NASA is being directed to buy this property to use as a neutral buoyancy laboratory.

One might well ask, Mr. President, what this provision is doing in a bill, the main focus of which is to reduce the deficit.

But, Mr. President, just when you think you have seen it all, you read the very next provision, section 1009, which reads as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation. * * * NASA shall convey, without reimbursement, to the State of Mississippi, all rights, title and interest of the United States in the property known as the Yellow Creek Facility and consisting of approximately 1,200 acres near the city of Iuka, MS.

Mr. President, if you can believe it, it gets worse. Further down section 1009 we find the following.

Provided further that \$10 million in appropriated funds otherwise available to NASA shall be transferred to the State of Mississippi to be used in the transition of the facility.

Not only are we giving away this facility, Mr. President, the Federal Government is actually throwing in \$10 million to sweeten the deal in something we call a rescissions bill.

Mr. President, in two consecutive sessions of the so-called rescissions bill, NASA is required to pay \$35 million for 13 acres of land and facilities in Texas to establish a neutral buoyancy lab and to give away 1,200 acres of land and facilities in Mississippi along with a bonus of \$10 million.

My back-of-the-envelope arithmetic suggests that Federal taxpayers netted out losing \$45 million and 1,187 acres from just those two sections alone.

I am sure someone might be able to provide us with some reasons NASA is being required to make these deals, but nothing in this legislation before us suggests anything the least bit urgent about them.

Mr. President, should we be asked to swallow these land deals as part of legislation intended to give us a good jump-start at deficit reduction and to provide emergency funding for some urgent problems? I do not think we should. If there are sound reasons to make these land deals, then those who advocate these arrangements should be willing to subject them to the scrutiny of the regular appropriations or authorization bills. These provisions argue strongly for the reform that the Senator from Arizona and I have introduced and that was included in the line-item veto measure we passed.

Mr. President, by establishing a new point of order against adding these kinds of nonemergency measures to emergency appropriations bills and by prohibiting OMB from adjusting spending caps or otherwise relaxing the sequester process for emergency appropriations bills that include these extraneous measures, our proposal would limit the ability of some to circumvent the normal legislative process as I suggest may have occurred here. These provisions also argue for the line-item veto measure itself, and I very much hope we can make progress in moving that issue along as well.

I just want to reiterate any thanks to the Senator from Arizona and his staff for their continuing vigilance on these issues. There are tangible costs to that work, as anyone reviewing the list of projects that has been rescinded can divine, but in the end, Mr. President, the only way we will end these abuses is for Members to follow the lead of the Senator from Arizona and reject these special provisions even when it means rejecting a project for one's own State.

So I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). Who yields time?

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Iowa be allowed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Senator from Arizona for the 10 minutes.

Before I speak to the point that the Senator from Arizona brought up about the national swine center, I want to compliment everyone who worked on this rescissions bill which rescinds \$16 billion of expenditures, moving us more quickly to a balanced budget than waiting until the beginning of fiscal year 1996 which starts October 1 of this year.

This gives us a 6-month head start on the efforts toward balancing the budget. Everybody, Republican and Democrat, involved in this process to bring forth this sort of change in the expend-

itures for our present fiscal year is to be complimented and to be considered fiscally responsible. I applaud them for that.

At the same time, I think it is irresponsible for the President to take the position he has when there was so much of an effort in the Senate to accommodate the White House in the first instance of the passage of this legislation.

I hope the President will change his mind, sign the bill and help move us on to a balanced budget much quicker than would otherwise happen.

My good friend from Arizona has raised a lot of issues, on this bill and on other bills, that raise the question about the wise expenditure of public moneys. I compliment him for doing that. He is a responsible watchdog of the taxpayers' money. There are not enough of those in this town.

One of the issues that he raised previously was on the National Swine Research Center located at Iowa State University, one of the major universities in my State. I want to speak to that point, because I think he raised some legitimate questions about it.

The first question raised was whether or not it was a conferenceable item—was it in one of the bills before it went to conference or was it amended in conference?

It was a conferenceable item. Under the rules of the House and Senate conference, it was something that could have legitimately been dealt with in the conference. It was not something that was added after the fact by the conferees in an effort to sneak something through.

The next question that was legitimately raised was why a swine research center and why at Iowa State University?

I suppose the latter one is the easiest to answer. It is there because our State is the leading pork producing State in the Nation. And some of the best scientists in animal husbandry are there, some of the best researchers. So you put a facility where outstanding people are located to do the research when you have a national goal to do research in a particular area.

The whole issue of swine research, the whole issue of agricultural research, is not questioned any more as a good public policy of our Government. It is something that has been promoted by the Federal Government going back to 1862. More specifically, in this century, a lot of legislation was passed that has the Federal Government, through the Agriculture Research Service, very much involved in agricultural research; not to benefit just the farmers, but to make sure that there is an adequate supply of food and high-quality food available for consumers.

Why do we have a National Swine Research Center? Well, there was careful consideration given to the formation of this. A long time ago, a national peer panel recommended the establishment of a Swine Research Center. They did it

because the needed research was not being conducted in any other State or Federal laboratory nationwide. This peer review panel made very definite that this program of research not be duplicative and they made a determination it would not be duplicative. They did that through defining the mission, the mission of the research center. That mission is to develop technology to ensure that the U.S. pork industry operates as an environmentally sound and efficient animal production system.

In that particular statement from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, we ought to put emphasis upon environmentally sound as a lead purpose of the swine research center in Iowa as opposed to the other swine research centers that the Senator from Arizona mentioned in the question about why, when you have some, do you need others. We need a national swine research center because we have not had adequate research in that area and we need it.

The emphasis, of course, is on the environmental aspects. But also like other research centers, the environmental research and determinations have something to do with the efficiency of the animal production system.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, through their directives on this particular National Swine Research Center, says that it will help maintain and increase the competitiveness and efficiency of U.S. pork production and marketing. These are national goals, as well. Agriculture is one of those areas of production in America where we are most efficient and where we are without a doubt competitive with any other country in the world.

The exports of our agriculture products give us a very positive, favorable trade balance in agriculture. Without that positive favorable balance in agriculture and in food products we would have yet a bigger deficit in our overall trade. So, a research center that is going to continue to keep us competitive has a very good overall economic benefit to our entire Nation, as we try to keep our trade deficit down.

Now this compromise before us allows the laboratory of the national swine center to be built at a cost of \$12,678,000 by the Agriculture Research Service.

Mr. President, we have appropriated these funds in other fiscal years for this project, in fiscal year 1992, \$1.8 million; fiscal year 1993, \$1.5 million; fiscal year 1994, \$4.5 million; and fiscal year 1995, \$6.2 million.

Twelve million dollars completes the project. I am sure that the Senator from Arizona would not suggest that we should throw the work already done down the drain by not completing this project.

Now, the legitimate question is asked by the Senator from Arizona about why is this project given to Iowa State University.

The pork industry of the United States of America, probably the researchers involved, and Iowa State University, would rather not have this given to Iowa State University. Traditionally, this would continue to be a Federal facility with the operation costs paid, because it is a national research center in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, fulfilling a national service.

A lot of those operational costs over the ensuing years would be paid for by the Federal taxpayers. But, it is one of the compromises, in order to go ahead and get this facility finished, that Iowa State University would assume the operational costs of the laboratory and any additional construction costs above that figure. The Agricultural Research Service, then, would turn the completed structure over to Iowa State University.

Where continually there would be an ongoing cost every year for decades into the future for the operation of this, the answer to the Senator from Arizona is it was given to Iowa State University so that the Federal taxpayers would not be saddled with the operation of it into the future.

Iowa State University, the National Pork Producers and even the Agriculture Research Service will work to make sure that there is no duplication of research other places, that there are efficiencies made elsewhere at the other facilities for swine research, and to make sure that we consolidate Federal swine research activities so there is no duplication.

This was a demand from the chairman, particularly on the House side, for us to meet, to satisfy the leaders on the other side of the Hill that this would not be an ongoing cost and this would be the end of it if they completed it. This was all a general agreement to get this activity completed. So it is completed.

I hope that I have satisfied the Senator from Arizona—without trying to discourage him from asking legitimate questions, which he has—that the completion of this is necessary so that the \$12 million is not wasted and, in addition, that this will not be an ongoing cost to the taxpayers of the Federal Government. That it was only given in ownership to Iowa State University, not just because the Federal Government just gives away things willy-nilly, but because Iowa State University is accepting the cost of the operation not for only the short term but long term.

I hope that my colleagues see that as a good deal for the taxpayers, a good deal for agricultural research, a good deal for the pork industry, a good deal for our balance of trade, a good deal to assure an adequate supply of quality food to the consumers of America. All of these are good public policy; all of these have been followed in a lot of areas of agricultural research in the past, maybe even a lot of research generally that our National Government conducts.

So I ask my colleagues to consider these points of view and let this facility be completed once and for all.

Mr. McCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Iowa for his very lucid and informative explanation. I regret we have to go through this kind of a drill. I think we could probably avoid it in the future under different circumstances of authorization and appropriations process.

I also thank my friend and colleague from Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD, for all he has done and all he will continue to do. I appreciate the opportunity of working with him on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I regret that my friend, the senator from Arizona, has chosen once again to criticize funding for the National Swine Research Center. He attacks this conference report because it does not rescind funding for the center provided in previous measures.

Let us be clear that the rescissions bill passed by the Senate did not include any provisions pertaining to the National Swine Research Center. It was only in the measure passed by the House of Representatives that funding for the center would have been rescinded. So if the senator from Arizona is criticizing the Senate conferees for supporting the Senate's position and not receding to the House on this point, I believe his criticism is misplaced.

We debated funding for the center on the floor of the Senate earlier this year. My colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, and I discussed the development of plans for the center, the need for the research that it will conduct and the justification for construction of this new facility.

The Agricultural Research Service has stated that the research at the Swine Research Center will not be duplicative of other research. There is no other facility now equipped to carry out the research that is planned for the Center. That research will emphasize odor and water quality research. The goal is to help the pork industry improve its competitiveness and efficiency in an environmentally sound manner.

This Center was peer reviewed. It has been identified by ARS as a high priority. It is a product of joint planning by ARS, the National Pork Producers Council, the Iowa Pork Producers and Iowa State University.

Because agricultural research is so important to our Nation, and because pork production is such a large part of our Nation's agricultural economy, I believe there is ample justification for using Federal funds to construct the National Swine Research Center and to support the operation of the center and its research in future years.

But the House conferees on this bill said that their leadership was adamant

about not letting the plans for the Swine Research Center go forward as originally developed. I strongly disagreed with the position of the House conferees, and I worked with them to improve report language they had first recommended that would have been quite damaging to the future of the center. In the end the House conferees agreed that the \$12.678 million which had been appropriated would not be rescinded, but they insisted on report language specifying that once the facility at Ames, Iowa is constructed it would be conveyed to Iowa State University and further stating that future costs of operating that facility at Ames are expected to be provided by sources other than the Federal Government. The language also states that Iowa State University should work in collaboration with the pork industry to cover research and additional construction costs associated with the center or to offset those costs through the consolidation of Federal research activities. Again, I strongly disagree with the report language insisted upon by the House conferees, but it was the best that could be obtained under the circumstances.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I believe I have about 7 minutes remaining. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Rhode Island who has a statement to make.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona for letting me have some time at the final part of this evening.

It is with some reluctance that I will vote against the conference report on H.R. 1158, the pending rescissions bill. The report has much to commend it. It would provide needed disaster relief to Americans across the country who are still recovering from a series of tragedies, of course the principal one of those is in Oklahoma City.

In addition, the report would provide for more than \$16 billion in savings to the Federal Treasury. Although I cannot say I agree with each of the places where the report would make these cuts, nonetheless it represents a really solid first step toward reversing the pattern of unconstrained Federal spending.

Mr. President, notwithstanding the benefits of the funding provisions of the report, it is the general policy provisions that are the ones that have led me to conclude I cannot support the report. As those who have read the report carefully will note, it is replete with measures that would override or revise substantially environmental laws in a variety of contexts. I am especially concerned about those relating to Federal timber sales and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, sometimes referred to as NEPA.

My concern with the bill's timber sales provisions have been evidenced ever since I voted against a motion to table a substitute amendment during

the floor debate on the Senate version of the bill. I recognize the need to address expeditiously risks arising from the poor health of certain public forests.

However, this provides no ground for throwing environmental considerations overboard. The conference report has only added to my concerns.

Why do I say this? First, the report retains so-called "sufficiency language," with respect to salvage and option 9 timber sales. This language provides that an agency's compliance with certain minimal obligations in the carrying out of a sale is "deemed sufficient" to satisfy the requirements of all applicable statutes.

This language would disallow any meaningful site-specific challenge to a sale under the environmental laws, especially given that the report would also would eliminate administrative appeals of timber sale decisions.

In addition, Mr. President, another provision in the report expressly would revise the agencies' analytical obligations with respect to salvage timber sales. The provision in question would make the duty to consider environmental effects of salvage timber sales solely discretionary. I think this is an important point, Mr. President. Under the revisions that have been made in connection with this rescissions bill, the agency would make the duty to consider environmental effects of salvage timber sales to become discretionary; in other words, you do not have to do it.

This approach, I believe, is shortsighted and unwise. Conducting environmental analysis can be especially important in carrying out salvage sales because candidate sites usually have experienced significant disturbances. A salvage sale has arisen because there has been significant disturbances in the area—a tremendous hurricane or tornado, earthquake, or something as formidable as an explosion, the volcanic action of a mountain, as took place in the State of Washington about 15 to 18 years ago.

Such sites, therefore, are often especially sensitive to further disturbance caused by timber harvests.

Is this me talking or some expert? Well, let us see what the dean of the Duke University School of Environment, Norman Christensen, said in March 23 of 1995, just 2 months ago, in a letter to Appropriations Committee Chairman HATFIELD. He explained the possible serious adverse effects of poorly carried out salvage sales.

This is what he said:

Improperly used, however, [salvage and thinning] can cause serious, long-lasting damage to resources including soils, streams, wildlife, fish and residual trees. The timing and manner of their application requires at least as careful analysis and monitoring as other types of logging.

In other words, there is not something unique about salvage sales, winds fall and timber; you can just go in and take it away.

Done poorly, the productivity and biological integrity of public forests may be permanently compromised.

And finally, Mr. President, environmental effects of sales encompassed by the report could be substantial, particularly in light of two factors: No. 1, the conferees extended by a full year the period during which sufficiency language would apply. This extension would nearly double the sufficiency period that was in the Senate bill.

We passed a bill at a certain length of time. They doubled it in the conference, and this could translate into an additional 2 billion to 4 billion board feet of timber being harvested with minimal environmental analysis. This is not a case of rushing in and picking up some timber that has just fallen down in a certain area. This is big activity.

No. 2, while numerical timber volume targets have been removed from the bill, the managers' statement includes a so-called "volume requirements." This is a classic example of trying to have it both ways. The managers' volume numbers exceed by far what agriculture Secretary Glickman has said the Forest Service can achieve while meeting substantial requirements of applicable law.

Mr. President, I have concerns over what is done to the National Environmental Policy Act, so-called NEPA. But, Mr. President, in this late period in the evening, I am not going to debate the merits of the report's NEPA provisions as much as to highlight that there has not been real debate on them at all. These actions take place in the Appropriations Committee, and I do not think the Congress should be in the routine of using appropriations bills to bypass or bar compliance with environmental statutes in ways that will have significant environmental effects. This is an improper practice that must cease. For me, that means now with this report.

I want to thank the Chair and yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1158, the Emergency Supplemental and Rescission Act. I am proud of the fact that my colleagues and I on the House and Senate Appropriations Committees have cut more spending in this bill than in any rescission bill in the history of this country. I want to compliment Chairman HATFIELD and Chairman LIVINGSTON for their leadership on this legislation.

The bill cuts \$16.4 billion in spending and provides supplemental funding for disaster relief and increased anti-terrorism funding to respond to the Oklahoma City bombing. I, for one, am outraged that President Clinton announced last Wednesday that he intends to veto this rescission bill. The President should sign the rescission bill and join our efforts to put the Federal Government on a budget like everybody else. When President Clinton

vetoed a \$16 billion cut in Government spending to protect a few pet programs, he is putting the interests of his administration and his part in front of the interests of the people of America.

I would like to comment briefly on the supplemental funding provided for the FBI and the Justice Department in the Commerce, Justice, State section of the bill. The President requested \$71 million for the Justice Department's response to the Oklahoma City bombing and to enhance Federal law enforcement's ability to respond to domestic terrorism. The conferees were concerned that, in many cases, the President's request failed to provide the true, full-year cost of hiring additional FBI and other Justice Department personnel, since the President assumes that many of these new personnel will be hired late in the fiscal year.

As a strong supporter of federal law enforcement, I wanted to ensure that the FBI and the Justice Department have the resources they need to prosecute and convict the violent criminals who committed the Oklahoma City bombing. I also wanted to begin the process of strengthening Federal law enforcement so that we can do everything possible to prevent anything like this terrible crime from ever happening again.

To accomplish these goals, the conferees have provided \$113 million for the Justice Department, including \$90 million for the FBI, and an additional \$16.6 million for increased security at Federal courthouses. These amounts are within the parameters set for this bill by the full committee chairmen, and I intend to provide additional resources for these purposes when I present my recommendations for the fiscal year 1996 Justice Department appropriation.

I am dismayed that, in many cases, the additional resources requested by the President to respond to the Oklahoma City bombing are for items previously requested by the FBI and the Justice Department in their regular budget requests, but previously rejected by the Clinton White House.

Under the Clinton administration, the FBI endured a nearly 2-year hiring freeze, while normal attrition reduced the number of special agents by 765. The FBI crime laboratory has been forced to curtail the services it provides State and local law enforcement agencies due to budget constraints. As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that funds the FBI, I am committed to reversing this trend, and I am confident that these efforts will have the strong support of the American people and the vast majority of the Senate.

Finally, I am proud that the conference agreement on the Commerce, Justice, State section of the bill includes more new spending reductions than either of the House- or Senate-passed bills. The budget resolution currently under consideration in the Congress will build on the good work of

this rescission bill and ultimately lead us to the first balanced Federal budget since 1969. When we complete our work on these measures, we will have fulfilled the promise Republicans made to the American people last November, to put the Federal Government on a budget, to say not to more Federal spending, and to allow more families to say yes to their own spending priorities for their own children.

NATIONAL KOREAN WAR VETERANS ARMISTICE DAY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, included in H.R. 1158 is language that will designate July 27 of each year, from 1995 until 2003, the 50th anniversary of the end of active conflict in the Korean war, as National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day. This important designation could not have been achieved without the assistance of my good friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska, Senator STEVENS. I would also like to point out that our initiative to put this language in H.R. 1158 is a one-time exception due to the timeliness of the matter—the Korean War Veterans' Memorial will be dedicated this July.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I join with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia, in this proposal to formally honor those brave Americans who fought in the Korean war. This is an initiative which is both important and necessary.

On June 25, 1950, without warning, armed forces of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea invaded their neighbors to the south, the Republic of Korea, initiating the Korean war. Shortly thereafter, at the request of the President of the Republic of Korea, President Harry S Truman directed American forces to enter into the war. The American involvement was spearheaded by the Army's Task Force Smith.

Subsequently, a U.N. command was created which, by the end of active combat, had incorporated military units from 21 member nations, under U.S. leadership, in the struggle. The fighting continued, with American forces bearing the brunt of the action, until July 27, 1953, when a cease-fire agreement ended active combat.

Mr. WARNER. Under the command of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and, later, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgeway, U.N. forces repelled the invasion and restored the integrity of the Republic of Korea along with the freedom and independence of the South Korean people. During 3 years of active hostilities, our Armed Forces, enduring the rigors of combat in the extremes of a hostile climate and the most trying of conditions, engaged in some of the most significant battles in our Nation's history. Those battles included the Inchon landings, the Pusan Perimeter breakout, and the battle of the Chosin Reservoir.

Over 5.7 million American service people were involved directly or indirectly in the war. Of those, 54,246 died;

33,629 of whom died in battle. An additional 103,284 were wounded and 8,177 were listed as missing or prisoners of war. There are 329 American prisoners of war still unaccounted for.

Mr. STEVENS. Unfortunately, the Korean war has come to be known as America's forgotten war, and our veterans from that era deserve the recognition they earned through their valor and sacrifices. The following Senators served in that war: my friend JOHN WARNER, as well as BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, JOHN CHAFEE, JOHN GLENN, and ARLEN SPECTER.

Mr. President, for that reason, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia and I proposed establishing a National Korean War Armistice Day. We believe that this Nation should never forget the service rendered, and the sacrifices made, by those brave Americans who fought, and in particular those who died, in the Korean war.

Mr. WARNER. The distinguished senior Senator from Alaska and I are also pleased that, as a result of congressional and Presidential authorizations, the Korean War Veterans Memorial will be built, in Washington, DC, to recognize and honor the service and sacrifice of those Americans who participated in the Korean war. By establishing July 27 as National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day, we will build upon and enhance that long-due recognition for Korean war veterans.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I rise to speak against the conference report that is before us this evening. Six weeks ago, we spent nearly a week here on the Senate floor debating the merits of cutting funding for education. Many believed that the rescission bill made too many cuts in important education and training and children's programs that benefit working families and children.

After many days of debate, the Senate reached an agreement that rearranged the Senate's priorities and restored funding for children and for education. Under the leadership of Majority Leader DOLE and Minority Leader DASCHLE, the children and education cuts were limited to \$400 million. In the end, the Senate took a strong position in support of students and children, a position that we expected would be held in conference.

Head Start, WIC, Safe and Drug Free Schools, Title I, Goals 2000, School to Work, Immigrant Education, Trio, and National Service all received important infusions of funding that made the final Senate package—with \$405 million in education cuts—stand in stark contrast to the House package, with \$1.6 billion in education cuts. The Senate's intention on education could have not been more clear.

Two weeks later, 34 Senators, Republican and Democrat, reaffirmed that position, and sent a letter to Senator HATFIELD explaining why the Senate had made the changes, and asking that "We strongly urge you to support students and education and the Senate

level of education rescissions." I ask unanimous consent that this letter be entered into the RECORD.

Despite an unmistakably clear message to the conferees, the conference agreement has now come back with \$950 million in cuts to education programs and we are being asked once again to cut education.

I don't think I need to repeat again the effect of these harsh rescissions—reduction or elimination of violence and drug prevention programs for 39 million students; elimination of school reform grants to 4,000 schools; reduction in reading and math assistance for 135,000 at-risk children; elimination of a promising start on technology in schools—all of this and more will be gone if the conference report is adopted and the President signs the bill.

One point cannot be overemphasized—schools across the country are counting on these funds. States have already been notified of the amounts they will receive in July. If these rescissions go through, children will be dropped from services, teachers will be laid off, computer orders will be canceled.

I think the record of the U.S. Senate on education rescissions is clear. I urge my colleagues to reject this report, and to vote to sustain a veto if President Clinton vetoes this bill, which I believe he should and will.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we have an order for the disposition of debate under the rescissions supplemental appropriations bill. I wonder if the Senator will permit us to complete that action, and then there will be a period for morning business set aside for the Senator to speak.

Mr. FEINGOLD. How much time remains?

Mr. COCHRAN. Only 3 minutes remain with this Senator. I am advised the Senator from West Virginia has 8 minutes, and he authorized us to yield back that time. So the Senator can speak very quickly. We will be in morning business very soon.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Very well.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I yield myself the remainder of the time under the order.

Mr. President, the Senators from Wisconsin and Arizona complain about two provisions in this conference report dealing with NASA. They are administrative provisions, and they are clearly and fully explained in the committee report on pages 132 and 133.

Let me add to the Clear Lake development facility issue by saying that the authority to enter into this transaction was previously passed by the

Senate last year on the NASA authorization bill on October 5.

This purchase saves taxpayers' funds and makes needed facilities available to NASA on a timely basis. It was considered carefully by the Senate conferees and was found to be not only in the public interest but in the interests of the Federal Government. That is why it was included and approved.

Insofar as the Yellow Creek Facility in Mississippi is concerned, time does not permit a long narrative to expand on the provisions of this conference report itself, describing the history of this facility.

Let me just quickly say from my own personal recollection, the Federal Government came into this northeast corner of Mississippi, condemned property to build a huge nuclear facility for TVA. Halfway through the construction phase, after everybody had been stressed and strained in terms of accommodating the Federal Government's interest or this agency's interest, they canceled the facility, putting a lot of people out of work who had moved to the area who helped build the facility, and finally NASA decided they would take the land.

Transfers were authorized by Congress for NASA to build an advanced solid rocket motor facility on the property. People moved into the area—scientists, technicians and all the rest—schools were built, roads were built, infrastructure developed, by the State, by local governments, taxes were raised, to help pay for this Federal facility and accommodate the interests of the Federal Government.

Patriotism was rampant because of the new pride in that part of the State to do something for our Federal Government and our space program. NASA abandoned ASRM when the House voted it down one night and canceled all the authority for the funds. Then they worked out a program to have a nozzle facility built to take the place of this other facility. Now it has been canceled, just recently.

Finally, they say in Mississippi, "Look, get the Federal Government out of here. Let the State government try to do something that is predictable that makes sense." This is after \$100 million had been invested by local and State interests, local taxpayers. People have lost money building housing in this area, doing things in anticipation of the result that would come from these Federal Government activities.

Now, finally, we are just saying in this provision, this is an emergency supplemental bill, too, not just a rescission bill. It provides funds for disaster assistance, to disaster victims. I challenge anybody to find anyone who has been victimized any more than the people of this part of the State of Mississippi by actions of the Federal Government. This provision has been requested by NASA, it was considered carefully by conferees on both sides. It

is included here, because it is in the public interest. There ought to be more included here to deal with the victims of that disaster.

I will not belabor it. I congratulate the Senator from Iowa for his comments about the facility. They complain about being in the bill, in the conference report now. We defended the position of the Senate. The Senate authorized this to continue to be a Federal Agriculture Research Service facility. We had to compromise with the House.

The Senator, complaining that we should not have compromised, I suppose. It does not make logical sense to me to complain about the actions of the conferees who were bound to defend the position of the Senate. The Senate entertained an amendment of the Senator from Arizona and voted it down.

We are obligated to take up for the Senate and we did. But we had to compromise with the House and we worked it out, and the Senator fully described the result.

I am proud of the work our conferees did. We worked hard and brought back a conference agreement that I hope the Senate will approve when we vote on it tomorrow morning.

Mr. President, the fiscal year 1995 Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act provided \$297 million in cost-of-money lending authority for telephone loans of the Rural Utilities Service, formerly the Rural Electrification Administration, at a subsidy cost of \$60,000. There is a 7-percent interest rate cap in that program, and when rates exceeded that amount at the beginning of the fiscal year, the cost-of-money program was substantially curtailed because of inadequate subsidy. Because of the cap, when long-term Treasury rates exceed 7 percent, the interest rates on individual loans require a subsidy. The \$60,000 subsidy was appropriated to satisfy the loan loss reserve requirement of the Treasury Department, not to subsidize interest rates.

The conference report accompany H.R. 1158, incorporates a provision included in the Senate-passed bill which removes the interest rate cap for fiscal year 1995 in this program. This action will allow the Rural Utilities Service to utilize the entire \$297 million in loan authority provided for this program. It is my understanding that the Rural Utilities Service has already approved seven loans during this fiscal year, totalling \$3.2 million. However, none of the funds on these loans have been drawn down by the borrowers. Since interest rates on these loans are fixed at the time of draw down, not at the time of approval, there will be no interest rate subsidy associated with these loans upon enactment of H.R. 1158.

Fortunately, the long-term Treasury rate is now around 7 percent again, rather than almost 8 percent that existed early in October. This means that

borrowers will receive a reasonable rate of interest at no cost to the Treasury for any loan in this program approved during fiscal year 1995. However, if interest rates do rise, the program will still continue at the authorized levels, without an interest rate subsidy, as Congress intended.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the conference agreement accompanying H.R. 1158, the second supplemental appropriations and rescissions bill for fiscal year 1995.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his efforts to complete congressional action on this bill. I regret that after significant work, the President now states that he will veto the final bill.

Such action will even further delay the provision of emergency disaster assistance requested by the President for California and 40 other States that have experienced natural disasters.

Such action will delay the availability of funding to pursue the investigation of the tragic Oklahoma City bombing.

Such action will delay the provision of funding requested by the President to fund a new counterterrorism initiative.

The funding in this bill to respond to these requests by the President totals \$6.95 billion.

These emergency funds include disaster aid of \$3.35 billion to be available for the remainder of fiscal year 1995, and \$3.35 billion as a contingency appropriation, which can be obligated by the President beginning in fiscal year 1996 with specific notification of the Congress.

The bill includes rescissions totaling \$15.4 billion in budget authority and \$0.4 billion in outlay savings for fiscal year 1995 to provide deficit reduction as the Congress seeks to move toward a balanced Federal budget.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill. It will put a downpayment on the significant deficit reduction that will be required to balance the budget, and begin to alleviate the burden of debt we are leaving to our children and future generations.

Now is the time for Congress to embark on a serious journey to get its fiscal house in order. This bill is but a first step on what will be a long and difficult, but necessary, journey.

I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point two tables showing the relationship of this bill to the section 602 allocations of the Appropriations Committee and to the current level which displays congressional action to date for fiscal year 1995.

H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS CONFERENCE

[FY 1995, in millions of dollars, CBO scoring]

Subcommittee		Current status ¹	H.R. 1158 ²	Subcommittee total	Senate 602(b) allocation	Total comp to allocation
Agriculture—RD	BA	58,117	-82	58,035	58,118	-83
	OT	50,330	-30	50,300	50,330	-30
Commerce-Justice ³	BA	26,693	-291	26,402	26,903	-501
	OT	25,387	-99	25,288	25,429	-141
Defense	BA	241,008		241,008	243,630	-2,622
	OT	249,560		249,560	250,713	-1,153
District of Columbia	BA	712		712	720	-8
	OT	714		714	722	-8
Energy-Water	BA	20,293	-234	20,059	20,493	-434
	OT	20,784	-52	20,732	20,749	-17
Foreign Operations	BA	13,537	117	13,654	13,830	-176
	OT	13,762	241	14,003	14,005	-2
Interior	BA	13,577	-282	13,295	13,582	-287
	OT	13,968	-79	13,889	13,970	-81
Labor-HHS ⁴	BA	265,870	-2,883	262,987	266,170	-3,183
	OT	265,718	-252	265,465	265,731	-266
Legislative Branch	BA	2,459	-16	2,443	2,460	-17
	OT	2,472	-12	2,460	2,472	-12
Military Construction	BA	8,735		8,735	8,837	-102
	OT	8,519		8,519	8,519	-0
Transportation	BA	14,193	-2,624	11,568	14,275	-2,707
	OT	37,085	-22	37,063	37,072	-9
Treasury-Postal ⁵	BA	23,589	-588	23,001	23,757	-756
	OT	24,221	-39	24,182	24,225	-43
VA—HUD	BA	89,891	-8,495	81,396	90,257	-8,861
	OT	92,438	-112	92,326	92,439	-113
Reserve	BA				2,311	-2,311
	OT				1	-1
Total appropriations ⁶	BA	778,674	-15,378	763,296	785,343	-22,047
	OT	804,957	-457	804,501	806,377	-1,876

¹ In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, these totals do not include \$3,905 million in budget authority and \$7,442 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress, and \$841 million in budget authority and \$917 million in outlays for emergencies that would be available only upon an official budget request from the President designating the entire amount as an emergency requirement.

² In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, these totals do not include \$3,491 million in budget authority and \$441 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and/or the Congress.

³ Of the amounts remaining under the Commerce-Justice Subcommittee's 602(b) allocation, \$22.1 million in budget authority and \$1.6 million in outlays is available only for appropriations from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

⁴ Of the amounts remaining under the Labor-HHS Subcommittee's 602(b) allocation, \$45.4 million in budget authority and \$8.2 million in outlays is available only for appropriations from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

⁵ Of the amounts remaining under the Treasury-Postal Subcommittee's 602(b) allocation, \$1.3 million in budget authority and \$0.1 million in outlays is available only for appropriations from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

⁶ Of the amounts remaining under the Appropriations Committee's 602(a) allocation, \$68.8 million in budget authority and \$9.9 million in outlays is available only for appropriations from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

FY 1995 CURRENT LEVEL—H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS BILL
(In billions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays
Current level (as of May 5, 1995) ²	1,233.1	1,216.2
H.R. 1158, emergency supplemental and rescissions, conference agreement ³	-15.4	-0.4
Adjustment to conform mandatory items with budget resolution assumptions	(1)	(1)
Total current level	1,217.7	1,215.7
Revised on-budget aggregates ⁴	1,238.7	1,217.6
Amount over (+)/under (-) budget aggregates	-21.0	-1.9

¹ Less than \$50 million.

² In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include \$3,905 million in budget authority and \$7,442 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress, and \$841 million in budget authority and \$917 million in outlays for emergencies that would be available only upon an official budget request from the President designating the entire amount requested as an emergency requirement.

³ In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, these totals do not include \$3,491 million in budget authority and \$441 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress in this bill.

⁴ Reflects revised allocation under section 9(g) of House Concurrent Resolution 64 for the Deficit-Neutral reserve fund.

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

Mr. BOND. The President recently announced his intention to veto the rescission bill recently agreed to by the joint House-Senate conference committee. In part, he decried the agreement on the basis of the rescissions proposed for HUD. This is outrageous. This President wants to take a mouthful of popular political rhetoric on budget constraint and responsibility, but still can't bring himself to inhale. You can't stop spending until you halt

the growth in programs which generate it. This stuff may be hard to swallow, but unless we get beyond the political posturing, our Nation and our economy will gag on the unpaid bills of our irresponsibility.

Some have questioned why HUD is being cut more than \$6.3 billion, nearly three-quarters of a total rescission of \$8.5 billion for the Subcommittee. The answer is simple: The cut is roughly proportionate to that Department's available budgetary resources. Although HUD received new appropriations for fiscal year 1995 of \$25.7 billion, about 39 percent of the funding for our four major agencies, it also carried into this fiscal year \$35.2 billion in unobligated prior year balances. In other words, it more than doubled its total available budgetary resources with this massive influx of unspent, unobligated funding.

We must cut HUD, and we must begin now if there is to be any hope of surviving the very constrained "freeze-minus" future for discretionary spending reflected in both the House and Senate reported budget resolutions. The Congressional Budget Office analysis of the cost of the President's original budget submission for subsidized housing demonstrated a 50% expenditure increase over the next five years. Unless we act now to curb the spiraling

growth in outlays, we will have to make truly draconian cuts in the near future.

The solution is simple: Turn-off the pipeline of new subsidized units. That is the fundamental focus of the rescission bill. We have also restored cuts proposed by the House in CDBG, modernization, and operating subsidies, and redirected available resources toward another urgent aspect of restoring budgetary sanity to this out of control Department: demolish the failed housing developments, and put the rest on a sound footing to survive the competition and subsidy reductions coming down the pike.

Amid all the debate over the future of HUD, it's important to keep in mind that over 4.8 million families receive Federal housing assistance, and over half of them are elderly or disabled. It's also important to note that such housing assistance is expensive, as I said \$26 billion in fiscal year 1995 outlays, and current costs are rising. In fact with the long-term contractual commitments previously made by HUD, the Government is currently obligated to pay over \$187 billion over the life of these contracts, some stretching out 40 years.

Given the long-term nature of these obligations and commitments, halting

the budgetary growth of the Department can only be accomplished with a focused, determined, multi-year effort. Unless we begin now, with this bill, we will lock ourselves into another multi-billion dollar chunk of long-term budget obligations. And this is only a first step, one of many in which we will go beyond the limited fixes and cuts that can be accomplished in a rescission bill. We must enact major reform legislation later this year, but this is a good, and very necessary beginning.

The program reforms and initial reductions contained in the rescission bill are desperately needed to avoid a budgetary train wreck with the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The President has criticized a number of specific actions contained in the conference agreement. Frankly, there are a number of recommendations in the conference report which are troubling to me. But this bill is a compromise with the House-passed measure which contained much larger rescissions, and I believe the agreement goes a long way towards minimizing adverse program impacts while increasing our contributions to deficit reduction.

For example, the rescission agreed to for National Service was increased to \$210 million from the \$105 million Senate-passed level. While many of us are dubious of the whole premise of paying people to become "volunteers," regardless of their financial resources, and we have heard of instances where excessive payments have been made, the conferees decided to maintain this program at the pre-existing funding level established for fiscal year 1994. I might add that the rescission is half the House-passed rescission of \$416 million.

The President's statement also says we cut funding for housing AIDS victims. While a \$30 million rescission was approved, it is only a small fraction of \$186 million included in the House bill. Moreover, the rescission simply provides the identical funding level requested by the President for this fiscal year! Since the President didn't request this appropriation in the first place, it is at least ironic that he should now protest its rescission.

The conference agreement includes the full \$6.7 billion requested by the President for the disaster relief fund. This will enable FEMA to respond to needs in California resulting from the Northridge earthquake and disasters in other states.

Mr. President, I would also note that citizens of my own State are enduring yet another flood on the Missouri River. Thankfully, this flood does not compare to the devastation wrought by the Midwest Flood of 1993, but a number of communities still have suffered significant damage, and thousands of families have been dislocated. Missouri's governor already has stated that he anticipates a formal request for assistance within days, and that need

has been echoed by the many local officials who have contacted my offices in recent weeks.

Yet FEMA tells me that they will only be able to respond for a few more weeks without additional funding. Where will that leave the victims of the latest flooding in the Midwest when the President chooses politics over people?

Mr. President, I would also note that the conference agreement contains \$5 million requested by this the Administration to enable FEMA to initiate flood mitigation activities authorized by the National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. So this bill not only provides the resources to help flood victims recover from these disasters, but we are also taking steps to help avoid such flood damage in the future.

With appropriations contained in this bill, FEMA will also be able to meet all needs arising as a result of the terrorist attack in Oklahoma City. I am pleased that the conference agreement includes \$7 million for FEMA to train and plan for any future terrorist incidents, and to beef up security in several locations. We commend FEMA for its compassionate, timely and professional response to the Oklahoma City attack. FEMA has earned the confidence and respect of the American people, and has come a long way under the leadership of James Lee Witt.

The conferees agreed to rescind \$81 million from the Department of Veterans Affairs, including \$50 million from excess personnel costs and \$31 million from excess project reserves. This rescission will not impact VA's ability to provide patient care in any way. The rescission to personnel costs does not affect staffing. Simply, VA's budget included \$50 million more than they now estimate they need to pay salaries. Despite the erroneous assertion in the President's statement, no funding is being rescinded for medical equipment needs of VA hospitals and clinics.

In terms of the construction account, funds are rescinded from projects which are costing less than what was originally appropriated. Rescinding the funds ensures VA carefully manages its construction budget.

The conferees rescinded a total of \$1.5 billion from EPA. Of the total, \$1.3 billion is rescinded from the drinking water state revolving fund. Because this program has not been authorized, EPA has been unable to obligate the funds. While I support the need for this program, until it is authorized no funds may be spent.

Within the Superfund program, \$100 million is rescinded. Because EPA fails to obligate on average \$100 million in Superfund appropriations each year, this rescission is not expected to have a dramatic effect on program activities. On the other hand, it is intended to slow program spending pending enactment of major reform legislation which will likely change the scope and nature of clean-up activities previously planned.

Although the total rescission for EPA is slightly greater than the total rescission contained in either the House or Senate versions, the conference agreement is entirely within the scope of the differences between the Houses for each budget account of the agency. No new or extraneous items were rescinded.

The conference agreement contains a number of legislative provisions impacting EPA programs. Provisions impacting EPA's automobile inspection and maintenance program are intended to ensure EPA is flexible in reviewing states' plans for I/M programs and considers assigning additional credits for effective decentralized programs.

Two provisions contained in the Senate-passed version of the bill have been retained: first, a moratorium on new Superfund site listings for the balance of this fiscal year, unless requested by the governor or unless reauthorization legislation is enacted, and second, a prohibition on EPA from enforcing vehicular trip reduction programs were agreed to in conference.

Finally, the White House has indicated that it seeks to restore \$14 million for the \$88 million rescission for the yet to be established Community Development Financial Institutions program. This is despite the fact that the conference agreement adopted the funding level contained in the Daschle democratic leadership compromise amendment.

Mr. President, the conference agreement on this supplemental and rescission package is a good one. Rescissions for programs under the jurisdiction of the VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee total \$8.5 billion. The contribution towards deficit reduction is \$1.6 billion more than the level originally passed by the Senate, but is \$800 million less than that passed by the House. It is a compromise, but one which fairly balances the differing priorities of the two Houses and still maintains funding for critical activities.

Mr. President, I hope the White House reconsiders its ill-advised initial reaction to this bill. If this bill is vetoed, it will mean further delays which may disrupt timely delivery of assistance to disaster victims in 41 States, including my own, as well as the Federal response in Oklahoma City. Perhaps equally important, delay also means that Federal agencies will obligate even more of the funds we have identified for rescission, making the task of saving money in low priority programs even more difficult.

The stated objections of the White House to this emergency supplemental and rescission bill are nothing more than spurious. And the matters that they have demanded be changed can only be described as a grab-bag of politically appealing items, which aren't needed, or couldn't be effectively utilized, or simply increase current spending when we all know that spending must be reduced to get our budget back in balance.

Mr. President, this is a responsible bill. It cuts funding and contributes to deficit reduction. It provides emergency funding which is urgently needed to assist victims of disasters. It makes long overdue reforms and corrections in programs which need fixing. And this bill needs to be enacted without further delay. I urge the White House to set politics aside, and begin working with us to make this conference agreement law.

INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I would ask the Senator from Missouri three questions about the provisions in this bill on the auto emissions inspection and maintenance program required by the Clean Air Act. The bill would prevent EPA from apply an automatic 50 percent discount in emissions credits for State programs that included test-and-repair, as opposed to test-only, stations. It is my understanding that the bill requires EPA to examine each program a State has submitted and assign the appropriate emissions credits. Based on various features of a State's program, EPA might assign emissions credits equal to 100 percent of a test-only program. Or EPA might find the appropriate credit is only 75 percent or 25 percent, depending on how a State program is structured. Is that a correct reading of the bill?

Mr. BOND. The Senator is correct. EPA is to examine the entirety of each State inspection and maintenance program and is to assign the appropriate emissions credits based on the actual program the State submits. No automatic discounting factors should apply and the determination of the appropriate emissions credits should be based on good science and engineering analysis.

Mr. CHAFEE. The report language accompanying this bill indicates that EPA may give a State up to 2 years to make a demonstration that justifies the credits it is seeking. Is EPA required to grant a 2-year demonstration period to every State that requests it?

Mr. BOND. No. The 2-year period to demonstrate the effectiveness of a State program may be granted by EPA, if the Agency believes it to be reasonable. This allows the Agency to implement the inspection and maintenance requirements in a more flexible way. But unreasonable proposals that surely would not merit the emissions credits claimed need not be granted a 2-year demonstration period. It is not an automatic extension for any and all inspection and maintenance programs that may be submitted by the States.

Mr. CHAFEE. Finally, I would ask whether this provision affects any other aspect of the plan submissions and attainment demonstrations that States are to make under the Clean Air Act?

Mr. BOND. No. The sole purpose of this language is to prevent EPA from requiring States to adopt enhanced inspection and maintenance programs based on the I/M240, test-only model

and to prevent EPA from automatically discounting programs that use test-and-repair stations by a factor of 50 percent. The language has no other effect on State obligations under the Clean Air Act.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask first of all to yield back the balance of time under the order of the Senator from West Virginia.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Does that conclude the authority under the conference report, under the order previously entered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are still 6 minutes for the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I yield the time back on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO LES ASPIN

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I knew Les Aspin for 25 years. In 1970, I was a junior in high school in Janesville, WI, when I signed up as a volunteer on Les' first campaign for the First Congressional District seat in Wisconsin. He won that election after a tough recount in the primary, defeated the incumbent Congressman.

I then interned in his Janesville, WI, Post Office basement office in 1971 and in 1972 during the summers. During the next quarter century, we had a continuing friendship, as he carved out a distinguished career in the United States House of Representatives, eventually rising to become the chairman of the Armed Services Committee while I prepared for and began my own career.

By temperament and training, Les Aspin was a man who listened to ideas and demanded facts. His mind was trained at some of the best educational institutions in the world: Yale, Oxford, and MIT.

Sometimes the conclusions he reached after thoroughly probing a problem were not welcomed by all who heard them, but they were always the product of a rigorous and honest intellectual process. Les Aspin enjoyed the successes and endured the setbacks common to all Members who choose a career in public service.

His service was marked by unflagging dedication. I believe he always did what he thought was right and he always did his best.

One thing was readily apparent. He came from our strong Wisconsin reformist tradition. He was long an oppo-

nent of waste and fraud and abuse in Government, including but certainly not limited, to the military.

He fought against junk telephone calls as well as junkets. He unearthed cost overruns in big-ticket weapons projects, punched holes in corporate propaganda campaigns, and dragged some highly questionable foreign business practices out into the spotlight.

He also criticized the insular environment that enveloped the Defense Department and the defense industry that fostered the waste of taxpayers' money.

Along the way, Les Aspin became recognized as one of the Congress' leading experts on military policy. I would say one of the leading experts of any time in the history of our Congress.

Les Aspin served his country diligently in many capacities. As an Army captain, he worked as an analyst in the Pentagon; he served on the staff of President John Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisors; he represented Wisconsinites for 22 years in Congress; he enthusiastically took on the giant task of steering the Defense Department into the uncharted waters of the post-cold war era.

When Les Aspin suffered his fatal stroke, he was chairing the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, working with his friend and colleague, CIA director John Deutch, on needed reforms in our intelligence communities.

Mr. President, Les Aspin was a man I deeply respected and admired. As I look back at the fact that my own entry into politics began in his first campaign for office in 1970, I feel a profound sense of loss at his passing. He was a good friend and a dedicated public servant. Far too soon we have lost an exceptional human being.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before turning to today's bad news and it is terrible about the Federal debt, let us go through our pop quiz routine once more. You remember—one question, one answer:

Question: How many million dollars in \$1 trillion? While you are arriving at an answer, let us acknowledge that it was the U.S. Congress that ran up the Federal debt that now exceeds \$4.8 trillion.

To be exact, as of the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, May 23, the Federal debt—down to the penny—stood at \$4,885,334,984,188.51, meaning that every man, woman, and child in America now owes \$18,544.81 computed on a per capita basis.

Mr. President, how many million in a trillion? There are a million million in a trillion, and the Federal debt now exceeds four million million, 885 billion dollars. Get the picture?